

## Political Activism in Archaeology in Israel: From Critical Theory to Political Practice

This article seeks to investigate the method by which a political activity is crystallised and organised in the field of archaeology in Israel. It highlights the current tension between knowledge-based professional organisation and activist social organising. Firstly, the paper explores existing political dimensions in the knowledge of archaeology in general, and then examines this field in Israel/Palestine. Based on the postcolonial concept, the paper provides a review of the political defining features of archaeology in this geopolitical context. To this end, the author makes reference to the field research she conducted at Bridging the Past,<sup>1</sup> a human rights activist organisation, which opposes the political uses of archaeology in Israel and archaeological projections to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Along this vein, the paper provides an overview of the principles of thinking which guide Bridging the Past and translation of these principles into a political activity. It casts light on the challenges, which arise in the field of archaeology based on the close link between science or professional knowledge and its political implications.

### Archaeology, politics and social Action

Considered by many as an objective scientific discipline with neutral methods and research principles, archaeology is practically a domain of knowledge that is inextricably linked to national, religious and ideological spheres. It is influenced by social, political and economic issues (Wylie, 2007). Among other things, archaeology is often used to legitimise and establish a relationship between a nation or a group of people and a particular place. Archaeology helps to shape and instil historical and cultural narratives in the space (Gathercole and Lowenthal, 1990; Dietler, 1994; Meskell, 1998). Accordingly, the state is considered as a key player that essentially influences and shapes archaeological interpretations (Kohl and Fawcett, 1995). In other words, archaeology is often used as a tool in the hands of institutions and groups, to develop a social material interpretation of the past (Trigger, 1984; Silberman and Small, 1997; Kohl, 1998).

Over the past centuries, other ideologies have largely impacted archaeological interpretation. At the heart of these were religious and religious-nationalist movements. Contrary to the traditional claim grounded in precisely the relationship between nationalism and secularism, religion has a central bearing on the formation of identity in general, and national identity in particular. Thus, researchers argue that the manner in which this ideology influences interpretation and concepts in archaeology must be examined (Kohl, Kozelsky and Ben-Yehuda, 2007). Private organizations, as movements, associations and social organisations compete with state institutions over power and control, and their ideology becomes central in the shaping of archaeological interpretation. Moreover, at times the ideology of private associations contradicts the messages, which the state wishes to convey through archaeological excavations (Kohl, Kozelsky and Ben-Yehuda, 2007; Yekutieli, 2008).

These perceptions, which view archaeology as a domain of knowledge that is influenced by political ideologies and ideas, are related to critical dispositions in the philosophy of social science and the humanities. Most conspicuous are Foucault's ideas about the dimensions of power that knowledge and science produce, and questions of subjectivity in scientific/professional action (1980); and Donna Haraway's concept of *situated knowledge*, which understands "objectivity" in science as contest-

1 A pseudonym to maintain confidentiality of relevant activists.

ed and a part of a convoluted web of interpretations (2007). Within this developing body of knowledge, archaeology has been increasingly drawn to contextual studies, stressing cultural differences, diversity, and multiple identities. Post-processual archaeology opened the discipline to more players and voices, and has positioned social and cultural systems of meaning as central (Trigger, 1995; Meskell, 1998: 6–7). It is also influencing the conception of archaeology as a political matter, articulating the prominence of socio-political contexts in which archaeological projects evolve (Shanks and Tilley, 1987; 1992). As Silberman puts it, because archaeology implies political dimensions by definition, national orientation in archaeological research and interpretation is not a local – temporary matter. That is not a question of a curable and reversible symptom (Silberman, 1995).

These developments have led to re-examining the manner in which archaeology influence the world. Over the past years, there has been a preliminary tendency among archaeologists to think anew of the status of archaeology in the broader social context and of its ability to promote social and political changes from within the profession (Stottman, 2010). For example, Castañeda views social change that takes place through archaeology as Vocational Activism, meaning that a general and far reaching social change is made in conjunction with the internal change of the theoretical framework and methods of archaeology (Castañeda, 2014). Other scholars propose new methods for thinking about political activism through archaeology. Along this vein, Stottman Stottman recommends archaeology to utilise applied anthropology and the processes the discipline has experienced over recent decades, including intrinsic criticism and inclusion of practices of social change. Stottman also stresses the importance of archaeologists' social engagement, which can give power to local communities (Stottman, 2010). In addition, Hodder emphasized the possible advantages of the tool of reflexivity within the framework of archaeological research (Hodder, 2003). McGuire integrates Marxist criticism and proposes to establish an emancipatory praxis within the framework of archaeology wishing to change power relations in society. Influenced by the feminist intellectual school, McGuire also suggests that procedures of intrinsic criticism be put to effect in order to change social relations within the work of archaeology itself as well (McGuire, 2008).

Atalay (2012) particularly incorporates the postcolonial critical approach, which seeks to challenge the colonial origins of the discipline, characterized by power relations between the institutions of science and the “natives” who are affected by the professional act. In places such as Australia, the United States, Latin America, and the Mediterranean, colonial archaeology influenced the schematic and hierarchical separation between indigenous cultures and European histories (for example: Lydon & Rizvi, 2016; Ferris, Harrison & Wilcox, 2014; Politis & Perez Gollan, 2007; Van Dommelen, 1997). Thus, post-colonial archaeology aims to contribute to the exploration of indigenous histories as well as to the decolonization of archaeological practices (Hart, Oland, & Frink, 2012: 1–2). In this context, Atalay highlights the benefits of joint public research as an important tool to develop archaeological activism (Atalay, 2012).

### **Archaeology and politics in Israel**

The nexus between archaeology, politics and nationalism has a significant impact on Israeli society. Archaeology has become an auxiliary tool to establish the relation between the Jewish people and land. Since the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, the Jewish community in *Palaestina* [Palestine] has shown interest in archaeological excavations, which were viewed as a tool that proves the Jewish right to the

land. In addition, archaeology has provided a legitimizing rational tool for the secular Zionism of the origins of the Jewish people. It has also been utilised to embody the common ancient history of all the Jews in the Diaspora. This way, the common past of the Jews, has been established as an alternative to the dividing past of the Diaspora (Feige, 2008). As a result, since the Israeli state was established, engagement in archaeological excavations has become a typical Israeli occasion in schools, the army, as well as among tourists (Silberman, 1990). Archaeological excavations have inspired the majority of national symbols in Israel (Elon, 1997). All the more so, the significance of archaeology in Israel has capitalised in light of the national struggle, which has consolidated the attempt to demonstrate that the Jewish past in the country did precede the Arabs' (Feige, 2008). It is true that the 1980s saw a declining national commitment to archaeology, allowing room for critical concepts. However, as religious Zionist movements gained ground, nationalism has been restored, and so has the attempt to possess and associate national archaeology with the ideological needs of these movements (Feige, 2008; 2009).

In her book, *Facts on the Ground: Archaeological Practice and Territorial Self-Fashioning in Israeli Society*, Nadia Abu El-Haj (2001) analyses in detail the method by which Israeli archaeology has been developed and institutionalised as a national-colonial enterprise. Abu El-Haj (2001, p. 2) approaches archaeology as "an institution, realised and practiced at the nexus of multiple social and political fields". She questions how archaeology has become so central and convincing as to crystallise political concepts and cultural imagining in the space of Israel/Palestine. Abu El-Haj (2001, pp. 1-21) describes how archaeology has been used as a national tool and helped promote, lay the foundation for and legitimise the establishment of the State of Israel. Abu El-Haj argues that archaeology is a domain of knowledge – a science – and a profession, which developed in Europe side by side with the evolution of nationalistic ideas. It was created in a way that made research agenda largely associated with the attempt to find national resources for different racial-ethnic groups in archaeological findings. This concept was transferred to Israel even before it had been established as a state. To this avail, early archaeologists worked towards setting the grounds for the Jewish relationship with Israel through ancient findings. This endeavour has been developed as a foundation to bring into being national myths. For example, the Masada myth increasingly documents the nexus between the Jewish people and the area. However, Abu El-Haj does not only associate archaeology in Israel with the nationalist enterprise. She also draws a connection between archaeological knowledge and colonial-imperialist regimes, the British and the Zionist, in Israel/Palestine. As to Abu El-Haj, Israel has evolved into a state through colonial practice, largely leading to the erasure of Palestinian society from the historical and geographical space, based primarily on the body of archaeological knowledge-power (Abu El-Haj, 2001).

Abu El-Haj's contribution is carried out by an investigation of material practices, methods, tests, and decisions made in the scientific endeavour by means of the perspective availed by the anthropology of knowledge. This concept views science as a playing field for different and diversified actors. It is a field where categories are produced and tests conducted all the time. It involves many and changing tools, laws and practices that give shape to scientific work and findings. All these are key to understanding the dynamism and mechanism of power production (Abu El-Haj, 2001, pp. 1-10). Abu El-Haj (2001: 10) proposes that "we approach archaeology not primarily as a body of knowledge – as a collection of empirical and theoretical propositions about the past (ones that represent

or, for that matter, misrepresent it). Instead, we must bring into focus a fundamental aspect of archaeological practice – the work of garnering and excavating material culture – and consider what kinds of effects or consequences that practical work has in the world.”

Abu El-Haj traces the institutional development of archaeology in Israel from the British Mandate towards the Oslo Accords. Along this vein, Abu El-Haj examines post-1967 archaeology as an extension of the colonial project associating Israeli nationalism with the land (Abu El-Haj, 2001: 234-238). However, like Kohl, Kozelsky and Ben-Yehuda (2007) and Feige (2008; 2009), Abu El-Haj emphasises the fact that involvement of national-religious streams into the scientific practice of archaeology has resulted in a particular change in the approach, essentially reversing the relationship between the Bible and archaeological findings (Abu El-Haj, 2001: 234-238). According to Abu El-Haj, the Oslo Accords are another constituent political event which influences and shapes relations between the Israelis and Palestinians concerning the issue of archaeology. Attempts to discuss the status of archaeological findings, and subsequent public debate, have demonstrated the continued presence of colonial components in the Israeli approach, as well as gave voice for the first time to internal Israeli criticism directed at the practice of archaeology (Abu El-Haj, 2001, pp. 239-240).

### **Field research**

This article is based on an ethnographic research conducted during 2017-2018, at Bridging the Past, an Israeli organisation that “working to prevent the politicization of archaeology in the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict” (Bridging the Past website). Bridging the Past views itself as a human rights organisation that works along the lines of political activism against the Israeli occupation and abuse of the local Palestinian population. Established in 2009, Bridging the Past currently employs seven staff members, half of whom are archaeologists. With a focus on East Jerusalem and West Bank, Bridging the Past operations cover a set of distinctive civil society activities in Israel, including tours, conferences, and public encounters. Among other things, Bridging the Past submits petitions to the High Court of Justice, files objections against planning, organises lobbying activity, and launches social media campaigns.

The research includes around 50 participant-observations in a variety of different locations: in popular activities organised by Bridging the Past, such as conferences and tours; in occasions and meetings attended by staff, such as deliberations in courts or encounters with lawyers; and in staff meetings and planning sessions. The research is also premised on the analysis of Bridging the Past’s website and activity in the social network. Those provide a space for public self-presentation of the organisation and offers a variety of background materials, bulletins, reports, maps, etc. These presented, expressed and promoted ideas of Bridging the Past. They also helped me to understand the theoretical and practical mental-logical background which guides these ideas. In addition, I conducted interviews with all staff members of Bridging the Past. I opted to hold these interviews at a relatively advanced stage of the field research to help consolidate and build on the perceptions collated from the surveys and further investigate the research content. These assisted in examining how activists think of political action while at the same advancing it.

The research and examination of the functions of Bridging the Past help build on the research done

so far in the politics of archaeology. This research seeks to draw a link between active political action, change of social reality, and effort made to challenge and test the archaeological knowledge in the space of Israel anew. Within this framework, I propose that the focus of research be broadened by altering the viewpoint: instead of concentrating on the method by which state institutions and the academia organise and understand archaeology as a national-ideological institution, my contribution attempts to test the method by which archaeological knowledge is reflected from the perspective of those who seek to challenge the scientific-vocational technique in this field.

## **Bridging the Past – Political activism in archaeology in Israel**

### **Scientific-ethical criticism**

Bridging the Past reflects a direct and clear criticism of the archaeological method in general, and archaeology in Israel in particular. As a body of knowledge/power, archaeology introduces a specific organising spatial narrative and advances ownership of the land. This critique is based on the critical theories mentioned above, first and foremost postcolonial concepts that have impacted archaeology around the world. In the process, the influence of the material diagnosis provided by Abu El-Haj is noted in relation to the knowledge-power-practice of archaeology in Israel.

This approach of Bridging the Past is reflected, for example, in the concept that “archaeological sites cannot constitute proof of precedence or ownership by any one nation, ethnic group or religion over a given place” (Bridging the Past website). Bridging the Past’s slogan, which appears on a banner in each conference, displays the same concept: “A Past to be Shared, Not Owned” in English and “A Past of Place and Not of Nation” in Hebrew (my translation). In an interview, Nir,<sup>2</sup> an archaeologist at Bridging the Past, said: “I really like our slogan, the past pertains to a certain place and not to any nation or identity. This is our driver, this is what motivates me ... this is what I am here for” (14 August 2018). Dani, an academician who accompanies Bridging the Past, also said in an interview: “For me, the essence [of the organization] is acknowledging that archaeology is a public resource, that it is out there for everyone, and that it has ethical viewpoints and boundaries” (3 February 2018). These ideas are theoretical and inclusive, they generally investigate archaeological practice, as well as local and particular, criticising specifically archaeological excavation sites in Israel, Jerusalem, and the West Bank.

Indeed, professional guiding principles of Bridging the Past stem from an ethical scientific concept of the archaeological method of, and archaeologist’s responsibility for, the space in which they operate. In an interview, Dani provides a detailed account of his perception of archaeological ethics:

Questions about the influence of science on the location and space [...], every scientist needs to face [them]. And many organizations have an ethical code, doctors, lawyers, and archaeologists. Now why do archaeologists need ethics while an Assyriologist, for example, does not? Because archaeologists are outside, they are there, they are in the field, they are in constant interaction, they always change the environment. [...] The other [aspect] is that we create our own body of knowledge [...]. Archaeologists are always busy in this, creating it. In other words, every decision – like where to excavate, how fast, with whom to cooperate, which tools to use – influence what will come out of the ground [...] and become findings. (ibid.)

---

2 All persons in this article are pseudonymous.

Archaeological ethics has become a pivotal issue for many scholars (e.g. Hodder and Hutson, 2003; Trigger, 1995; Shanks and Tilley, 1987). Various archaeological projects are influenced by this debate (e.g. Atalay et al., 2014; Stottman, 2010; McGuire, 2008; Hodder, 2003). Bridging the Past is of the view that archaeology in Israel is short of many necessary components of ethical scientific work. This is an essential and central element of the critique proposed by Bridging the Past. In so doing, the Organisation largely focuses on the method by which archaeological practice is carried out on professional grounds. It also questions the decision-making process in relation to archaeological conservation. Similar to the logic of its slogan, Bridging the Past views archaeology in general, and the antiquities of Jerusalem in particular, as something which “the rich and diverse fabric of human history, which has universal appeal” (Bridging the Past website). Hence, archaeology “does not rank cultures hierarchically” (Bridging the Past website). Accordingly, Bridging the Past criticises crucial decision-making on the conservation of layers in reference of cultural and national preferences of archaeologists.

Another important issue revolves around the following questions: To whom does the archaeology belong? And who is influenced by it? In this context, a guiding principle of Bridging the Past provides that “an archaeological site is comprised [sic] not only of historical layers, but is significant in the present-day lives of people who live in or near it, and may form a central part of their culture” (Bridging the Past website). To this end, in times past, Bridging the Past conducted a public archaeological excavation with the aim of “strengthen a local community’s relationship to an archaeological site and to their local heritage” (Bridging the Past website). This practice arises from the idea of “public archaeology”. Despite the fact that it has accelerated over the past decades, according to Dani, public archaeology is still absent from the Israeli landscape. This school of thought advocates for engaging society from across the spectrum in archaeological excavations through a wide-ranging examination of the context and socio-political consequences of this domain of knowledge (e.g. Atalay, 2012; Merriman, 2004; Shackel and Chambers, 2004; Faulkner, 2000).

In addition, building on relevant theoretical critical analysis, Bridging the Past operates a method, by which various social forces – ideas, ideologies, economic resources and institutions – exert influence on archaeological excavations. In doing so, Bridging the Past tests the influence of national interests, state intervention, and private, primarily religious, organisations. As mentioned above, all these actors have a significant impact on the decision-making process on the archaeological site, as well as on the creation of historical narratives premised on the interpretation of archaeological discoveries. In Israel, state intervention has been particularly prominent as a result of the close relation between archaeology, State of Israel and Zionism since 1948. It produces a clear and explicit preference of the Jewish narrative and history (Feige, 2008; Ben-Ari, 2008; Gori, 2013; Hallote and Joffe, 2002; Abu El-Haj, 2001; Silberman, 2001; Ben-Yehuda, 1995). Within this framework, Bridging the Past views universities as institutions that promote and develop state authority in archaeological excavations. Although for many universities are an emblem of a position towards the critical vision, a challenge of widespread concepts, and freedom of research activity; in the eyes of Bridging the Past, these are institutions that collaborate with the national-international-Zionist factory and the unilateral narrative it makes. In an interview, Dani explicated the way he thinks this relation is developing:

[I was once told] that if I think the cooperation between the University and the Antiquity Authority is a big thing, luckily, I am not aware of all the other collaboration the university has with the government... That is what exposed me to the fact that our academia is attached to the regime .... (03.02.2018)

Amnon, an archaeologist at Bridging the Past, also addressed this link between archaeologists, the state, and Zionist debate:

Archaeologists are Zionists and they came to tell a Zionist story. They went looking for ancient findings from the Bible, so the whole discourse of Israeli archaeology is Zionist, and they did it with faith [...] and in the universities, archaeology ends in the Byzantine era, they don't teach Muslim periods at all [...] and the departments are called The Department of Biblical Archaeology, so it is all built around it. (13.08.2018)

As mentioned, towards the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, other ideologies were integrated into the system which shapes archaeology, and Israeli archaeology too. These were essentially religious and national-religious movements. Most often, movements of this sort also approach archaeology with an agenda or material political interests. Against this backdrop, Bridging the Past seeks to defend archaeology against selective interpretations of history, namely, interpretations that are subjected to textual sources (religious and others too). It also wards off the use of archaeology as a provider of ideological justifications to demonstrate a historical right or ownership of the space.

Accordingly, Bridging the Past embraces a complex ethical scientific critique. This is grounded in critical concepts, which attempt to undermine the exclusive guardianship of archaeologists over knowledge and interpretation. Bridging the Past also challenges political ideologies or institutions' control over archaeological findings, and the way these ultimately develop into historical narratives. Along this vein, Bridging the Past offers a comprehensive critique, which covers the domain of knowledge and practice of archaeology, the method by which these take hold in the space, direct relationship [with the space], and international-national interference with the interpretation of archaeological discoveries. Moreover, in this type of criticism, which is proposed in the disputed space of East Jerusalem and the West Bank, an obviously direct political critique is integrated. Different aspects of the critique mentioned above largely stem from the set of archaeological projections on geographies dominated by legal-political-ideological disagreement as well as direct and continuous political struggle. Therefore, the ethical scientific critique and political opposition, which Bridging the Past intends to express by means of this critique, are practically inseparable. Below is a living example of the connection between the scientific and the political as developed in the City of David (Ir David) archaeological site. The analysis then explores the projections of these positions on the change Bridging the Past seeks to advance in various lines of activity.

### **Political practice of theoretical criticism – The City of David archaeological site as a living example**

To draw a link between intellectual scientific concept and political action, what follows is a key example of Bridging the Past activity. This illustration helps unveil different dimensions, and relevant political content, of criticism. Since its inception, Bridging the Past has worked on the City of David

archaeological site, which falls under the responsibility of the Israel Nature and Parks Authority. However, the Ir David Foundation (commonly known as El-Ad) manages and provides guidance on this site. Located in the Palestinian neighbourhood of Silwan in East Jerusalem, this is a site of a long-term struggle for expansion of the City of David Jewish settlement, including by developing and expanding the archaeological site. Using various tools at hand, Bridging the Past attempts to resist expansive territorial and intellectual control of the settlement, as allowed and supported by the state. Bridging the Past also seeks to give voice to the narrative of the Palestinian population.

In this context, almost two years ago, the Israel Antiquity Authority started excavations inside tunnels on the archaeological site. These were aimed at uncovering the level of a street, which had unfolded in the area. The street was traced back to the Second Temple period. The critique made by Bridging the Past makes clear the ethical and political dimensions of this activity. In practice, this excavation method is detrimental to the basic concept of a top-down approach to archaeology. Instead of removing all historical layers which make up the hill [Tel], excavations directly penetrate into the layer of interest to the research project. They neglect discoveries that can be found within other layers. In a tour around Silwan, Amnon provided a detailed critique of tunnel excavations:

The first problem is that they excavate in tunnels... Fundamentally, archaeology is based on stratigraphy, on layers. This is the whole idea. In the past, before we came, people lived here, and all the different layers were created. We now come to study history and culture through discovering the stories of the different layers, trying to figure out the dates of events, usually through some kind of a typology. This is the archaeological tool. Therefore, it is extremely important to excavate through the layers, because this is the basic [methodology] of this science. When you start to excavate in tunnels, it contradicts the most basic idea of the discipline, and then what do you have left? (24.05.2018)

The nature of these excavation also has political projections. As mentioned above, these are an integral part of the critique articulated by Bridging the Past. From theory to practice, underground excavations expand El-Ad's control over areas on the site, namely under the ground. Areas on the ground are not necessarily in possession of El-Ad. Until such time these excavations were conducted, El-Ad had challenged the closure of passageways and gates, and prevented access for Silwan residents to other areas in the neighbourhood under the pretext that this was an archaeological site. The issue at hand is a struggle against a multifaceted territorial expansion of the site.

The concept of space on the site is also changing. Tourists who visit the place pass through a track, which is completely underground. Realisation of the space is obscured and confused. It becomes considerably difficult to distinguish the contested location of the archaeological site: an occupied territory in East Jerusalem, where a religious, ideological settlement is erected within and as part of an archaeological site in the heart of a Palestinian village. Before current excavations were conducted in tunnels, Pullan and Gwiazda had spelled out the strategies used by El-Ad to shape the landscape and space. These strategies reflected religious and national extremism grounded in the biblical narrative (Pullan and Gwiazda, 2009). In a more recent investigation based on field research and content analysis of tourist tours to and reactions to the archaeological site, David Landy argues that operators of this site have managed to develop the tourism experience in a way that turns a blind eye to the existence of Palestinians in the space and presents Jerusalem as a Jewish entity

par excellence (Landy, 2017).

Bridging the Past claims that science carried out by the state serves a historical-ideological enterprise in a way that jeopardises, and leads to, a material and conceptual elimination of the indigenous Palestinian population. That is not only a question of an enterprise that violates ethical principles or of an excavation method that does not fulfil key scientific norms. It involves an initiative that effectively abuses an indigenous-local population group. This body of scientific, ethical and political criticism is inseparably integrated. While it consolidates the resistance Bridging the Past seeks to articulate, this integration gives rise to tensions that defy the Organisation's capability of influence. The following is an analysis of a central tension between professional and political dimensions in the work of Bridging the Past. The investigation explores how the Organisation's activity impacts the scientific community and Israeli society.

### **Between the professional and the political: Challenges to transforming professional ideas into political practice**

A major challenge that Bridging the Past faces both directly and indirectly is how it can be both political and professional at the same time. All the more so, how can this approach be accepted by institutions and communities that it attempts to influence? Yuval is a staff member of Bridging the Past but does not hold a degree or qualification in archaeology. She reflects on this predicament, stating:

[The Organisation] holds both ends of the cord. I believe this is clever on part of the Organisation. It says that everything is political as if such tension is taking place between professionalism and politics. We all know that this ... [So] what is it all about? All the time, we say that, as professionals, we want to advise you not to accept the historiographies of Jerusalem. At the same time, however, we are playing a double game with them. We are using professionalism to advance our political doctrine. We always put on the fig leaf of professionalism, and we try to make progress as such. It is something unfair to do. How can we be honest, say that our motives are practically political, and want to change the direction of politics? We want to divide Jerusalem. We want things like this. For me, this looks like ... I still don't know ... On the other hand, it is also wrong to completely abolish this mission. There is a say: it is something in between postmodernism and modernism. Do you understand? I'm not aware of the philosophical answer to that. Of course, professionals have another toolbox. This is somewhat more important than just a person with an opinion (8 July 2018).

This difference is based on the general understanding of the term "profession" in a way that does not include internal political dimensions. Professions are works that rest on the foundation of technical or tactical knowledge (Evetts, 2013). Professionals are persons who have acquired both knowledge and confidence and have experienced social upbringing as members of a field of activity, which they are accountable for. In so doing, they are subject to constant observation by their counterparts (Schinkel and Noordegraaf, 2011: 69). This understanding is an object of considerable criticism in sociological literature. Accordingly, professionals and professional organisations work towards concealing the dimensions of control, which underlie their actions; i.e. within a specific professional realm and between different professional domains (Schinkel and Noordegraaf, 2011: 70-71; Saks, 2016). Evetts (2003) proposes that professional-specialist manifestations be viewed as a particular

type of ideology. Along this thread of thinking, Bourdieu argues that professionalism includes dimensions of risk by reason of neutrality, and more so by reason of naturality, both associated with the prevalent perception of the term (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992: 242-243; Schinkel and Noordegraaf, 2011: 72). Hence, professionalism causes tension within the professional world, between one professional domain and another, and between professionals, decision-makers, the state, and civil society. As it is, archaeology is a domain of knowledge, a realm of scientific knowledge, and academic profession. Operating in a multidimensional space, archaeology sets an example that confirms different methods, in which professionalism involves political projections (Wylie, 2007).

Bridging the Past recognises current political implications for the use of this profession, either by or within the framework of operations of various organisations and institutions in the field. According to Yuval, the challenge is that integration of the professional and the political is reflected more effectively. This is also visible in encounters with the public, whom Bridging the Past seeks to influence. Below is a detailed account of the challenges posed by Bridging the Past's intellectual concepts and *modus operandi* in relation to these two central communities.

### **Scientific community**

Archaeologists of Bridging the Past are members of the scientific community. Founders of the Organisation, who continue to play a pivotal role in its activity, come from the field of archaeological knowledge in Israel. They studied at relevant higher education institutions and worked for a long time at the Israel Antiquity Authority. This is the classical track of many archaeologists in Israel, namely, those who do not join the academia as researchers. Informed by this research and professional experience, Bridging the Past has developed scientific criticism, which seeks to undermine a major portion of the constituent hypotheses of the Israeli archaeology since its inception during the British Mandate period. Many activities of Bridging the Past target the scientific community, both directly and indirectly. It aims at stressing the need for changing ethics and professional practice, and advancing an open and flexible approach to research, which does not automatically adopt the Israeli-Jewish viewpoint of archaeological research in the space.

These efforts, to be an influential player in the scientific community, produce a complex dynamism of action. To a large extent, these make difficult the capability of influence. Within the scientific community, whose language revolves around knowledge *per se* and who is accountable for the production of knowledge, undermining and integrating knowledge in political claims pose a complex challenge. Such a challenge is not peculiar to Bridging the Past. For example, Moore indicates that, in the 1950s-1970s, American scientists decided to separate their political activity from science. In an attempt to keep the professional and the political apart, these scientists founded exoteric scientific organisations to advance their political goals (Moore, 1996). Operating a method similar to that of Bridging the Past, environmental organisations have suffered for years from exclusion and delegitimation by the scientific community, which seeks to draw clearly defined lines between science and politics (Eden, 2005; Cash et al., 2003). In his research on activism against AIDS, Epstein also resolves that there is no simple answer to the question: "Can a person be both an activist and a scientist?" (Epstein, 1996: 342).

Clearly, Bridging the Past is sometimes not necessarily viewed as a fully legitimate professional

player in the scientific community. A key example is shown by the effort made by Bridging the Past to organise archaeologists in Israel and establish a union around a year ago. Bridging the Past took the initiative to create a professional archaeological union. When the initiative was about to take shape and see the light of day, other organisers from universities and Israel Antiquity Authority requested, shortly before a broader meeting was held, to strike off the name of an archaeologist and of Bridging the Past from the invitation. The stated reason was that both identified with particular political agenda. Then in the making, the union would not want to identify with such an agenda.

As far as I understand, in relation to the scientific community, this positioning of Bridging the Past is associated, first and foremost, with the nature of criticism the Organisation intends to convey about current processes in research. This criticism is fundamental. It seeks to change professional, applied and practical *ab initio*. It undermines part of constituent hypothesis of the profession. It is also inextricably linked to undermining the status of the Zionist narrative, which demarcates the story arising from archaeological discoveries in the space. But beyond this, scientific criticism of Bridging the Past is so closely linked to its political criticism that a dividing line cannot be drawn between archaeological practice and theory. In addition to impacting the space, criticism has a bearing on the way it provides a tool to lay the foundation for the territorial and conceptual occupation at the expense of Palestinians. No matter how fundamental it is, the moment scientific criticism becomes directly political by a human rights organisation that has its own political agenda, the scientific community is closed and finds it difficult to conceive of and confront a wide array of criticism proposed by Bridging the Past. From the outset, the archaeological community in Israel does not necessarily view archaeology as a political object. In the course of its activity, this community continues to attempt to keep away from political dimensions. Intimately linked to political criticism, scientific criticism, particularly those critiques which may undermine the Zionist idea, is subject to a double standard.

Amnon explicates the way archaeologists at Israeli universities eliminate the critical debate in archaeology:

When they have staff [positions], universities themselves prefer to have more persons who say the same thing. It seems as if they do not accept a person with such a [critical] agenda. In practice, universities are forces that replicate themselves by the same debate all the time. [They involve] all companions of the biblical debate, and biblical archaeology, rather than a debate over archaeology and ethics. It appears as though powerful persons there are replicating themselves through their research students. From this standpoint, one expected that universities would effectively provide a critical body for all archaeological activities, but they were not. They are part of the institution" (13 August 2018).

Along this thread of thinking, Nir raised the issue of archaeologists from the academic-professional field, who do not join Bridging the Past. Nir argued that "there are no archaeologists. archaeologists don't join us. There were three of us in the beginning and there remained three, maybe four [...] only [he or she] who is interested in what lays beyond archaeology will join such a thing" (14.08.2018).

### **Israeli society in general, and left wing in particular**

Another community is placed in the mainstream process of Bridging the Past, namely, Israeli soci-

ety in general, and left wing positions in particular. This is largely the main audience that Bridging the Past, as a political human rights organisation, targets. It also seeks to align this community to the Organisation's political ideas and goals. However, by addressing Israeli society, like other civil society organisations, Bridging the Past also practically faces impediments associated with the style and characteristic of its message. In the first place, the request to undermine or think anew of how knowledge is organised in the world and of the archaeologist's role and responsibility in scientific research is not impliedly perceived by the broader public. Contemporary ideas are largely institutionalised, confirming the powers of knowledge and expert's role in organising the social reality. This deconstructionist and critical agenda, which emphasises the distribution of professional power and capacities, is not necessarily consistent with public perceptions.

Secondly, Israeli society, particularly within the framework of the political debate which has been taking shape over the past few years, is not open to concepts that seek to undermine the Zionist narrative as a prevailing force over the space and consciousness. Even the left wing in Israel has, overtime, relied on and revolved around the Zionist initiative as an unshakable foundation for the existence of the State of Israel. In general, Amnon claims that the left wing in Israel does not recognise the significance of history, preferring to concentrate on modern ideas of democracy and equality:

[...] The public, as a whole, is so distant from you: the community of archaeologists, and the public in general, particularly the left wing as well. The whole issue of the relation to history, to the past, to the heritage. It is not a debate of the left wing. The debate of the left wing addresses democracy, human rights, equality, and values of contemporaneity. The whole issue of the past. No, not at all [...] They are very present in Europe. They are very present within political conflict, international [conflict], and human rights. They manage it... They are very present in a European liberal debate, which they run. The question of the bible, history, heritage, and archaeology are very strange to them, as though it is a question of the right wing. This seems to be part of patriotism, of nationalism.

Therefore, it requires a great deal of coordinating messages and the type of cooperation initiated by Bridging the Past so that it can recruit public support. "Thought must be given to producing a voice for ourselves. It would not be a provocative voice, but which can be understood, one which is directed to the centre. It should make itself moderate" Yuval said (8 July 2018).

### **Response to the tension between the professional-scientific and the political**

Within Bridging the Past, there are at least two potential answers to the existential, but intrinsic, tension between the political and the professional. This tension exerts and influence the narrative, which organises Bridging the Past as well as its cooperation. Although they are antithetical, these answers exist in parallel. First is the proposition to focus on creating alternatives in order to produce and excavate knowledge by improving ethics and archaeological research tools. This answer focuses on the challenges, which are highlighted by theoretical-intellectual perceptions mentioned above. Within these lie projections of knowledge production on the space and society, as well as the power activated by knowledge in the social reality. In terms of the solutions to be advanced, this position relies on the objection to unlawful and abusive excavation methods. It promotes a combination of propositions made by archaeologists around the world, most notably indigenous and public archae-

ology.

Dani explains the broad projections, he theorises for professional ethics:

I was an activist outside the academia [...] I always felt that this was part of my existence. For a long time, I drew a distinction between what I do at the Antiquity Authority or then at the university and what I do at my leisure time. Gradually, I reached the conclusion that I could do it from within archaeology, from within the profession as a lecturer, as a writer, as an excavator, all these things. I could choose the values which I want to advance or which are important to me and central to my identity. I could perform this professional activity, as well [...] You develop a position for yourself, stating what is good and what is not, right? It is not a question of objectivity. There are things which we, most people, the major portion of our humanity or culture, know that it is good for one to be healthy rather than ill, to be alive rather than dead. Something like that, right? These are very basic things. To enjoy job security is better than being unemployed. There are things, where we know the difference between good and evil. The archaeologist who performs his work so that the space is more beautiful, so that people are happier, so that living there is more convenient, so that people know more, so that they have fun, I don't know. Somethings like these, which we consider as good, are happening there. So this is an archaeologist who is doing a good work. On the other hand, the archaeologist who makes the place uglier, a place where violence prevails, or place that lacks justice, in the sense that people who have everything exist side by side with people who have nothing, and with no contact between them, that is bad... (3 February 2018).

This answer to the tension between the political and the professional practically claims that correcting and documenting ethics in archaeology will help make sure that the archaeologist does not jeopardise the place, where he works and where archaeology is conducted. As an outcome, and in the context of Bridging the Past, it will lead to separating, or in the least, declining influence of archaeology on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. In other words, more delicate ethics mean less intervention of archaeology in the politics of occupation. This approach is in tandem, albeit indirectly, with the tension resulting vis-à-vis the scientific archaeological community, by confirming and giving more weight to scientific matters over political issues, as a way to overcome the price of the direct political opposition.

Some activists of Bridging the Past embrace another concept, namely, to reduce professional engagement of the Organisation and to shift to work on clearer contexts of human rights organisations. This approach does not call for leaving the ideological dimension of the Organisation. In essence, it realises the importance of historical concepts and narratives for the continued political conflict and its projections on the space. However, it only seeks to use that as an intellectual foundation, and use political tools of human rights organisations.

Nir expressed this idea, effectively, as a real goal which he envisages for Bridging the Past to continue to exist:

In my opinion, it is so difficult to master two fields. This means... It reminds me of the world of art, where they say 'Come one. Let's see good art. Come on. Let's see political art.' It is so

difficult to perform art, which is good, and political at the same time [...] Bridging the Past is carrying a professional, archaeological matter, however, the real professionalism of Bridging the Past is to be an organisation. An organisation that works in the field of human rights, in the field of struggle for heritage, in the field of struggle against the occupation. At least, this is my aspiration [...] With such an organisation, we have more to do. We are [still] not professionals enough in the sense of an organisation that is struggles oriented. In my view, Breaking the Silence (Shovrim Shtika) is the professional organisation. Let's say it's B'tselem [...]. In the exact sense of the word, in my opinion, these are the role model of professional organisations. Bridging the Past is not there. It is still preoccupied with this debate. I don't think this is good for it. This prevents us from exerting more influence and grow further (14 August 2018).

According to this approach, resorting to professional justifications suspends further influence of Bridging the Past, particularly on Israeli society and decision makers. It reflects another sequence of preferences and of the relation between the professional and the political. Accordingly, political goals of ending the Israeli occupation are more important and central. An attempt to enhance ethics in archaeology is not pivotal way to materialise these political goals. To a large extent, it seeks to be similar to the human rights debate, with an addition of the significance of the history and narrative of the past. This relation between ideas can be recruited to exert political influence with a view to ending the conflict and suspending exploitation and ownership of Palestinian land.

From a structural-organisational perspective, this approach causes a major homogeneity (Powell and DiMaggio, 1991) and organisational symmetry between Bridging the Past and other human rights organisations in terms of agenda, style of dialogue, fundraising, and distribution of roles within the Organisation. It allows to organise the process on the basis of a previous experience of organisations, which find it difficult to dispatch a certain type of messages to Israeli society. It also creates a cooperative society, which provides the real intellectual and value foundation of Bridging the Past. In a particular sense, this is how the special knowledge the Organisation brings to the field becomes secondary. Oftentimes, it is used only as an instrumental tool to achieve political goals.

Notwithstanding these two standpoints, which seek to highlight different aspects between the professional and the political, constitute an attempt to influence the social reality through the concept of archaeology and heritage, which is contingent on realising the relation between both dimensions. Amnon believes that this association is needed. Amnon is of the view that every professional activity is political, in the wide sense of the term, particularly when it has bearing on real life. Yuval also argued that "the state used the professional platform in order to devise a political change. Therefore, this language must be used and struggle must be waged by means of these tools [...] We are aware that everything is interconnected. It is worthwhile that everything under debate be addressed in a multifaceted manner" (7 August 2018). It is, therefore, not surprising that a significant issue, which preoccupied the personal perception of activists, be debated. It determines the options they make in the professional and political field, enlivens and organises the structure of Bridging the Past anew, and influences current interactions between different players within the Organisation. As the debate revolves around the key question "Can one be both activist and scientist?" (Epstein, 1996: 342), various forces at Bridging the Past pull in different directions. Even if it is answered by activists, this question is still unsolvable in the eyes of the public and the scientific community.

## Summary

In this article, I have sought to examine one central aspect of the challenge faced by social organisations in the course of translating critical scientific ideas into political action. At the outset, I presented the political dimensions of archaeology as a domain of knowledge that is closely linked to socio-political perceptions. It is also connected to institutions, which influence interpretation of discoveries, such as the state or religious organisations. Then, I provided a detailed account of political dimensions of archaeology in Israel. I explored method by which postcolonial concepts are recognised, such as that proposed by Abu El Haj. I also approached archaeological work in Israel as a matter associated with the national and colonial enterprise of occupation of the land and consciousness. Along this vein, I claimed that the intellectual-theoretical perception of Bridging the Past is deep rooted in similar critical perceptions. These highlight the archaeological responsibility of the space, the impact of the past on what goes on in the present, and the ideas that interpretations of archaeological findings are subjective, dynamic and multidimensional. I then made clear how these perceptions turn into a direct political criticism of Bridging the Past. This criticism is firmly established within the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and occupation of East Jerusalem and West Bank. To this avail, I used the example of the City of David archaeology site in the Palestinian neighbourhood of Silwan.

Based on this intellectual and political premise, I sought to highlight a central tension within Bridging the Past's work over the intrinsic contradiction between a professional organisation, which promotes professional ethics on one hand, and a political organisation, which attempts to change politics and power relations in the sphere of Israel/Palestine on the other hand. I cast light on the expression of this tension by means of the encounter between Bridging the Past and the public with whom it works, namely, the scientific community and Israeli public. To this end, I demonstrated that this tension entails different methods and thinking principles within Bridging the Past itself, pulling the Organisation in different, somewhat opposite, directions. Still, I claim that the tension between the professional and the political is a constituent and substantial question in such organisations. It, therefore, continues to be pondered by activists of Bridging the Past. It is an integral part of the factors which shape the Organisation's agenda.

In relation to archaeology politics in Israel, the article has sought to build on and test the subject from the perspective of those who oppose the practice and theory of scientific knowledge. It also proposes a debate over the constituent narrative of human rights organisation and transformation of ideas into political action. Apart from this, the article practically refers to the underlying the duality of organisational activity. On one end, a shift from ideas to action is challenging. It requires an ongoing work and process, with long-term projections on socio-political action. On the other end, organizations are exactly what allows this shift from ideas to action and enables to change the social and scientific reality, through a variety of instrumental, tangible and political tools.

## References

- Abu El-Haj, N. (2001). *Facts on the Ground: Archaeological practice and territorial self-fashioning in Israeli society*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Atalay, S. (2012). *Community-based Archaeology: Research with, by, and for indigenous and local communities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Atalay, S. et al. (eds.) (2014). *Transforming Archaeology: Activist practices and prospects*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Ben-Ari, Y. (2008). "Jewish or General Archaeology: Research on the Land of Israel towards 1948". In M. Feige and Shilony S. (eds.). *An Axe to Excavate with: Archaeology and Nationalism in the Land of Israel*. Beersheba: The Ben-Gurion Research Institute for the Study of Israel and Zionism, Ben-Gurion University, pp. 221-234 [in Hebrew].
- Ben-Yehuda, N. (1995). *The Masada Myth: Collective Memory and Mythmaking in Israel*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Bourdieu, p., and Wacquant, L. (1992). *An Invitation of Reflexive Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Cash, D. et al. (2003). Saliency, Credibility, Legitimacy and Boundaries: Linking research, assessment and decision making. *KSG Working Papers Series RWP02-046*. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=372280> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.372280>.
- Castaneda, Q. E. (2014). Situating Activism in Archaeology: The Mission of Science, the Activist Affect, and the Archaeological Record, in Atalay s. et al (eds.) *Transforming archaeology: Activist Practices and Prospects*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 61-90.
- Dietler, M. (1994). "Our Ancestors the Gauls": Archaeology, Ethnic Nationalism, and the Manipulation of Celtic Identity in Modern Europe, *American Anthropologist* 96(3), 584-605.
- Eden, S. (2005). Green, gold and grey geography: Legitimizing academic and policy expertise. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 30(3), 282–286.
- Elon, A. (1997). Politics and Archaeology, in Silberman N.A and Small D.B. (eds.), *The Archaeology of Israel: Constructing the Past, Interpreting the Present*. Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 34–47.
- Epstein, S. (1996). *Impure Science: AIDS, activism and the politics of knowledge*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Evetts, J. (2003) The Sociological Analysis of Professionalism. *International Sociology* 18(2), 395-415.
- Faulkner, N. (2000). Archaeology from below. *Public Archaeology* 1(1), 21–33.
- Feige M. (2008). "Introduction: An Axe to Excavate with: Archaeology and Nationalism in the Land

of Israel". In M. Feige and Shilony S. (eds.). *An Axe to Excavate with: Archaeology and Nationalism in the Land of Israel*. Beersheba: The Ben-Gurion Research Institute for the Study of Israel and Zionism, Ben-Gurion University, pp. 221-234 [in Hebrew].

Feige M. (2009). "Imagined Communities of Archaeology: On Nationalism, Eschatology, and Sur-  
[face". *Democratic Culture*, 12, 167-205 [in Hebrew

Ferris N., Harrison R., Wilcox M. V. (eds.) (2014). *Rethinking Colonial Past Through Archaeology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977*. Brighton, Sussex: Harvester Press.

Gathercole, P., and Lowenthal, D. (eds.). (1990). *The Politics of the Past*. London: Routledge.

Gori, M. (2013). The stones of contention: The role of archaeological heritage in Israeli-Palestinian conflict. *Archaeologies* 9(1), 213–229.

Hallote, R. S., and Joffe, A. H. (2002). The politics of Israeli archaeology: Between "nationalism" and "science" in the age of the Second Republic. *Israel Studies* 7(3), 84–116.

Haraway, D. (2007). Situated Knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective, in K. Asdal, B. Brenna and I. Moser (eds.) *Technoscience: The politics of interventions*. Oslo: Oslo Academic Press, Unipub, 109–134.

Hart, S. M., Oland, M., and Frink, L. (2012). Finding Transitions: Global pathways to decolonizing indigenous histories in archaeology, in Oland M., Hart S. M., and Frink L. (eds.) *Decolonizing Indigenous Histories: Exploring prehistorical/colonial transitions in archaeology*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1–18.

Hodder, I. (2003). Archaeological reflexivity and the "local" voice. *Anthropological Quarterly* 76(1), 55–69.

Hodder, I., and Hutson, S. (2003). *Reading the Past: Current approaches to interpretation in archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kohl, P. L. (1998). Nationalism and archaeology: On the constructions of nations and the reconstructions of the remote past. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 27(1), 223–246.

Kohl, P. L., and Fawcett, C. (1995). 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, 3–18.

Kohl, P. L., Kozelsky, M., and Ben-Yehuda, N. (2007). Introduction, in P. Kohl, M. Kozelsky and N. Ben-Yehuda (eds.), *Selective Remembrances: Archaeology in the construction, commemoration, and consecration of national pasts*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1–28.

Landy, D. (2017). The place of Palestinians in tourist and Zionist discourses in the 'City of David', Occupied East Jerusalem, *Critical Discourse Studies*, 1–15.

- Lydon, J., and Rizvi, U. Z. (eds.) (2016). *Handbook of Postcolonial Archaeology*. New York: Routledge.
- McGuire, R. H. (2008). *Archaeology as Political Action*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Merriman, N. (ed.) (2004). *Public Archaeology*. New York: Routledge.
- Meskell, L. (ed.) (1998). *Archaeology Under Fire: Nationalism, politics and heritage in the eastern Mediterranean and Middle East*. London: Routledge.
- Moore, K. (1996). Organizing integrity: American science and the creating of public interest organizations, *American Journal of Sociology* 101(6), 1592–1627.
- Politis, G., and Perez Gollan, J. A. (2007). Latin American archaeology: From colonialism to globalization, in Meskell L. and Preucel R. W. *A Companion to Social Archaeology*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 333–373.
- Powell, W.W., and DiMaggio, P.J. (1991). *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press
- Pullan, W., and Gwiazda M. (2009). 'City of David': Urban design and frontier heritage, *Jerusalem Quarterly* 39, 29–38.
- Saks, M. (2016). A Review of Theories of Professions, Organizations and Society: The case for neo-Weberianism, neo-institutionalism and eclecticism. *Journal of Professions and Organization* 3, 170-187.
- Schinkel, W., and Noordegraaf, M. (2011). Professionalism as Symbolic Capital: Materials for a Bourdieusian theory of professionalism. *Comparative Sociology* 10, 67-96.
- Shackel, P., and Chambers, S. (eds.) (2004). *Places in Mind: Public archaeology as applied anthropology*. New York: Routledge.
- Shanks, M., and Tilley, C. Y. (1987). *Social Theory and Archaeology*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Shanks, M., and Tilley, C. Y. (1992). *Re-constructing Archaeology: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Silberman, N. A. (1990). *Between Past and Present: Archaeology, Ideology, and Nationalism in the Modern Middle East*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Silberman, N. A. (1995). Promised lands and chosen peoples: 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, 249–262.
- Silberman, N. A. (2001). If I forget thee, O Jerusalem: Archaeology, religious commemoration and nationalism in a disputed city, 1801–2001. *Nations and Nationalism* 7(4), 487–504.
- Silberman, N. A., and Small, D. B. (1997). Introduction, in Silberman N.A., and Small D.B. (eds.) *The*

*Archaeology of Israel: Constructing the Past, Interpreting the Present*. Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 17-31.

Stottman, M. J. (2010). Introduction: Archaeologists as activists, in J. Stottman (ed.), *Archaeologists as Activists: Can archaeologists change the world?* Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1–18.

Trigger, B. G. (1995). Romanticism, nationalism, and archaeology, in P. L Kohl and C. Fawcett (eds.), *Nationalism, Politics and the Practice of Archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 263–279.

Trigger, B. G. (1984). Alternative Archaeologies: Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist. *Man (N.S)* 19(3), 355-370.

Van Dommelen, P. (1997). Colonial constructs: Colonialism and archaeology in the Mediterranean. *World Archaeology* 28(3), 305–323.

Wylie, A. (2007). The Constitution of Archaeological Evidence, in T. Insoll (ed.), *The Archaeology of Identities: a reader*. New York: Routledge, 97-118.

Yekutieli, Y. (2008). “From the Field of Nationalism to the Field of Capital: Archaeology Nowadays – 1989-1998”. In M. Feige and Shilony S. (eds.). *An Axe to Excavate with: Archaeology and Nationalism in the Land of Israel*. Beersheba: The Ben-Gurion Research Institute for the Study of Israel and Zionism, Ben-Gurion University, pp. 1-18 [in Hebrew].