



Archaeology Under Fire

Nationalism, politics and heritage
in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East

EDITED BY LYNN MESKELL



**Also available as a printed book
see title verso for ISBN details**

Archaeology Under Fire

Archaeology Under Fire is a ground-breaking collection which addresses the Middle East and Eastern Mediterranean as one of the most politically-charged regions in which archaeology is implicated. Historically, this area played a formative role in the emergence of archaeology as a discipline. However, until now, study of the sociopolitical implications of archaeology has focused on Western Europe rather than the region explored here, where the materiality and practice of archaeology is inextricably linked to the political and cultural realities faced by their respective peoples.

Leading academics present chapters on Cyprus, Greece, the former Yugoslavia, of archaeology in current political issues, from ethnic cleansing in the Balkans to the division of Cyprus. Globalism, postcolonialism and the positive role of the past as a means of reconciliation are some of the themes explored in this volume. The contributors interweave theory and practice and demonstrate how this area of the world can provide a relevant model for understanding archaeological praxis.

Archaeology Under Fire will be essential reading for archaeology students and professionals and all those interested in the impact of the past on current political debate.

Lynn Meskell is Research Fellow at New College, Oxford. She has written extensively on Egyptian and Mediterranean archaeologies and the application of feminist theory and sociopolitics to archaeology. feminist theory and sociopolitics to archaeology.

Archaeology Under Fire

Nationalism, politics
and heritage in the
Eastern Mediterranean
and Middle East

Edited by
Lynn Meskell



London and New York

First published 1998
by Routledge
11 New Fetter Lane, London EC4P 4EE

This edition published in the Taylor & Francis
e-Library, 2002.

Simultaneously published
in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
29 West 35th Street, New York, NY 10001

© Selection and editorial matter, Lynn Meskell;
individual chapters, the contributors

All rights reserved. No part of this book may
be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any
form or by any electronic, mechanical, or
other means, now known or hereafter
invented, including photocopying and
recording, or in any information storage or
retrieval system, without permission in writing
from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available
from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
A catalog record for this book has been
requested

ISBN 0-415-16470-2 (hbk)
ISBN 0-415-19655-8 (pbk)
ISBN 0-203-02981-X Master e-book ISBN
ISBN 0-203-20071-3 (Glassbook Format)

Archaeology, politics and the cultural heritage of Cyprus

A. Bernard Knapp and
Sophia Antoniadou

Introduction

Across the spectrum of contemporary archaeology, few would deny that political realities impact powerfully and often negatively on both archaeological practice and archaeological interpretation. We hear more and more of archaeology's role in the construction and legitimisation of cultural or ethnic identity, and of the destruction, sale and obliteration of archaeological pasts from their modern cultural contexts. Such 'cultural cleansing' is nourished by the consequences of war, nationalistic fervour, inter-ethnic conflict, and the illicit and universally condemned trade in antiquities. In these situations, political neutrality is unachievable and can no longer be condoned by archaeologists (Pollock 1992:301–4).

Nor can archaeology deny its overtly political role in informing us about our human past, disrupting long-held myths and prejudices, and impacting our current social constructions within the global village. The current literature is awash with articles treating ethnicity, cultural identity, politics and nationalism in archaeology (for example, Atkinson *et al.* 1996; Díaz-Andreu and Champion 1995; Graves-Brown *et al.* 1996; Jones 1997a; Kohl and Fawcett 1995a; Schmidt and Patterson 1995; Trigger 1984; Whitlam 1996). Archaeologists tend to adopt current social concerns such as these, make them their own, and relate them—

consciously or unconsciously—to the historic as well as the prehistoric past (Wilk 1985). However, it is not enough simply to be aware of the atrocities committed during the last decade as a result of ethnic or nationalistic turmoil throughout the world: we must also realise that archaeological information in these regions has been accessed, used and abused for unintended purposes by diverse special interest groups (Preucel 1995:161).

Images and symbols from the past play conspicuous and powerful roles in the political present. Archaeological finds may become banners for newly-created ethnic groups or nations (see Brown 1994, Chapter 3). Mythical and historical evidence for ancient migrations may be cited to justify ethnic cleansing or to legitimise present-day territorial expansion. Renfrew (1994:156) maintains that ‘the perversion of ethnicity is the curse of our century.’ As a direct result of national funding practices or even of individual archaeologists’ personal interests, disproportionate emphasis is given to certain sites (for example, Great Zimbabwe) or classes of data (for example, Islamic pottery in Iron Age east Africa) that are seen to be politically useful. Such overt political bias in archaeological research and interpretation is neither new nor unusual: what has changed is the willingness of archaeologists to recognise such realities. By its nature archaeology has always had an obvious political dimension, and nationalism—like ethnic or cultural identity—makes manifest the character of archaeology as a social, historical and political enterprise (Silberman 1995:249; see Hodder, Chapter 6).

Despite a long-standing archaeological tradition and the potential global impact implicit in any study of the Middle East, most studies of archaeology and ethnicity or nationalism have steered clear of the region’s volatile states (cf. Elon 1994; Jones 1997b; Silberman 1987, 1989). Meskell in the introduction to this book maintains that this reality is linked inextricably to the construction of our field, which views archaeologies in the region as conservative and theoretically challenged (similarly Knapp 1996:141–2); in this respect, world archaeology simply has shortchanged itself. However, in order to treat the politics of archaeology in this region, it is necessary to consider deeper currents in the unfolding of the modern world system—the spread of capitalism, and the eventual but inevitable reaction of postcolonial cultures.

Such a statement implies that we exist in a state of ‘postcoloniality’, but in fact the present is entirely bound up in colonial formations. Postcolonial means more than just *beyond* colonialism: it is also concerned with implementing sociopolitical action to resist and replace dominant imperial structures (Jacobs 1996:161). Whereas people, cultures and nations may actively resist and deny colonialist tendencies and colonial constructs (Thomas 1994:58–60), the past is always being reworked nostalgically and adapted creatively to the present. When contemporary European states began their economic and imperial

expansion over the globe during the seventeenth to eighteenth centuries, empirical dogma began to replace religious beliefs, and the proponents of classical or biblical archaeology found themselves forced to counter historical doubts cast on the validity of scripture by Darwinian evolutionary theory and by European evolutionary archaeology (Silberman 1995:255). The discovery and excavation of sites in ancient western Asia and the eastern Mediterranean positioned 'Western' scholars as the legitimate cultural (and imperial) heirs of a rich archaeological past (see Özdogan, Chapter 5; Bahrani, Chapter 8 and Hassan, Chapter 11). Residual formations of colonialism like this are still very powerful in the eastern Mediterranean and the Middle East, despite postcolonial 'resistance'; moreover, the (formerly) colonised still engage in complicity, conciliation and even disregard for colonialism. It is mainly those who harbour nostalgic feelings for imperialism that see the formerly colonised as actively resisting the former 'core' (Jacobs 1996:14–15). As long as assumptions of superiority and the right of force are galvanised in the rhetoric of contemporary research, part of what Said (1978:12, 94–5) called the 'Orientalist discourse', constructions of the past will devalue indigenous cultures and histories, and propagate the dominant, Euro-American presentations of the past constantly repeated by the major figures in the field (Whitelam 1996).

The situation on the eastern Mediterranean island of Cyprus also involves a somewhat different, cultural translation of a far more distant colonial past (cf. van Dommelen 1997:306). Silberman (1995:259), for example, states:

For a nation like the Republic of Cyprus, with its obvious political attachment to images of Greek antiquity, the extensive excavation and presentation of classical cities like Paphos, Kition, and Ammathus [sic] are clearly linked to a modern, national self-consciousness.

But what of those places that do not become part of the official heritage, or are denied a role in that heritage because they are inaccessible (i.e., in occupied territory)? Such sites take on powerful political roles and set the stage for struggles over cultural identity and political power. Heritage, then, imbues certain places with symbolic values and beliefs, and transforms them into a space where cultural identity is defined or contested, and where the social order is reproduced or challenged (Jacobs 1996:35). Increasingly, heritage culture represents a strategy of response to global forces, centred on the preservation rather than the reinterpretation of identities; the imperative is to salvage 'placed identities for placeless times' (Robins 1991:41). Heritage involves a dynamic process where multiple pasts compete to become sanctified. The politics of archaeology on Cyprus are both multiple and ambiguous: dividing lines are sharply drawn on the land itself, and contrasting arguments and ideologies are precisely defined. Yet both sides, for entirely different reasons, follow political

or economic agendas that affect the preservation of Cyprus' cultural heritage (see also Özdoğan, Chapter 5).

The 1974 Turkish invasion and subsequent occupation of the northern part of the island precipitated a blatantly ideological, cultural cleansing of the Greek Cypriote past; it also set in motion a train of events which continues to impact negatively on the practice and potential of archaeology on the island. The list of antiquities that have gone missing or been destroyed since 1974 continues to grow. Archaeologists no longer have any legal status to study or conduct any kind of research in the occupied northern part of the island. The status of Turkish Cypriote archaeologists in this regard can be debated, of course, but they have nonetheless a moral duty to control and protect the cultural heritage in the face of its large-scale destruction and looting. Whatever the situation may have been prior to 1974, the prevailing culture history of Cyprus has become quite biased, based as it is on excavations and surveys that have been limited for the past twenty three years to the southern sixty three per cent of the island. Since 1974, in other words, the cultural, archaeological, environmental and ideological conditions that prevail in the north have been inaccessible to most practising field archaeologists, to virtually all people who study Cypriot archaeology and to all Greek Cypriotes.¹

In the attempt to treat all these diverse and volatile issues, this chapter presents first a general discussion of politics in archaeology, followed by a more focused treatment of imperialism, postcolonialism, globalism and the cultural identity of Cyprus. Two factors are then considered that have impacted the politics of archaeology within contemporary Cyprus. First, we outline the political and religious background to events that resulted in the Turkish invasion of Cyprus in 1974, and examine the pattern of destruction and desecration in the northern part of the island, citing data from public records. Second, we consider from a cultural and political perspective the negative impact of such developments on the practice and interpretation of archaeology in Cyprus today. We conclude with an overview of the politics of postcolonial place, and argue that Cypriot archaeologists will have to frame their own political agenda as contemporary political realities beyond their control shape and re-shape the cultural heritage of Cyprus.

The politics of archaeology

Shanks and Tilley (1987a, 1987b, 1989) have argued that only political goals are viable in archaeological research; archaeological discussion and interpretation thus should aim to disempower political and intellectual élites by affirming the validity of diverse explanations of the past (Trigger 1995:263; cf. Holtorf *et al.* 1996). Other archaeologists who speak from gender, Third World, or rural

perspectives maintain that archaeologists like Shanks and Tilley are élitist in their own right, and have done nothing to advance the position of the real archaeological underclasses (e.g., Andah 1995; Ferguson 1992; Handsman 1991; Spector 1993; Wylie 1991, 1993; Zimmerman 1995). Trigger (1995:263–4) points out that archaeological data have been adopted to promote bigotry, violence and destruction just as much as they have been used to promote social justice. When archaeological enterprise is used to justify unpredictable or unacceptable political ends, archaeologists have to move beyond polemic, and attempt to redress the social or moral imbalance.

The way archaeologists interpret the past is conditioned by what they individually and collectively believe they know about the past, and by the techniques available for recovering, analysing and interpreting archaeological evidence (Trigger 1995:265–6). Archaeologies influenced by nationalism are neither all bad nor all good, and the intricate relations between nationalistic archaeologies and political practice stem from the nature, tradition and relevance of archaeology to the political process (Trigger 1995:270). For their part, archaeologists must recognise that their personal attitudes towards politics or nationalism are likely to stem from what they perceive to be in their own self-interest. Whatever such personal views or biases may be, there can be no justification for deliberately distorting the archaeological record, or for misinterpreting it with political ends in mind (Kohl and Fawcett 1995b: 9).

At one end of the spectrum, archaeological data have been misinterpreted for nationalistic or political purposes, and human history has been deliberately reconstructed. At the opposite end, nationalistic archaeology has generated questions about ethnicity or local cultural configurations that most processual and culture historical archaeologists would have eschewed. Viewed optimistically, then, the practice of a political archaeology can help to resist and overcome colonial and imperial residues. As Meskell emphasizes in the introduction to this book, postprocessual or interpretive archaeologies foreground social and political contexts; they work at the local level and are concerned with issues of meaning, symbolism, ethical and political responsibilities, and cultural or even individual identities. Postmodernist approaches to the study of the past (Knapp 1996; Preucel 1995) now extol the proliferation of competing narratives. Indeed, it is only within a theoretical milieu which encourages diverse viewpoints that archaeology can develop its social conscience and political stance. Ethnic cleansing and cultural fragmentation are not simply academic matters; they are human reactions that involve the creation of new polities, the assertion of re-worked cultural identities, the disempowerment of social groups and the destruction of past histories. Given such realities, the intrinsic power of the past challenges archaeology's engagement in the present and raises compelling questions about

archaeological practice on a local level and archaeological responsibilities on a global level.

Postcolonialism, globalism and cultural identity

In order to consider the various political issues that impact on the archaeology of Cyprus, our perspective is necessarily local, historical and relativistic. However, because we believe these developments arose and persist primarily in the context of British imperialism and its local reflection, colonialism, this chapter is not intended as a retreat into 'nostalgic localism'. Nor is it an act of defiance against global capitalism: neither the transnational tendencies of colonialism nor the spread of multinational corporations have been able to obliterate the local or contain the national. Capitalism in both its imperial and postmodern forms operates through *difference*, through the 'specificity of the local' (Jacobs 1996:6), and through a range of cultural processes that engage both Self and Other in constructing hierarchies of power. Indigenous groups living in colonial situations periodically seek to redefine their social position, thus articulating the local within a wider, global context (van Dommelen 1997:309).

During the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, those hierarchies that had produced and maintained colonial structures were progressively undermined as new nation states emerged and counter-colonial movements sought to reclaim or re-establish their cultural (or ethnic) identity, or even to revamp such identities as had been constructed under the colonial umbrella. It is precisely within such a framework that we must look at the 'Cyprus problem', the formation of Greek Cypriote and Turkish Cypriote identities, the illicit trade in antiquities, and the concomitant developments in Cypriot archaeology, in other words, at the processes by which Self (the imperial British) and Other (the colonial Cypriotes) were defined and articulated as a crucial part of the *cultural* dimensions of colonialism and postcolonialism. These processes delimited categories of difference that became inscribed as imperial/colonial structures, where the making and remaking of cultural identity was carried out in representational, material and ideological spheres (Jacobs 1996:2). Our focus on the local, or colonial, then, makes it possible to engage the global, or imperial, as we consider the shaping of the Cypriot identity, the practice of Cypriot archaeology over the past century, and the postcolonial condition that envelops the 'Cyprus problem' and dictates the constitution of Cyprus' cultural heritage.

But before we celebrate prematurely the concept of postcolonialism as an ideal theoretical construct, we also need to be aware of its limits, of problems inherent in the application of dualities such as colonial/postcolonial, or Self/Other, when it is the presence of agency or intentionality that is critical to

postcolonial formations. Even if postcolonial theory challenges the notion of unilinear development and its associated binary ways of thinking, the very term paradoxically sets up a binary orientation and perpetuates the logic of Western historicism. The politics of agency must be incorporated into any analysis of the wide range of postcolonial formations expressed in various ways and in diverse settings. Negotiations of identity and the dynamics of agency are located within specific hierarchies of power that permeate particular politico-economic frameworks (Jacobs 1996:28). Thus it is more effective to conceptualise postcolonialism as a set of formations that seek to negotiate social, ideological and material power structures established under colonialism. If the term postcolonialism necessarily implies globalism, and thus generalises diverse histories and links them too tightly to the imperial core, at the same time it provides the practices and experiences of the Other with an agency, a strategic sensibility that reacts against the core. If this notion appears to be driven by nostalgia, by a seduction with the primitive and exoticness of the Other, at least it offers an alternative way of conceptualising ‘otherness’ and of distinguishing the independent place of divergent, local cultures (Staler 1989). These are issues of postcolonial theory, not of postcoloniality itself, and so must not infringe negatively upon the varied perspectives that can be formulated, critiqued and revised. Most importantly, these diverse perspectives can engage and contest the study of colonial cultural productions, and facilitate the critical analysis of postcolonial peoples and nations who still speak from the margins.

We turn now to consider how the imperial past and postcolonial present have affected the cultural heritage of Cyprus. In order to do so, we present here a narrative of events and issues (see Table 1.1) that led, first, to the establishment of an independent Republic of Cyprus and, second, to the 1974 Turkish invasion and occupation of the northern part of the island, which fractured that independence.

Cyprus—politico-religious background (1571–1997)

In 1571, Cyprus became a province of the Ottoman Empire, as had many other southeastern Mediterranean countries throughout the sixteenth century. Incorporating Cyprus into the Ottoman Empire entailed certain social and demographic developments which altered the ethnic composition of the island and which survived in much the same form into the twentieth century. The Sultan, for example, issued *six firmans* (edicts) ordering the emigration to Cyprus of one-tenth of the population of several Anatolian provinces, ostensibly in order to boost the depleted population of the island. And, in order to revive the rural economy (Kyrris 1985:259), grants of land were made to Turkish officials for their military service; in time such lands passed largely into small-

Table 1.1 Cyprus: historical outline, political and religious developments, 1571–1997

12th–16th centuries AD	Prankish and Venetian rule of Cyprus
1571	Cyprus becomes a province of the Ottoman Empire
1878	Cyprus ceded to the British Empire, following Turkey's defeat in Russo-Turkish wars
1881	British census: the Greeks of Cyprus constitute 73.9% of population, the Turks 24.4%
1914	Turkey enters First World War as an ally of Germany, and Cyprus is annexed to the British Empire
1923	Treaty of Lausanne, by which Turkey renounces its claim to Cyprus
1925	Cyprus proclaimed a Crown Colony
1955	National struggle against colonial power/policy started by EOKA; Archbishop Makarios III leads EOKA's political wing and General Grivas its military wing
1955	'Tripartite Conference': in discussing the Cyprus situation, British, Turkish and Greek foreign ministers recognise Turkey's equal rights on Cyprus for first time since the Lausanne Treaty (1923)
1958	Zürich agreement (Turkey and Greece) gives constitutional status to Cyprus
1960	London agreement between Britain, Turkey, Greece, Greek Cypriotes and Turkish Cypriotes (1959) leads to foundation of the Republic of Cyprus on 21 August (Archbishop Makarios III elected President and Dr Fazıl Küçük Vice-President)
1960	Cyprus joins British Commonwealth (March) and becomes a United Nations member (September)
1961	Cyprus gains membership in the Council of Europe
1963	Makarios puts forward to Küçük thirteen proposals for constitutional revisions, which spark intercommunal fighting between Greek and Turkish Cypriotes
1964	'Green Line' established, dividing the two communities in Nicosia and marking arrival of the United Nation Forces in Cyprus as 'peacekeepers'
1967	Grivas and Turkish Cypriotes clash, which prompts threat of Turkish invasion; Grivas banished
1971	Grivas returns to oppose independence of Cyprus and the rule of Makarios; with support of Greek military junta (ruling Greece, 1967 to 1974), Grivas sets up EOKA B', a para-state terrorist organisation committed to overthrowing the government
1974	Greek military coup on Cyprus (15 July) provokes the Turkish invasion (20 July); culminates on 14 August with Turkish military occupation of 37.2% of the island
1974	UN Security Council demands that all states respect sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus (Resolution 353, adopted unanimously on 20 July, 1974)
1975	Turkey ignores UN conventions and establishes a 'Federal Turkish-Cypriote State'
1983	Turkey unilaterally declares independence and establishes the 'Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus', an action condemned by the UN Security Council (Resolution 541 / 83 and subsequent)
1997	Cyprus problem remains unresolved

holding peasant ownership. In this way, villages and village quarters of Turkish-speaking Moslem peasants came to be interspersed throughout the island within, or nearby, the villages of Greek-speaking peasants. It is generally agreed that the Turkish settlers numbered between sixteen and twenty thousand (Hadjidimitriou 1987:229; Hunt 1990:227).

For the first time in Cyprus there existed settled Moslem communities predominantly Turkish in origin. The dispersal throughout the landscape of both Greek-speaking and Turkish-speaking Cypriotes remained a firm and immutable geopolitical fact until the population uprootings of 1964 and the Turkish invasion of 1974. Relations between the Greek-speaking and Turkish-speaking Cypriotes in the countryside were reportedly amicable (Argyrou 1995:199; Hunt 1990:254); the reality was surely more complex, but at least there were relations, until the second half of the twentieth century.

After some three hundred years of Ottoman rule, in 1878 the island became part of the British Empire in the wake of Turkey's defeat in the Russo-Turkish wars. The cession of Cyprus to Britain was greeted enthusiastically not only by the British government (Tsalakos 1981:139), but apparently also by the Cypriotes. In his welcoming address to the first High Commissioner in Larnaca, Archbishop Sophronios declared: 'We accept the change of the government inasmuch as we trust Great Britain will help Cyprus as it did the Ionian Islands to be united with Mother Greece with which it is naturally connected' (Alastos 1955:308; Constantinides 1880:116–17; Hill 1952:297; Pantelis 1985:71). Britain thus represented to the Greeks of Cyprus a 'philhellenic' power which in 1864 had ceded the Ionian islands to Greece. In reality, of course, other agendas were at work: British colonial policies meant domination over a people and its territories to ensure that raw materials were available for exploitation and that new markets were created for manufactured goods. Above all, Cyprus represented a strategic piece of land in an area where Britain still had limited influence.

The common origin and language, the shared myths, symbols and ideologies, and the strong historical bonds between the Greeks in Greece and on Cyprus, that is, the fundamental characteristics of their common *ethnos*, served to shape the Greek national identity. In Greek, the word *ethnos* means 'nation', yet ethnicity and nationalism operate in different ways: nations, for example, can be established and obliterated as political events take their course but ethnic identity is not so easily adopted or abandoned (Banks 1996:2–3). Ethnicity, on the other hand, is expressed in the extent to which an individual feels connected to and acts within a particular social setting: it is an almost mythological arena of feelings and beliefs. Equally important are the notions of choice and self-perception (Banks 1995: 183–7). Ethnicity is a social construct which allows people to classify, locate and identify themselves within the world; it helps to inform and guide individual behaviour and, significantly, to distinguish it from another ethnic group's behaviour. The modern-day Greek *ethnos* was established as part of the widespread nineteenth century national awakenings throughout Europe (Díaz-Andreu 1995: 39–41; MacConnell 1989:107–9; Trigger 1995:266–72).

The Cypriotes accepted the change from an Ottoman to a British administration only as a temporary and transitional measure. The British

administration, for its part, regarded the Greeks of Cyprus as having a well developed system of political representation through the Church and the Archbishop as political leader (*ethnarch*), as well as a degree of ethnic/nationalistic consciousness within their leading groups. This was especially so after the foundation of the Greek state (1830), and derived from the subordinate, if somewhat autonomous, position of Greek-speaking Cypriotes in the Ottoman Empire. By contrast, Moslems in general and Turkish Moslems in particular had been the dominant administrative unit (*millet*) of the Ottoman Empire and thus had little reason to develop nationalistic movements. As a consequence of their membership in the ruling class, the Turks in Cyprus developed few nationalistic sentiments. Moreover, because they were a minority, the Turks had no qualms about identifying with the colonial organisation established by the British administration, nor about giving their support to the new colonial power.

These conditions served as the basis for the development of relations between Greeks and Turks on Cyprus. Nationalism as a political emotion thus developed asynchronously amongst Greeks and Turks, whilst the relationship of the two ethnic groups to the British colonial power was decidedly asymmetrical (Attalides 1979:2). Even after Turkey renounced its claim to Cyprus in favour of Britain (1923), indeed even after World War II, Turkish nationalism remained comparatively weak on Cyprus, at the same time that the Greek Cypriotes were escalating demands for unification with Greece. Britain, however, resisted any possibility of *enosis* (union) with Greece, which resulted in the national struggle started by EOKA [National Organisation of Cypriot Fighters] in 1955 against colonial policies. Once Turkey's equal rights on Cyprus were re-established by the Tripartite Conference (1955) (Pantelis 1985:298), the involvement of Turkey and its opposition to Cyprus' unification with Greece contributed significantly to the negative reaction of the Turkish Cypriotes to this national demand.

The Republic of Cyprus was founded in August 1960, with Archbishop Makarios as President and Dr Fazıl Küçük as Vice-President. The process of decolonisation as initiated by the establishment of an independent Cypriot republic is perhaps a poor indicator of 'postcoloniality', because the formal move to independence was permeated with imperialism. Decolonisation, in other words, set the stage for neo-colonialism rather than postcolonialism. The demographic restructuring that followed independence was in effect a neo-colonial formation, and the Cypriot people—Greek and Turkish—led lives still shaped by the ideologies of domination and imperialism. Turkish Cypriotes became marginalised culturally by the same rhetoric of exclusion—otherness and backwardness—that the British had formerly adopted against the Greek Cypriotes. Postcolonialism perhaps implies a level of liberation that is effectively beyond the capacity of existing power relations. And chauvinistic nationalism is nothing more than a form of neo-imperialism (Said 1993:325–31). In Cyprus, independence might

better be categorised as a sociopolitical formation that attempted to negotiate the ideological and material structures of power established under British imperialism.

According to its new constitution, Cyprus was forbidden to pursue either union or partition. Cyprus' territorial integrity, the basic articles of the constitution and its independence, were guaranteed by Britain, Greece and Turkey, each of which reserved the right to take separate action to restore the status quo in case of a breach. Although Greek Cypriotes made up eighty two per cent of the population (Crawshaw 1986:1), the ratio of the administrative rights given to the Greek and Turkish communities was 70:30 respectively (Hunt 1990:281; Koumoulides 1986). Accordingly, Archbishop Makarios put forward to Dr Küçük in November 1963 thirteen proposals intended to revise the constitution. These sparked intercommunal fighting and set in train Turkish threats of invasion. Subsequent discontent led to the establishment of the 'Green Line' in 1964, thus dividing the two communities in Nicosia and marking the arrival of the United Nation 'Peacekeeping' Forces (UNFICYP) in Cyprus.

General Grivas and the Turkish Cypriotes clashed during 1967 and Grivas was subsequently banished from the island; however, he returned secretly in 1971, opposing both independence and Makarios. With the support of the Greek military junta, Grivas set up EOKA B', a para-state terrorist organisation, whose primary target was Makarios and whose chief intention was to overthrow the government. The Greek military *coup d'état* in Cyprus on 15 July 1974 provoked the Turkish invasion five days later. The invasion culminated on 14 August 1974 with the military occupation of 37.2 per cent of the island, a situation that remains in force today.

This invasion and subsequent occupation of the northern part of Cyprus by Turkish troops eventually led to demographic upheavals which produced 200,000 refugees and over 1,600 missing persons, and led to the forced transferral of Greek Cypriotes to the south and of Turkish Cypriotes to the north, the widespread destruction of property, the colonisation of the northern part of the island by new Turkish settlers who now outnumber in many areas the Turkish Cypriote population (Jansen 1986:321; Kapsos 1995:185–6), and a number of atrocities which continue unabated. The Security Council of the United Nations has taken up the 'Cyprus problem' on frequent occasions since July 1974 and has also called repeatedly for an immediate end to foreign intervention and the withdrawal of all foreign troops. Turkey continues to ignore these decisions and appeals, and in 1983 unilaterally declared an independent 'Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus'. This action was condemned by the UN Security Council (Resolution 541/83); the political entity thereby established is recognised by no other nation of the world, except Turkey.

Destruction and illicit trade of antiquities

The destruction of Cyprus' cultural heritage (see Figure 1.1) is a subject that concerns not only the people of Cyprus but also the entire international community, especially inasmuch as this is articulated through binding conventions and agreements amongst the nations of the world. A number of treaties, conventions and decisions aim to protect and preserve the international cultural heritage (see Table 1.2). Of these, the most basic is the Hague Convention (14 May 1954) which was designed to protect cultural property in the event of armed conflict and which was accompanied by an 'Execution' clause and a 'Protocol' aimed at its implementation. Article 18 sets the provisions for the application of the Convention, and Article 4 regulates this subject and stipulates the special obligations of the occupying forces toward cultural properties. These articles fully cover the case of occupied northern Cyprus.²

The destruction of archaeological sites (see Figure 1.2) and the illicit trade of antiquities in the northern part of Cyprus has had dramatic and likely irreversible consequences, both for Cyprus' cultural heritage and for archaeological research on the island. Documents from the Turkish Cypriot (Yasin 1982) and foreign



Figure 1.1 Monastery at Tochni, Famagusta district: destroyed and used as a sheepfold
(Courtesy: Director of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus)

Table 1.2 Treaties protecting the international cultural heritage

The UNESCO General Conference (Paris, 19 November 1964): ‘the means prohibiting and preventing the illicit export, import and transfer of ownership of cultural property’
The European Convention (London, 6 May 1969): ‘for the protection of the archaeological heritage’
The UNESCO Convention (Paris, 14 November 1970): ‘the means of prohibiting and preventing the illicit export, import and transfer of ownership of cultural heritage’
International Convention (Paris, 16 November 1972): ‘the protection of world cultural and natural heritage’

Source: P.S.O’Keefe and L.V.Prott (1989) *Law and the Cultural Heritage*, Vol. 3, London: Butterworths.



Figure 1.2 Archaeological site at Soloi, classical period: pipeline (conduits) running through site
(Courtesy: Director of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus)

press (Fielding 1976; Gallas 1990), scientific journals (Knapp 1994), and a UNESCO authorised report³ provide specific references and information on the systematic looting and cultural cleansing that has occurred on Cyprus since 1974 (see Tables 1.3 – 1.6, below).

The case of the sixth century AD Kanakaria mosaics, stolen in 1979 and actually returned to the Republic of Cyprus in 1991 after a notorious legal battle in the

Table 1.3 Destruction of the cultural heritage of occupied Cyprus

<i>Type of Monument</i>	<i>Present Condition</i>	<i>Number</i>
Churches	used as mosques	55
Monasteries and Churches	diverted to alien uses (military purposes, art galleries, cinemas)	44
Historical Monuments, Churches	looted, damaged, or destroyed	40
Cemeteries	looted	26
Total		106

Source: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Cyprus (1995) *Report on the Plundering of the Cultural Heritage in Occupied Cyprus*, 29 November.

Table 1.4 Individual cultural monuments

<i>Monument</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Present condition / use</i>
Acheiropeitos Church	5th–10th, 12th–15th centuries AD	Karavas	military purposes
St Themonianos Church	13th–14th centuries AD	Lyssi	looted
Virgin Mary of Eleousa Church	15th century AD	Rizokarpaso	sheepfold
St Evlalios Church	Byzantine	Lambousa/Karavas	military purposes
St James Church	Byzantine	Trikomo	looted
St Panteleimon Monastery	18th century AD	Myrtou	looted/military purposes
St Spyridon Monastery	18th century AD	Tremetousia	military purposes
St Andronikos		Kythrea	destroyed
St Kassianos Church		Nicosia	destroyed
St Paul Church		Nicosia	looted
St George Church		Spatharico/Messoria	bombarded
St Mamas Church		Gaidouras	sheepfold

Source: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Cyprus (1995) *Report on the Plundering of the Cultural Heritage in Occupied Cyprus*, 29 November; (1994) *Cyprus—The Plundering of a 9000-Year-Old Civilisation*, Athens: Cultural Centre, Municipality of Athens.

Table 1.5 Different types of material looted or destroyed

<i>Item</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Present condition</i>
Mosaics	6th century AD	Virgin Mary of Kanakaria/ Lithrangomi	removed
Frescoes of the 'Elkomenos' and 'Descent from the Cross'	12th century AD	Virgin Mary of Apsinthiotissa/Synchari	removed and cut in pieces
Fresco of St Gregory of Agrigento	12th century AD	St John Chrysostomos Koutsoventis/Kyrenia	whitewashed
2 Icons	12th century AD	St John Chrysostomos Koutsoventis/Kyrenia	stolen
Icon of the Virgin Mary	12th–14th centuries AD	Virgin Mary of Apsinthiotissa/Synchari	stolen
Frescoes	13th–14th centuries AD	St Themonianos Church/ Lyssi	looted
Frescoes	12th–15th centuries AD	Antifonitis Church/Kyrenia	removed or destroyed
5 Icons	16th century AD	St John Chrysostomos Koutsoventis/Kyrenia	stolen
All icons	16th–17th centuries AD (Franco-Byzantine)	St Mamas/Morphou	stolen
150 icons and manuscripts	Byzantine	St Spyridon Monastery/ Tremetousia	looted
Ecclesiastic imple- ments and icons	All periods	St Paul's Church/ Nicosia	stolen

Sources: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Cyprus (1995) *Report on the Plundering of the Cultural Heritage in Occupied Cyprus*, 29 November; (1994) *Cyprus—The Plundering of a 9000-Year-Old Civilisation*, Athens: Cultural Centre, Municipality of Athens.

USA, is an exception to the fate of Cypriot antiquities looted and sold abroad (*Annual Report of the Department of Antiquities for the Year 1990*, p. 6; Byrne-Sutton 1992; Hofstadter 1992a, 1992b, 1994). Immense efforts to repatriate stolen antiquities have been undertaken by the Department of Antiquities with the economic support and generosity of the Leventis Foundation (Jansen 1986:322). Although a full party to the 1954 Hague Convention, Turkey has failed to meet its contractual obligations and has repeatedly ignored the binding regulations of international agreements by tolerating or ignoring the theft, plunder and destruction of antiquities (Tenekides 1994:55). Moreover, the demographic

Table 1.6 Recovered and repatriated archaeological objects from the Hadjiprodromou Collection in Famagusta

<i>Item</i>	<i>Material</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Number of items</i>
Cruciform Figurines	picrolite	Chalcolithic, 3200–2500 BC	5
White-Painted VI Juglet	clay	Late Bronze I, 1700–1400 BC	1
Zoomorphic Rhyton	clay	Submycenaean, 1100–1050 BC	1
Bird-Shaped Figurine	terracotta	Cypro-Archaic I, 750–600 BC	1
Wall-Bracket	clay	Cypro-Archaic I, 750–600 BC	1
‘Flute-Player’ Figurine	terracotta	Cypro-Archaic I, 750–600 BC	1
Zoomorphic Figurine	terracotta	Cypro-Archaic I, 750–600 BC	1
Bichrome IV Juglet	clay	Cypro-Archaic II, 600–475 BC	1
Head of Child	limestone	Hellenistic I, 325–150 BC	1
<i>Total</i>			<i>13</i>

Sources: (1994) *Cyprus—The Plundering of a 9000-Year-Old Civilisation*, Athens: Cultural Centre, Municipality of Athens.

Note

Only thirteen out of 2,000 objects have been recovered of the Hadjiprodromou Collection in Famagusta, which was entirely looted immediately after the Turkish invasion. These thirteen items, found in the possession of an antiques dealer in Dover, England, were confiscated by the authorities and returned to Cyprus.

composition of the population in the occupied zone has been altered systematically by the immigration of Turkish settlers, whilst most Greek toponyms for villages have been changed to Turkish names (Stylianou 1987:69–75). There is a disconcerting parallel here with the military origins of modern archaeology (e.g. Napoleon’s campaigns in Egypt) and the imperially-controlled mapping of colonial territories (e.g. Kitchener in Cyprus and Palestine; Burckhardt in Syria-Palestine), which makes it possible to define, name and thus to control place, for commercial, politico-ideological and military reasons (Carter 1987; see also Bahrani, Chapter 8).

The Cyprus situation and the ongoing destruction of its cultural property cannot be viewed as an accidental incident and goes far beyond the unavoidable consequences of damages sustained during hostilities. As Chippindale (1994:2) argues, destroying the visible evidence of one culture’s presence in another culture’s land does not happen by simple accident of war, nor by folly. If the relationship between a nation’s ethnic/cultural identity, its historical past and its landscape is best preserved over time through its material culture, and is best symbolised by its monuments, then this

sort of ‘cultural cleansing’ is usually an integral part and an early stage of ethnic cleansing. That is precisely why the Cyprus case and the rescue of its cultural property is not simply a case of limited significance or the defiance of international agreements (Tenekides 1994). In such situations do we judge the credibility and the effectiveness of international organisations such as UNESCO, which have undertaken the responsibility to set in motion the indispensable mechanisms of safeguarding cultural property, wherever it may be found. The Hague Convention accurately declares that ‘damage to cultural property belonging to any people whatsoever means damage to the cultural heritage of all mankind.’ To what extent do such sociopolitical agendas impact on the practice of Cypriot archaeology and the interpretation of archaeological data?

The politics of Cypriot archaeology

The relationship between Cypriot archaeology and political reality must be considered within the wider historical, cultural and political processes that unfolded over the last two centuries in Europe, the Middle East and the Mediterranean basin, when nationalistic rumblings led to the foundation of independent nation-states (Kohl and Fawcett 1995b: 12; MacConnell 1989:107). The development of archaeology as an independent discipline can only be understood in the context of national history and global identity, that is, a history directed at legitimising a nation’s existence and therefore its right to constitute an independent state (Díaz-Andreu 1995:54).

Antiquarianism

The case of Cyprus is rather different, inasmuch as Cyprus’ independence lay so far in the future (1960). Be that as it may, the archaeology of nineteenth century Cyprus was an archaeology of antiquarianism, imperialism, and the looting of antiquities (Goring 1988). Around the middle of the nineteenth century Cyprus, still part of the Ottoman Empire, was a land densely packed with antiquities that were both collected and exported by foreign officials resident on Cyprus. The Ottoman Antiquities Law declared that finds were to be divided three ways: between the excavators, the owner of the land and the government (Dikaïos 1961b: x). Sir Robert Hamilton Lang, one of the first foreign consuls to show interest in Cypriot antiquities, became a well-known collector (Lang 1878: 330–7). In 1870 he loaned a large collection to the Glasgow Museum and Art Gallery (Goring 1988:9), a collection that remains almost entirely unpublished. Of all the foreign consuls the most active and consequently the most devastating for Cyprus’ cultural heritage was the American, General Luigi Palma di Cesnola (Cesnola 1877; Myres 1914: xiii–xxv; Swiny 1991). His large scale plundering expeditions netted more than 10,000

items, most of which were exported from the island after 1870 and purchased by the Metropolitan Museum in New York, at least partly in exchange for Cesnola's appointment as director of the Museum (Casson 1937:9; Myres 1914).

Colonial archaeology

In 1878, when Cyprus came under direct British administration, a ban was imposed on unauthorised excavations and, by 1887, excavation permits were given only to professional archaeologists represented by public and scientific bodies. Beginning in 1879, Max Ohnefalsch-Richter carried out extensive excavations at numerous sites on behalf of the British Museum, which ultimately received a considerable share of the finds (Myres and Ohnefalsch-Richter 1899). In 1883 the British government founded the Cyprus Museum to house its share of finds from excavations. In the same year, under the guise of philhellenism and with the support of the British School at Athens, the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, and Cambridge University, the Cyprus Exploration Fund was established to support legitimate field enterprises. The most profitable and professional work carried out under the Fund's aegis was that of J.L. Myres (Myres 1914; Myres and Ohnefalsch-Richter 1899).

With Cyprus' recognition as a Crown Colony in 1925, the archaeological scene changed once again. The fieldwork of the Swedish Cyprus Expedition (1927–31) established a new approach to the recording and analysis of archaeological data, based on stratified sequences and chronological associations (Åström *et al.* 1994:7). The generous share of finds allocated to the Swedish mission was exported from the island and is now stored and exhibited in the Medelhavsmuseet (Museum of Mediterranean Archaeology) in Stockholm. It is worth noting that, with or without government sanctioning, a substantial stockpile of Cypriot archaeological material had been swept off to foreign museums in Glasgow, New York, London, Cambridge, Stockholm and elsewhere between about 1870 and 1940; such are the consequences of a colonial archaeology.

The international character which Cypriot archaeology gained as a result of the Swedish Cyprus Expedition's fundamental work mobilised the British colonial government to take a deeper interest in the island's antiquities. This led to the enactment of an Antiquities Law in 1935, and the creation of the Department of Antiquities, the latter responsible for all archaeological activity and associated publications on the island. A.H.S. Megaw, a Dubliner educated at the University of Cambridge, was appointed director of the Department, whilst Porphyrios Dikaios, a Greek Cypriote, became Curator of the Cyprus Museum (Dikaios 1961b:ix-xvi).

The culture historical approach to archaeology, introduced to the island by Gjerstad (1926), shaped post-1930 fieldwork and research, including that of Gjerstad's Swedish successors (Åström and Åström 1972; L. Åström 1967; P. Åström 1957, 1966; Sjoqvist 1940) and that of various Cypriote (Dikaios 1953, 1961a,

1969–71; Karageorghis 1965, 1983), French (Schaeffer 1952), British (Du Plat Taylor 1952, 1957), Australian (Hennessy 1964; Stewart and Stewart 1950) and American (Benson 1972; McFadden 1946) teams. The period between 1935–60, that is, up to the time of Cyprus' independence, proved to be very productive, both for archaeological fieldwork and for various museums round the world (Brown and Catling 1980:85–86; Peltenburg 1981; Tsielepi and Bienkowski 1988:2; Webb 1986), which acquired material chiefly from excavations organised and financed by educational institutions. Despite the fact that native Cypriote archaeologists maintained an active and impressive role in the fieldwork of their island (Knapp 1994:398), colonial attitudes meant that most excavations were still directed by foreigners (Åström 1971; Webb and Frankel 1995:97, figure 4).

Postcolonial archaeology

In 1960 Cyprus gained its independence and P.Dikaïos became the first Cypriote Director of the Department of Antiquities (Åström 1971:27). Following Dikaïos' retirement, Vassos Karageorghis became Director in 1963 and in 1964 the Antiquities Law changed in a critically important way: 'All antiquities which the holder of a licence...may discover throughout the duration of the excavations shall vest in the Cyprus Museum without any payment whatsoever' (Karageorghis 1985:7). The increase of archaeological activity, the encouragement of international expeditions and Karageorghis' personal devotion and immense effort resulted in an international awareness of Cypriot archaeology. Although the culture historical approach was and remains (to a lesser extent) dominant in post-1970 Cypriot archaeology, new directions and eco-environmental approaches were introduced by Australian (Frankel 1974a, 1974b), British (Croft 1985, 1988, 1989; Peltenburg 1983, 1985; Stanley Price 1977, 1979; Todd 1987) and French (Le Brun 1981; Le Brun *et al.* 1987) prehistorians working on Cyprus. This culture historical bias is still prominent in Cypriot archaeology, but no more so than elsewhere in world archaeology, and no less than is essential for a viable programme of archaeological study and research. Several archaeologists working in Cyprus engage in both processual and postprocessual approaches to the study of the past (Hadjisavvas 1992; Held 1990; Karageorghis and Michaelides 1996; Keswani 1989, 1993, 1994; Knapp 1997; Knapp and Meskell 1997; Manning 1993; Peltenburg 1991a, 1991b, 1993; Rupp 1988; Webb 1992, 1995; Webb and Frankel 1994; cf. Merrillees 1994).

The 1974 Turkish invasion and occupation of more than one-third of the island has had a devastating impact on archaeological research. This was the real turning point in archaeological attitudes and political awareness, particularly because all archaeological fieldwork in the north came to an end in July 1974 and all

archaeological sites became inaccessible. Moreover, the destruction of ancient and modern monuments and the illicit trade in antiquities began in earnest. Since that time no legal archaeological project or research has been conducted in the north because the only internationally recognised political authority, the government of the Republic of Cyprus, has had no practical control of the occupied area. In the south, however, new sites were made available to several foreign missions that had been working in the north by the Department of Antiquities; at the same time, new excavations and survey projects were encouraged (Karageorghis 1995:857, Knapp 1994:435). All current fieldwork and survey is concentrated in the southern part of the island, which has created a different kind of archaeological bias (Knapp 1994:434). If the culture history of Cyprus was once based largely on the evidence of non-purposive survey and pottery from tombs in the north (Merrillees 1985:16), interpretations of Cypriot material culture prevalent today are based almost entirely on the results of much more intensive survey and the extensive excavation of settlement sites in the south.

Conclusion

The dichotomy between the authenticity of the local and the appropriative nature of the global has produced its own nostalgia, whether the hope of resistance or the inevitability of the global. If one focuses only on the global appropriation of the local, one loses sight of the complex and contradictory ways in which the past envelops the complex strains of capital and power that constitute place. In fact, these oppositions may contain one another, and our current preoccupation with the sense of place may localise it artificially and contain it within boundaries that never actually existed. Such dichotomies between local histories and global appropriations of place should be reconstituted with a more dynamic concept in which one always and already inhabits the other (Jacobs 1996:36). If local sites may be linked into global processes, and sanctioned heritage sites can be instilled into nationalistic imagery, then a politics of place becomes the politics of cultural identity.

This is a social geography of difference, of contested cultural reality, and nowhere is it better exemplified than on the island of Cyprus. Despite the pressures of contemporary politics and the limits on archaeological fieldwork, post-1974 developments in Cypriot archaeology have never looked back. The practice of archaeology has been redefined as a means of political expression and cultural representation. Imperial policies and attitudes no longer dictate the direction of Cypriot archaeology, and archaeologists working on the island need to write their own political agenda: the archaeology of Cyprus will never function outside its contemporary sociopolitical context and will never be politically innocent.

Cyprus' national cultural heritage is struggling with an overburden of popular memory and the reality of living in a sharply divided political space. Archaeological research and practice has a direct relevance here and is being shaped by politico-economic forces that demand a nationalistic perspective. However, in order to promote cooperation and to re-establish amicable relations amongst all ethnic groups on the island, it is essential to safeguard and preserve the cultural heritage of every community. The presentation of archaeological sites as cultural attractions in the Mediterranean world offers a nation the opportunity to surmount its colonial past and to reconstruct its archaeological narratives in a politically viable manner. As heritage constructs, such sites actively influence popular meanings or official sanctions imposed on them. The enterprise of heritage, in other words, is very much a political process in which certain places (for example, classical temples) are incorporated into the prescribed, nationalistic point of view, whilst others (for example, Moslem cemeteries) are denied or ignored because they are seen as a threat to nationalistic images.

If we wish to consider how grandiose imperial schemes became unstable, or even unethical, trajectories of power extending across time and space, it is essential to attend to the local, for there one can see how the past actively and influentially inheres in space (Jacobs 1996:35, 158). The politics of (postcolonial) place involve arenas in which people or polities may express their sense of self and their concept of 'home' —whether that may be a village, an archaeological site, a region, or a nation, an indigenous home or one recently adopted. The politics that emerge from places being remade or reconstructed in a postcolonial image become politics of identity through which notions of culture, class, community or gender are formed (Jacobs 1996:2; Read 1996). The politics of place and identity is neither decidedly local nor invariably global; rather it is framed around power structures constituted by broader geohistorical, colonial residues, imperialist presents and postcolonial opportunities.

Further issues continue to demand consideration: for example, as younger Greek Cypriotes become involved as participants, collaborators and leaders in the archaeology of their island, how will their contested view of the past be received? How may divergent viewpoints (Greek Cypriote and Turkish Cypriote) be reconciled, or at least debated, in the context of nationalist and ethnic extremism, where archaeology can play such a highly charged and politicised role? As long as personal identity remains inextricably linked to ethnicity and politics, and as long as overtly political acts continue to dictate the course of daily life for 750,000 people living in both the free and the occupied regions of the island, answers to these questions will be a long time coming. In the meantime, the cultural heritage of Cyprus will continue to be reformed in the face of changing and divergent nationalistic trends.

Acknowledgements

We both thank Lynn Meskell for asking us to contribute to this publication; it has been a challenge to do so. We sincerely thank the following people: Patroklos Stavrou, ex-Under Secretary of the President of the Republic of Cyprus, for providing several offprints and other helpful information, Dr Demos Christou, former Director of the Cypriot Department of Antiquities, for giving us permission to publish the photographs and Michael Mavros, for providing key references on ‘ antiquarianism ’ and ‘ colonial archaeology ’. We are also grateful to several people, in addition to the editor, who read and commented upon earlier drafts of this study, and/or suggested further relevant sources: Theodora Alexopoulou, Eleni Antoniadou, David Frankel, Michael Given, Sophocles Hadjisavvas, Vassos Karageorghis, Demetra Papaconstantinou, Panayiotis Voilas, Kylie Seretis, and Stuart Swiny. For their enthusiasm, reaction, and comments, Bernard Knapp wishes to thank members of the honours course in Cypriot Prehistoric Archaeology at the University of Glasgow, and participants in a seminar organised by the School of History and Archaeology at the University of Glasgow.

Notes

- 1 Some would argue that Greek Cypriotes have specific political agendas, just as the Turks and Turkish Cypriotes do; all political entities are highly selective in their choice of an appropriate past. Others observe that Greek Cypriotes are engaged in the commodification of the past in the race for the tourist dollar. The reality is that the Cypriot Department of Antiquities has very little power, or personnel, to stop such destruction. The situation in the north is palpably worse, however much the relevant ‘ authorities ’ there may seek to control illegal looting and export. There is, moreover, little doubt that Turkish Cypriotes have been denied a voice in the archaeology of their island. However, given the current political situation, there is little we can say about northern Cyprus or about Turkish Cypriotes because we do not have access to information held by the Turkish authorities. Nor do we have the permission to cite anything because there is no legal authority to give permission. Under the present circumstances, we could never support or substantiate any details emerging from northern Cyprus. This article, in sum, represents our own personal and political views.
- 2 Article 18 states: (1) Apart from the provisions which shall take effect in time of peace, the present Convention shall apply in the event of declared war, or any other armed conflict which may arise between two or more of the High Contracting Parties, even if the state of war is not recognised by

- one or more of them. (2) The Convention shall also apply to all cases of partial or total occupation of the territory of a High Contracting Party, even if the said occupation meets with no resistance. Article 4 states: (1) The High Contracting Parties undertake to respect the cultural property situated within their own territory as well as within the territory of other High Contracting parties, by refraining from any use of the property and its immediate surroundings or of the appliances in use for its protection for purposes which are likely to expose it to destruction or damage in the event of armed conflict and by refraining from any act of hostility directed against such property. (3) The High Contracting parties further undertake to prohibit, prevent and, if necessary, put a stop to any form of theft, pillage, or misappropriation of any acts of vandalism directed against cultural property.
- 3 The original one hundred page UNESCO report by Jacques Dalibard, a Canadian expert on religious art, was rejected by UNESCO, who published a 'bowdlerized version' in April 1976 with a UNESCO disclaimer detaching itself from the author's views. UNESCO thus effectively dropped the issue instead of using the report to apply pressure on Turkey, as well as on looters and smugglers (Fielding 1976; Jansen 1986:315). Note that Tables 3 to 6 simply exemplify the type of theft, destruction, replacement etc. that has occurred—the actual numbers are much higher in each case.

Bibliography

- Åström, L. (1967) *Studies on the Arts and Crafts of the Late Cypriot Bronze Age*, Lund: Berlingska.
- Åström, L. and Åström, P. (1972) *The Swedish Cyprus Expedition IV: ID, The Late Cypriote Bronze Age. Other Arts and Crafts*, Lund: Swedish Cyprus Expedition.
- Åström, P. (1957) *The Swedish Cyprus Expedition, IV: IB, The Middle Cypriote Bronze Age*, Lund: Swedish Cyprus Expedition.
- (1966) *Excavations at Kalopsidha and Ayios Iakovos in Cyprus*, Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology 2, Lund: P.Åström's Förlag.
- (1971) *Who's Who in Cypriote Archaeology*, Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology 23, Göteborg: P.Åström's Förlag.
- Åström, P., Gjerstad, E., Merrillees, R.S. and Westholm, A. (1994) *The Fantastic Years on Cyprus: The Swedish Cyprus Expedition and Its Members*, Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology and Literature 79, Jonsered: P.Åström's Förlag.
- Alastos, D. (1955) *Cyprus in History: A Survey of 5,000 Years*, London: Zeno.
- Andah, B.W. (1995) 'Studying African societies in cultural context', in P.R. Schmidt and T.C.Patterson (eds) *Making Alternative Histories. The Practice of*

- Archaeology and History in Non-Western Settings*, Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, pp. 149–81.
- Argyrou, V. (1995) 'Greek Cypriot nationalism and the poverty of imagination', in P.W. Wallace (ed.) *Visitors, Immigrants and Invaders in Cyprus*, Albany: Institute of Cypriot Studies, SUNY Albany, pp. 196–201.
- Atkinson, J.A., Banks, I. and O'Sullivan, J. (eds) (1996) *Nationalism and Archaeology*, Glasgow: Cruithne Press.
- Attalides, M. (1979) *Cyprus: Nationalism and International Politics*, Edinburgh: Q Press.
- Banks, I. (1996) 'Archaeology, nationalism and ethnicity', in J.A. Atkinson, I. Banks and J. O'Sullivan (eds) *Nationalism and Archaeology*, Glasgow: Cruithne Press, pp. 1–11.
- Banks, M. (1995) *Ethnicity: Anthropological Constructions*, Routledge: London.
- Benson, J.L. (1972) *Bamboula at Kourion: The Necropolis and the Finds*, University Museum Monograph, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Brown, A. and Catling, H.W. (1980) 'Additions to the Cypriot collection in the Ashmolean Museum', *Opuscula Atheniensia* 13: 91–137.
- Brown, K.S. (1994) 'Seeing stars: character and identity in the landscapes of modern Macedonia', *Antiquity* 68/261: 784–96.
- Byrne-Sutton, Q. (1992) 'The Goldberg Case: a confirmation of the difficulty in acquiring good title to valuable stolen cultural objects', *International Journal of Cultural Property* 1: 151–68.
- Carter, P. (1987) *The Road to Botany Bay*, London: Faber and Faber.
- Casson, S. (1937) *Ancient Cyprus, its Art and Archaeology*, London: Methuen.
- Cesnola, L.P. di (1877) *Cyprus: Its Ancient Cities, Tombs and Temples. A Narrative of Researches and Excavations during Ten Years' Residence as American Consul in that Island*, London: John Murray.
- Chippindale, C. (1994) 'Editorial', *Antiquity* 68: 1–9.
- Constantinides, T. (1880) *Historia tis Kyprou* (History of Cyprus), Larnaca.
- Crawshaw, N. (1986) 'Cyprus: the political background', in J.T. A. Koumoulides (ed.) *Cyprus in Transition*, London: Triglyph.
- Croft, P. (1985) 'The mammalian faunal remains: summary and conclusions', in E.J. Peltenburg, *Lemba Archaeological Project I: Excavations at Lemba Lakkous, 1976–1983*, *Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology* 70.1, Göteborg: P. Åström's Förlag, pp. 295–6.
- (1988) 'Animal remains from Maa-Palaeokastro', in V. Karageorghis and M. Demas, *Excavations at Maa-Palaeokastro 1979–1986*, Nicosia: Department of Antiquities, Cyprus, pp. 449–57.
- (1989) 'The Osteology of Neolithic and Chalcolithic Cyprus', unpublished PhD thesis, Dept of Archaeology, Cambridge University: Cambridge.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. (1995) 'Archaeology and nationalism in Spain', in P.L. Kohl and C. Fawcett (eds) *Nationalism, Politics, and the Practice of Archaeology*,

- Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 39–56.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. and Champion, T. (eds) (1995) *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe*, London: University College London Press.
- Dikaïos, P. (1953) *Khirokitia. Monograph of the Department of Antiquities of the Government of Cyprus* 1, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (1961a) *Sotira*, University Museum Monograph, Philadelphia: University Museum Press.
- (1961b) *A Guide to the Cyprus Museum*, Nicosia: Department of Antiquities, Cyprus.
- (1969–1971) *Enkomi. Excavations 1948–1958*, vols 1–3, Mainz-am-Rhein: von Zabern.
- Du Plat Taylor, J. (1952) ‘A Late Bronze Age settlement at Apliki, Cyprus’, *Antiquaries Journal* 32: 133–67.
- (1957) *Myrtou-Pigadhes: A Late Bronze Age Sanctuary in Cyprus*, Oxford: Ashmolean Museum.
- Elon, A. (1994) ‘Politics and Archaeology’, *New York Review of Books*, 29 September, 14–18.
- Ferguson, L. (1992) *Uncommon Ground: Archaeology and Early African America, 1650–1800*, Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Fielding, J. (1976) *The Guardian*, 6 May, 1976.
- Frankel, D. (1974a) *Middle Cypriot White Painted Pottery: An Analytical Study of the Decoration*, Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology 42, Göteborg: P. Åström’s Förlag.
- (1974b) ‘Inter-site relationships in the Middle Bronze Age of Cyprus’, *World Archaeology* 6: 190–208.
- Gallas, V.K. (1990) ‘Wo der Himmel unter the Räuber fällt (Where the Heavens Are Plundered)’, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Magazin*, Nicosia: Republic of Cyprus, PIO.
- Gjerstad, E. (1926) *Studies on Prehistoric Cyprus*, Uppsala: Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift.
- Goring, E. (1988) *A Mischievous Pastime: Digging in Cyprus in the Nineteenth Century*, Edinburgh: National Museums of Scotland.
- Graves-Brown, P., Jones, S. and Gamble, C.S. (eds) (1996) *Cultural Identity and Archaeology: The Construction of European Communities*, London: Routledge.
- Hadjidimitriou, K. (1987) *Istoria tis Kyprou*, Nicosia: Synergatiko.
- Hadjisavvas, S. (1992) *Olive Oil Processing in Cyprus. From the Bronze Age to the Byzantine Period*, Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology 99, Jonsered: Paul Åström’s Förlag.
- Handsman, R.G. (1991) ‘Whose art was found at Lipinski Vir? Gender relations and power in archaeology’, in J.M. Gero and M.W. Conkey (eds) *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, pp. 329–65.

- Held, S.O. (1990) 'Back to what future? New directions for Cypriot Early Prehistoric research in the 1990s', *Report of the Department of Antiquities of Cyprus*: 1–43.
- Hennessy, J.B. (1964) *Stephania: A Middle and Late Bronze Age Cemetery in Cyprus*, London: Bernard Quaritch.
- Hill, G. (1952) *A History of Cyprus*, volume 4, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hofstadter, D. (1992a) 'Annals of the antiquities trade 1: the angel on her shoulder', *The New Yorker* (13 July 1992): 36–65.
- (1992b) 'Annals of the antiquities trade 2: the angel on her shoulder', *The New Yorker* (20 July 1992): 38–65.
- (1994) *Goldberg's Angel: An Adventure in the Antiquities Trade*, New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux.
- Holtorf, C., Pluciennik, M. and Shanks, M. (1996) 'Review of P.L.Kohl and C.Fawcett (eds) *Archaeology, Nationalism, and the Practice of Archaeology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995)', *Arch-Theory* bulletin board (15 March 1996).
- Hunt, D. (1990) *Footprints in Cyprus: An Illustrated History*, London: Trigraph.
- Jacobs, J.M. (1996) *Edge of Empire: Postcolonialism and the City*, London: Routledge.
- Jansen, M. (1986) 'Cyprus: the loss of a cultural heritage', *Modern Greek Studies Yearbook* 2: 314–23.
- Jones, S. (1997a) *The Archaeology of Ethnicity: Reconstructing Identities in the Past and the Present*, London: Routledge.
- (1997b) 'Whose Past? Archaeology and the Search for Origins in Ancient Palestine', seminar presented in the Dept of Archaeology, University of Glasgow (28 January 1997).
- Kapsos, C. (1995) 'Modern invaders in Cyprus', in P.W.Wallace (ed.) *Visitors, Immigrants and Invaders in Cyprus*, Albany: Institute of Cypriot Studies, SUNY Albany, pp. 184–9.
- Karageorghis, V. (1965) *Nouveaux documents pour l'étude du bronze récent à Chypre*, Études chypriotes 3, Paris: E. de Boccard.
- (1983) *Palaepaphos-Skales: An Iron Age Cemetery in Cyprus*, Alt-Paphos 3, Constanzt: Universitätsverlag.
- (ed.) (1985) *Archaeology in Cyprus 1960–1985*, Nicosia: Leventis Foundation.
- (1995) 'Archaeology in Cyprus: the last sixty years', *Modern Greek Studies Yearbook* 11: 849–95.
- Karageorghis, V. and Michaelides, D. (eds) (1996) *The Development of the Cypriot Economy*, Nicosia: University of Cyprus and the Bank of Cyprus.
- Keswani, P.S. (1989) 'Dimensions of social hierarchy in Late Bronze Age Cyprus: an analysis of the mortuary data from Enkomi', *Journal of*

- Mediterranean Archaeology* 2: 46–89.
- (1993) ‘Models of local exchange in Late Bronze Age Cyprus’, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 292: 73–83.
- (1994) ‘The social context of animal husbandry in early agricultural societies: ethnographic insights and an archaeological example from Cyprus’, *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 13: 255–77.
- Knapp, A.B. (1996) ‘Archaeology without gravity? Postmodernism and the past’, *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 3: 127–58.
- (1997) *The Archaeology of Late Bronze Age Cypriot Society: The Study of Settlement, Survey and Landscape*, Glasgow: Dept of Archaeology, University of Glasgow, Occasional Paper 4.
- Knapp, A.B. (with Held, S.O. and Manning, S.W.) (1994) ‘The Prehistory of Cyprus: Problems and Prospects’, *Journal of World Prehistory* 8: 377–453.
- Knapp, A.B. and Meskell, L.M. (1997) ‘Bodies of evidence on prehistoric Cyprus’, *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 7: 183–204.
- Kohl, P.L. and Fawcett, C. (1995a) (eds) *Nationalism, Politics, and the Practice of Archaeology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1995b) ‘Archaeology in the service of the state: theoretical considerations’, in P.L.Kohl and C.Fawcett (eds) *Nationalism, Politics, and the Practice of Archaeology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 3–18.
- Koumoulides, J.T.A. (ed.) (1986) *Cyprus in Transition*, London: Trigraph.
- Kyrris, C.P. (1985) *History of Cyprus—With an Introduction to the Geography of Cyprus*, Nicosia: Nicocles Publishing House.
- Lang, R.H. (1878) *Cyprus: Its History, Its Present Resources, and Future Prospects*, London: Macmillan and Co.
- Le Brun, A. (1981) *Un Site néolithique précéramique en Chypre: Cap Andreas Kastros*, Recherches sur les Grandes Civilisations Mémoire 5 (Études néolithiques), Paris: ADPF.
- Le Brun, A., Cluzan, S., Davis, S.J.M., Hansen, J. and Renault-Miskovsky, J. (1987) ‘Le Néolithique précéramique de Chypre,’ *L’Anthropologie* (Paris) 91(1): 283–316.
- MacConnell, B.E. (1989) ‘Mediterranean archaeology and modern nationalism: a preface’, *Revue des Archaeologues et Historiens d’Art de Louvain* 22: 107–13.
- McFadden, G.H. (1946) ‘A tomb of the necropolis of Ayios Ermoyenis at Kourion’, *American Journal of Archaeology* 50: 449–89.
- Manning, S.W. (1993) ‘Prestige, distinction and competition: the anatomy of socio-economic complexity in 4th–2nd millennium B.C.E. Cyprus’, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 292: 35–58.
- Merrillees, R.S. (1985) ‘Twenty-five years of Cypriot archaeology: the Stone Age and Early and Middle Bronze age’, in V.Karageorghis (ed.) *Archaeology in Cyprus, 1960–1985*, Nicosia: Leventis Foundation, pp. 11–19.

- (1994) 'Einar Gjerstad: Reflections on the past and the present', in *The Swedish Cyprus Expedition: The Living Past*, Medelhavsmuseet Memoir 9: 45–53, Stockholm: Medelhavsmuseet.
- Myres, J.L. (1914) *Handbook of the Cesnola Collection of Antiquities from Cyprus*, New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- Myres, J.L. and Ohnefalsch-Richter, M. (1899) *A Catalogue of the Cyprus Museum*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- O'Keefe, P.S. and Prott, L.V. (1989) *Law and the Cultural Heritage*, vol. 3, London: Butterworth.
- Pantelis, S. (1985) *Nea Istoría tis Kyprou* (Modern History of Cyprus), Athens: I. Floros.
- Peltenburg, E.J. (1981) *Cypriot Antiquities in the Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery*, Birmingham: Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery.
- (1983) *Vrysi: A Subterranean Settlement in Cyprus*, Warminster: Aris and Phillips.
- (1985) *Lemba Archaeological Project 1: Excavations 1976–1983*, Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology 70.1, Göteborg: P. Åström's Förlag.
- (1991a) 'Kissonerga-Mosphilia: a major Chalcolithic site in Cyprus', *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 282–283: 17–35.
- (1991b) *Lemba Archaeological Project 2:2. A Ceremonial Area at Kissonerga*, Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology 70.3, Göteborg: P. Åström's Förlag.
- (1993) 'Settlement discontinuity and resistance to complexity in Cyprus, ca. 4500–2500 B.C.', *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 292: 9–23.
- Pollock, S. (1992) 'Bureaucrats and managers, peasants and pastoralists, imperialists and traders: research in the Uruk and Jemdet Nasr periods in Mesopotamia', *Journal of World Prehistory* 6: 297–336.
- Preucel, R. (1995) 'The postprocessual condition', *Journal of Archaeological Research* 3: 147–75.
- Read, P. (1996) *Return to Nothing. The Meaning of Lost Places*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Renfrew, A.C. (1994) 'The identity of Europe in prehistoric archaeology', *Journal of European Archaeology* 2: 153–73.
- Robins, K. (1991) 'Tradition and translation: national culture in its global context', in J. Corner and S. Harvey (eds) *Enterprise and Culture: Crosscurrents of National Culture*, London: Routledge, pp. 21–44.
- Rupp, D.W. (1988) 'The Royal Tombs at Salamis, Cyprus: ideological messages of power and authority', *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 1: 111–39.
- Said, E.W. (1978) *Orientalism*, New York: Pantheon.
- (1993) *Culture and Imperialism*, London: Vintage.
- Schaeffer, C.F.A. (1952) *Enkomi-Alasia I. Nouvelles missions en Chypre 1946–1950*, Paris: Klincksieck.

- Schmidt, P.R. and Patterson, T.C. (eds) (1995) *Making Alternative Histories. The Practice of Archaeology and History in Non-Western Settings*, Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.
- Shanks, M. and Tilley, C. (1987a) *Re-Constructing Archaeology. Theory and Practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1987b) *Social Theory and Archaeology*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- (1989) 'Archaeology into the 1990s', *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 22: 1–54.
- Silberman, N.A. (1987) *Digging for God and Country: Exploration of the Holy Land 1799–1917*, New York: Anchor Books/Doubleday.
- (1989) *Between Past and Present. Archaeology, Ideology, and Nationalism in the Modern Middle East*, New York: Doubleday.
- (1995) 'Promised lands and chosen people: the politics and poetics of archaeological narrative', in P.L.Kohl and C.Fawcett (eds) *Nationalism, Politics, and the Practice of Archaeology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 249–62.
- Sjöqvist, E. (1940) *Problems of the Late Cypriote Bronze Age*, Stockholm: Swedish Cyprus Expedition.
- Spector, J. (1993) *What This Aul Means. Feminist Archaeology at a Wahpeton Dakota Village*, St Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press.
- Stanley Price, N.P. (1977) 'Colonisation and continuity in the early prehistory of Cyprus', *World Archaeology* 9: 27–41.
- (1979) *Early Prehistoric Settlement in Cyprus: A Review and Gazetteer of Sites, c. 6500–3000 BC*, British Archaeological Reports, International Series 65, Oxford: BAR.
- Stewart, E. and Stewart, J. (1950) *Vounous 1937–1938*, Skrifter Utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Rom 14, Lund: Swedish Institute in Rome.
- Stoler, A. (1989) 'Rethinking colonial categories: European communities and the boundaries of rule', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 31: 134–61.
- Stylianou, P. (1987) *The Plundering of the Cultural Heritage in Occupied Cyprus*, Nicosia: Kipriaki Basiki Bibliothiki.
- Swiny, S. (1991) Foreward to reprinted edition of L.P.di Cesnola (1877) *Cyprus: Its Ancient Sites, Tombs and Temples. A Narrative of Researches and Excavations during Ten Years' Residence as American Consul in that Island* (London: John Murray), Limassol: James Bendon Ltd.
- Tenekides, G. (1994) 'The rescue of the cultural heritage of occupied Cyprus. The international dimensions', in *Cyprus: The Plundering of a 9000-year-old Civilization*, Athens: Committee for the Protection of the Cultural Heritage of Cyprus.
- Thomas, N. (1994) *Colonialism's Culture: Anthropology, Travel and Government*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Todd, I. (1987) *Excavations at Kalavassos-Tenta. Vasilikos Valley Project 6*, Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology 71.6, Göteborg: P.Åström's Förlag.
- Trigger, B.G. (1984) 'Alternative archaeologies: nationalist, colonialist, imperialist', *Man* 19: 355–70.
- (1995) 'Romanticism, nationalism, and archaeology', in P.L.Kohl and C.Fawcett (eds) *Nationalism, Politics, and the Practise of Archaeology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 263–79.
- Tsalakos, G. (1981) 'Suntome Episkopisi Orismenon Opseon tis Anglokrtatias stin Kypro' (Brief review of some aspects of the British rule in Cyprus), in E.Tenekides and Y.Kranidiotis (eds) *Kypros: Istoria, Problemata kai Agones tou Laou tis* (Cyprus: History, Problems and the Struggles of its People), Athens: Hestia.
- Tsilepi, S.C. and Bienkowski, P. (1988) *Cypriot Pottery in the Liverpool Museum, An Interim List*, National Museums and Galleries on Merseyside, Occasional Papers 2, Liverpool: Liverpool Museum,
- van Dommelen, P. (1997) 'Colonial constructs: colonialism and archaeology in the Mediterranean', *World Archaeology* 28: 305–23.
- Webb, J. (1986) *Cypriote Antiquities in Abbey Museum, Queensland, Australia*, Corpus of Cypriote Antiquities 12, Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology 20 (12), Göteborg: P.Åström's Förlag.
- (1992) 'Funerary ideology in Bronze Age Cyprus—towards the recognition and analysis of Cypriot ritual data', in G.K.loannides (ed.) *Studies in Honour of Vassos Karageorghis*, Nicosia: Society of Cypriot Studies, pp. 87–99.
- (1995) 'Abandonment processes and curate/discard strategies at Marki-Alonia, Cyprus', *The Artifact* 18: 64–70.
- Webb, J. and Frankel, D. (1994) 'Making an impression: storage and surplus finance in Late Bronze Age Cyprus', *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 7: 5–26.
- (1995) 'Gender inequity and archaeological practise: a Cypriot case study', *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 8: 93–112.
- Whitelam, K.W. (1996) *The Invention of Ancient Israel: The Silencing of Palestinian History*, London: Routledge.
- Wilk, R.R. (1985) 'The ancient Maya and the political present', *Journal of Anthropological Research* 41: 307–26.
- Wylie, A. (1991) 'Feminist critiques and archaeological challenges', in D.Walde and N.D.Willows (eds) *The Archaeology of Gender. Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Conference of the Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary*, Calgary: Archaeological Association, University of Calgary, pp. 17–23.
- (1993) 'A proliferation of new archaeologies: beyond objectivism and relativism', in N.Yoffee and A.Sherratt (eds) *Archaeological Theory—Who Sets the Agenda?*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 20–6.
- Yasin, M. (1982) 'Perishing Cyprus', *Olay* 26 April–17 May 1982.

Zimmerman, L. (1995) 'We do not need your past: politics, Indian time, and Plains archaeology', in P.Duke and M.C.Wilson (eds) *Beyond Subsistence: Plains Archaeology and the Postprocessual Critique*, Tuscaloosa: University Press of Alabama, pp. 28–45.