

**Cultivating Thinking/Challenging Authority: Experiments in Feminist
Pedagogy**

Margaret Conkey and Ruth Tringham
Dept of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley

December 1994

Submitted for publication in *Gender and Archaeology*, edited by Rita
Wright, published by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, PA

This chapter is primarily about practice, and about a practice - teaching - that necessarily derives from and contributes to our theories about archaeology, about teaching, about pedagogy, and about how to think about "the past". While there is an increasing literature that directly addresses issues of feminism and pedagogy (Luke and Gore 1992, Maher and Tetreault 1994, Middleton 1988, Rosser 1986, Rothschild 1988), and while pedagogical issues have been taken up within anthropology as they relate to gender, race and ethnicity (e.g., (Maxwell and Buck 1992), this chapter is not an attempt to lay out an explicit philosophical or conceptual framework for feminist pedagogy in archaeology nor to integrate various discussions and issues from this wider literature into a synopsis of the field, valuable as this might be. Rather, while we certainly hope that our essay will make a contribution to thinking about feminist pedagogies --especially in anthropology and archaeology -- we are primarily interested here to discuss our own recent experiments in the teaching of archaeology, experiments that have been motivated and informed by various aspects of feminist thought.

It is not possible to identify any one cause of our evolving experiments, but it is certain that, once we began with them, there was an increasing interest and engagement on our parts, and now there can be no turning back. A significant influence and stimulus for both of us emerged from our team-teaching, which began with an upper-division course on Archaeological History and Theory. Here we found ourselves face-to-face with the fact that we were not only mediating more than reporting, knowledge, but also that each of us had to find a path through the authority format that comes all too easily when teaching on one's own but which was immediately diffused in our team-teaching collaboration.

Both of us were inspired to engage substantively with the idea that there are different ways to present archaeology -- whether in publications or in the classroom -- by our experiences at the conference, "Women and Production in Prehistory" (1988), which formed the basis for the edited volume, Engendering Archaeology (Gero and Conkey 1991).

For each of us, there were some separate influences as well. For one of us (Ruth Tringham), the experimentation with alternative presentations and with an explicit focus on the alternative and multiple interpretations of the same data began with the revised paper from the "Women and Production in Prehistory" conference. The radio show format for presenting the different interpreters (and their interpretations) of early Neolithic life was tried out in the paper (Tringham 1991a) and was even presented (with many different actors) as part of what are usually single-speaker lectures in our departmental Faculty Seminar series. In writing the paper "Men and Women in Architecture" (Tringham 1991b), Tringham found many ideas to be crystallized in her reading of Bourdier, who articulated the idea that to ignore ambiguity and to work within the illusion that there are "proven facts" (in archaeology) is to claim that one's interpretation of knowledge *is* knowledge rather than a "mode of transmitting knowledge" (Bourdier 1989).

And if any one published paper or article can be credited with stimulating Conkey, it would be the brief essay reprinted in Lingua Franca, written by Jane Tompkins: "Teaching Like it

Matters: A Modest Proposal for Revolutionizing the Classroom" (Tompkins 1991).¹ In this article, Tompkins makes many provocative points, and a few of them were instrumental in re-shaping our teaching, and in encouraging us to scrutinize explicitly the links between our feminist thinking and scholarship, and our classroom practices. We will discuss some of these below, in that they influenced some of the specific formats we took up in order to address our converging ideas about teaching, archaeology, knowledge, and feminist thinking.

In the end, we both see quite clearly that these influences -- from conferences, some team-teaching, some readings -- were all catapulted into action by the 1991 publication of another book by Marija Gimbutas, The Civilization of the Goddess (Gimbutas 1991). Even more so than for her 1989 book (The Language of the Goddess) (Gimbutas 1989), it was the pre-publication announcements, the synopses on the book jacket, and the first summaries of the book - all of which declared it to be "the definitive answer to European prehistory" - that provided the proverbial last straw in our self-critiques of teaching and of the presentation of archaeology. We were thoroughly enmeshed in one of the major enterprises of feminist thinking, that is, to question history, authority and language, and from that vantage point, the claims for the Gimbutas book struck a raw chord. We had already team-taught a graduate seminar entitled Archaeology and the Goddess, and were preparing to teach an upper division undergraduate course on the same topic. And it was in the context of that class (Fall 1991) that we most self-consciously began to experiment with our teaching in ways that drew on what we had come to embrace as feminist principles.

Some of the pedagogical background for what we developed can be found in the Tompkins article. Tompkins critiques what she sees as the primary model for pedagogy in the classrooms of American higher education: the performance model². To her, this is a model that is no "less coercive and destructive of creativity and self-motivated learning" than the "banking model" (Friere), which emphasizes the deposition of knowledge, in which students are depositories and the teacher is the depositor. Simply put, what Tompkins advocates, and what she herself has tried and reports on, is more of a "coaching" model. And, as she herself says, "what this boils down to is this: The students are responsible for presenting the material to the class" (Tompkins 1991): 26).

While Tompkins presents numerous other ideas that are both inspirational and provocative, we took up her challenge to replace performance with coaching, and we confronted her observation that "what really matters as far as our own beliefs and projects for (social) change are concerned is not so much what we talk about in class as what we do". With all these ideas and influences in hand, we have embarked on a series of teaching experiments that have been self-consciously about the intersection of feminist thinking, archaeology, and pedagogy. While we have been

¹ Special thanks goes to Kristen Luker for sharing the article by Tompkins with Conkey, and thanks as well to all the "Chickens" for on-going discussions of feminism, pedagogy, and architectural (rather than housekeeping) action in the University.

² Tompkins describes herself in the performance mode in her own teaching: "I had been putting on a performance whose goal was not to help the students learn but to perform before them in such a way that they would have a good opinion of me" (Tompkins 1991:24).

fortunate to have departmental and University support for the opportunity to team teach frequently, we have also applied our ever-expanding insights in classes that we have taught individually. As Tompkins reports for her own experience, it will be difficult, if not impossible, for us to teach in the same way again. And while we feel that there has been a good measure - both quantitatively and qualitatively - of success, this does not mean there is no room for improvement or change, and this does not mean our efforts and attempts were ever received unanimously or without question or concern.

However, while we thought we were trying to "liberate" our classrooms, we have - perhaps in a self-centered sort of way - also liberated ourselves. The teaching of archaeology - and all that refers to, from theory to method, to data, to interpretation - has, for us, become not only a context within which we can think about the impact of feminist thinking on how we "do" archaeology, and what the human past might have been like; it has itself become a feminist practice. We would argue that, despite the late arrival of feminist thinking in archaeological literature and archaeological circles, the very nature of archaeology - its subject matter and its crucial (if not largely yet unrecognized) position in contemporary cultural politics - is particularly conducive to feminist pedagogy. Despite the resistance of many of its practitioners about the field of archaeology, it may inherently be one of the most feminist of enterprises!

The following essay will begin by addressing some of the themes or features of what we consider to be included within "feminist pedagogy". Most of the essay, however, will provide the specifics of our experiments in teaching archaeology, in the hope that others may find in them useful or applicable ideas and that we will receive suggestions, critiques, and ideas to develop further or improve these approaches.

What is Feminist Pedagogy?

A most important point to begin with is that it is not at all necessary to consider feminist pedagogy *only* for those courses that are explicitly feminist or gender-oriented. While we would agree with the feminist tenet that taking sex/gender seriously is indeed an integral part of what contemporary feminism is all about, feminist pedagogy in archaeology is not limited to courses on Archaeology and Gender, Women in Archaeology, or to sections of courses that deal with the more explicitly gendered categories or topics, such as household analysis, craft production, etc. While we began our feminist teaching in a team-taught upper-division undergraduate course that *was* explicitly gender-oriented and feminist - Archaeology and the Goddess - we saw immediately how our various pedagogical experiments were completely appropriate to what might be considered more mainstream courses, such as regional, topical or evolutionary courses. In our own case, for example, this has meant applying our ideas as much to our course on the Archaeology and Prehistory of Europe as to the course on Archaeology and the Goddess.

Our primary pedagogical device that served as the core of our "coaching" in each class was the use of Panels. We describe some of these in detail, as well as note both the strengths and weaknesses of such a format. We note this "device" at this point so that, as we discuss our feminist pedagogy a bit more, the reader can imagine how a Panel format might be a viable means to approximate and achieve our feminist goals.

We envision that a major part of our role as teachers is to mediate information between the literature (texts, articles, etc.) and our own experience/ knowledge, on the one hand, and an

active participating class, on the other hand. This active participating class is not a transitional group of faceless students, but comprises diverse individuals, each of whom is in the class not to be "filled" with knowledge, but, to use a current but not inappropriate phrase, to find their own voice through the interaction of experience and knowledge. We strive to break down the barriers between knowledge and experience. We no longer view the classroom as a place where we - the instructors - should "polish" our skills (as Tompkins says).

Rather, we aim to stimulate critical awareness and to provide students with some of the ways through which they can express their critical thoughts and observations. We encourage students to question - not passively accept - authors as authority. In archaeology, we are particularly concerned to encourage the exploration of the legitimacy of multiple interpretations. In classroom dynamics, we sought to find ways to encourage open expression of opinion among peers, if not an outright theater of discourse. We hoped to be able to foster their engagement with non-established ways of expression, such as multi-media or truly collaborative presentations, and through these vehicles, to recognize the power of the media itself. We sought ways to put the feminist critique of science into practice; what other field is as well suited as archaeology to question history, authority, language and symbol? We see the questioning of such things as central to the feminist critique and to the feminist enterprise.

Coaching Archaeology Through Panels

While the above heading may strike you as strange in contrast to the more familiar "Teaching Archaeology through Lectures", this is the essence of our approach. The panels, as described below, took on varying forms and content. The basic idea here is that during anywhere from 7-14 class meetings (in a 15 week semester), the class would basically be "taught" by a group of students composed as a panel. We experimented with optimal sizes for the panels, with ways to prepare and provide guidelines, and with kinds of topics to assign to each panel in advance. We inevitably left the format - a debate, a skit, a set of presentations, use of slides or props, handouts, etc. - up to the student panelists. While many were at first overwhelmed by the very idea of getting together with some 4-7 other (and usually previously unknown) students to work out an entire presentation, there is no doubt that almost all rose to the occasion. In some courses, all students enrolled were panelists; in other courses, there were too many for all to participate and so a certain division of the class had to happen and alternative modes of expression for non-panelists had to be devised (such as a 5-7 page research paper).

The panels were more successful when the material to be addressed in the panel was already somehow familiar in the personal experiences of the panelists, whether from previous reading, coursework, media, or through general life experiences of travel, household dynamics, power relations or whatever. We thus had to think through which of the many potential panel topics would perhaps work best. The panels were more successful when one or two of the panelists were strong leaders and they were more successful when the guidelines from us were specific (oral or written) and detailed. Panel participants inevitably went from an initial fear that they would have nothing to say to taking too long in their presentations so that an important part of the panel idea - open discussion and debate in the classroom - was often minimized or had to be (due to time constraints) cut off in the middle just as it was getting interesting.

Of course, the panels were only one part of the course learning. There were always readings, and we did have lectures by each of us and by visitors. The panels did not replace exams or even papers, though we found that the kinds of exams we gave, especially as a final exam, had to be more open-ended, such as essay exams that could be prepared in advance. We also found that when writing course papers, those that built on the topic an individual took up as a panelist were often the most effective. For example, if a panelist had been involved in the panel on the Terra Amata "hut" (in the European Archaeology course), for them to write their paper - which was to be an interpretive critique - on the interpretation of architecture and structures in the European Paleolithic would encourage the growth and consolidation within a particular domain of archaeological knowledge.

In many courses, we had a panel every week; in others, we had only 7 panels out of the 15 weeks. In one course (Archaeology and the Goddess) we had a quite explicit schedule, with a "data" lecture on Monday, a "theory" lecture on Wednesday and a panel on Friday. (These were 50 minute class periods). We tried varying ways to involve the non-panelists for each week in the critical assessment of the panels. Perhaps the most extensive such attempt was in Conkey's course on Prehistoric Art, in which some 100 students each wrote a one-paragraph critique of any 6 of the 7 panels, which generated some 600 paragraphs to be read and annotated by the instructor!

The following descriptive discussion of the panels is in three parts, taking up three different course sets: 1) the inaugural course - one that was topically an explicitly feminist/gender-oriented course, entitled Archaeology and the Goddess; 2) the conventional area courses, European Archaeology (team-taught, but taught two different times and with intentional differences in format) and Mediterranean Archaeology (taught by Tringham alone); and 3) a conventional topical course, Prehistoric Art (taught by Conkey alone).

Archaeology and the Goddess (Fall 1991)

This course was designed to look at the ways in which a contemporary theme in popular culture - "The Goddess Movement" - uses archaeology³ Just a few of the questions that motivated this course were: What is the relationship of archaeology to popular culture? How is archaeology

³ In the past 15 years, a suite of ideas about prehistoric matriarchies, female power and empowerment, harmonious gender relations, spiritual redefinitions, ecological consciousness, and the politics of spirituality have been mobilized by reference to and through imagery of "the Goddess" (Eisler 1987, Gadon 1989, Spretnak 1982, Stone 1976)89, Spretnak 1982, Stone 1976.(Gimbutas 1989, Gimbutas 1991) For a detailed critique see [Conkey, in press #1770; Tringham, 1993 #2064]. In a December 1992 issue, the Phoenix, Arizona Republic reports that, according to Megatrends, more than 500,000 people (mostly, but not exclusively, women) "identify "with various aspects of these ideas and issues.

The hypothesis (or conviction, to some) is, in its most basic form, as follows: There were past societies in Europe and the Near East, especially prior to the so-called "invasion" of Indo-Europeans circa 5000 years ago, that were Goddess-worshipping, female-centered, in harmony with their environments, more balanced in male-female relationships, and in which the status of women was high and respected.

These "facts" about past societies are based on the existence of artifacts (such as female statuettes) and interpretations of certain decorative motifs (e.g., "spirals") as female, and of certain architectural features as "altars", "shrines" or "temples" that are then taken to signify the sacred or religious nature of these features and their associated female characteristics or attributes. These are the archaeological manifestations of The Goddess or of goddesses.

used in the construction of contemporary belief systems? What archaeological evidence is there and what is claimed in support of certain prehistoric belief systems? The course was designed to be a critical evaluation of the recently accumulated work that has drawn substantially on the archeology of the Paleolithic and Neolithic to underwrite and sustain a particular gendered interpretation of the human past.

The topics for discussion in the panels, which were held almost every week, focused on theoretical issues (fig. 1). The aim of these panels was to draw out different viewpoints for debate. The course in general used "The Goddess Movement" as a podium to prompt consideration of what the feminist critique of archaeology is all about and what difference it makes to consider gender issues in past human societies from a critical perspective, including a critique of the archaeologist-as-authority. For this reason, the panels ranged over some very important theoretical debates about the construction of knowledge about the past. These debates, however, were placed in a context where the issues were quite explicit, clearly observed and critiqued. At the same time, the topical focus of the course - "the goddess" - is one that has been discussed quite a bit in the popular media and in differing contexts. All of this contributed to the generally stimulating effect that the course content had on the class (more than 50 students).

Insert fig. 1

About five of the students were what one might describe as "goddess activists", as goddess-inspired artists, dancers, or as members of a coven or as self-proclaimed "witches", which certainly enhanced the experiential basis for the class discussions! Other students had backgrounds in religious studies, as well as in anthropology, archaeology and other fields.

The second meeting of the course, while not a panel, was intended to set the stage for the understanding and simultaneous critique of the way in which archaeological narratives are constructed, and, more specifically, of the way in which the narrative of the "Goddess" in prehistory was being presented. While we chose to do this by means of a media presentation, - a video of the film "The Goddess Remembered" (produced by the National Film Board of Canada, Studio D) - this very medium reinforced for us and the class the fact that the media representations of archaeology, of the human past, and of gender relations are potent and rich pedagogical sources (see also (Maxwell and Buck 1992).

Tringham selected and showed certain sections of the video. At each point where an "authoritative" statement was made, the film was stopped and the class members were invited to make their own interpretation, to think how such statements were constructed (such as what *was* the path of inference from data to interpretation?), and to offer other commentary, questions, or critique. For example:

"I would say a matrifocal culture is one in which the female has a place of honor and respect and that doesn't mean domination. The men and women in these cultures in Old Europe were buried in almost equal ways. The women had a little more "stuff". But nothing like the patriarchal chieftain system later, where one man owned women and other men and horses and objects. So it was really pretty much an egalitarian society. There was not a putting down of men in order to elevate women. There was just a natural reverence of the bountiful powers of

Mother Earth and the bountiful powers of the female" (Charlene Spretnak speaking).

This quote was a wonderful demonstration of argument by assertion using archaeological data: how people lived, what they owned (and what "ownership" is), who ruled over whom, etc. It provided a starting-off point for a discussion of the use of burial goods to infer the status and ownership of the living person; of evolutionary terms such as egalitarian, chieftain system, matrifocal, patriarchal; and of the problems of essentializing what must have been a very complex set of people into a single category: the female" or "the male", as well as the gendering of the Earth, which provokes discussion of the dualistic nature/culture concepts, their intellectual history and the gendering (female) of Nature and its own intellectual history (e.g., (Keller 1985, Merchant 1980).

While this video may seem like an easy "target" for critique precisely because it was intended for a popular audience, this only reinforces for us the need to expand our analytical scope - as archaeologists within contemporary societies - to include and even focus on the media rather than to ignore it (in the hopes it will go away - which it won't!) because we may think it is not scholarly archaeology. It is *precisely* because the media is controlled and in the service of the very same controlling agents that have fostered patriarchal, essentialist, authoritative thinking that an explicit engagement with the media is even more crucial to a feminist pedagogy.

As the first course in which we used panels, the students were given less explicit guidance than we later came to adopt. For each panel, we provided students with some lead questions and some - but not too much - additional literature, as well as explicit reference to the assigned readings that would be most relevant to the panel topic.

[In addition to the panels (10 panels of 5 students), each student wrote an independent research paper, and there was an essay final exam, for which a set of possible essay questions was distributed in advance of the exam. We held at least one large (optional, but well-attended) review session to go over issues related to those questions before the exam.]

II. Area courses: Archaeology and Prehistory of Europe (taught jointly, Spring 1992 and Spring 1994); Mediterranean Archaeology (taught by Tringham, Spring 1993).

In many ways, it is more of a challenge to teach "mainstream" courses such as the prehistory or archaeology of a specific area from a feminist perspective than a course like the one described above, which focused more obviously on feminist or gender issues. We have some specific lessons learned from a feminist teaching of the archaeology of the European continent and that of the Mediterranean Basin.

Textbooks on the archaeology of these regions abound with authoritative statements about macroscale evolutionary and region-wide changes from the first human colonization to the beginnings of art and then agriculture, on through to the development of complex chiefdoms and exchange systems and so on. As practitioners within these research areas, we know that few things about the past are quite that definitive. We found, however, that we wanted to use some of these textbooks to provide much of the needed informational background against which a variety of issues could be developed. So, while we do not at all dismiss the generations of archaeological

research and what they have yielded, we were equally interested in discussing in class the uses to which these data and these "facts" have been put.

As with "Archaeology and the Goddess", our aim was to break down the mystification of these authoritative "facts" by exposing the ways in which multiple interpretations may be made of the same data by archaeologists, often with different socio-political backgrounds or who come from different archaeological "schools". That we ourselves were trained in two countries and at slightly different periods in Anglo-American archaeology also made for an on-going dialogue in the classroom, as we each often queried the other on how the other's intellectual heritage was showing!

Another important way in which the feminist critique was put into practice was to try to observe and interpret the data at multiple scales. Whereas the evolutionary scale was one that was the basis for the textbooks - *is* the scale for much of the established academic literature - we aimed instead, following much of the feminist critique in literature, geography, art and history to focus more attention on microscale interpretation: on individual intentional action, on life in the household, on the specific meaningfulness of single objects, on single events, and on the specifics of human social action, against and within a background of the more macroscale changes. This is actually very hard to put into practice in teaching, because it demands more time to talk about it. But more importantly it demands a greater familiarity of the instructor with the archaeological materials. Finally, it demands a greater effort in familiarization and imagination by the students.

The primary kind of panel for these three area courses was to use as the panel's starting point a site, a feature, a set of artifacts or sometimes a cultural "group" or period (fig. 2).

Insert fig. 2

In the first teaching of an area course (European Archaeology) in which such panels were organized, we provided background information rather informally, mostly verbally, although a relevant bibliography (often including the books and articles themselves) was provided. But otherwise, after a short initial meeting, the students were left to themselves. There were nine panels offered in the first teaching of this course with approximately 45+ students, so that each student was expected to participate in at least one panel, and might have a chance at being in a second.

In the course on Mediterranean Archaeology and in the second attempt at teaching European archaeology with these panels, each panel was provided with a more formal (written) set of background information that included the details of the archaeological data, the broad prehistoric context of the topic, background and specific literature, and some indication as to the kind of variable interpretations that would be plausible. This was an important advance on the earlier attempts at panels and dealt with the problem of wild, less-than-plausible theories (e.g. astronauts at Stonehenge, beer-making in the Maltese "temples").

An example of the kind of background information that the panel received is that for the Lepenski Vir panel (fig. 3):

Fig. 3 The Mesolithic Village at Lepenski Vir, Yugoslavia

Place: Lepenski Vir, right bank of Danube, Danube Gorges, Yugoslavia. Discovered during survey for Danube Dam. Excavated late 1960s by Dragoslav Srejovic. Post-Pleistocene (Mesolithic) hunter-gatherers. Excavator believes the site is basically pre-agricultural. Others (e.g. Tringham) believe it represents hunter-gatherer/agricultural (Neolithic) interaction.

General Context: Mesolithic-Neolithic transition in Southeast Europe. Hunter-gatherer/agriculturalist interaction in Europe.

Interesting finds at the site: trapezoid houses with unusual shaped hearths in terraces; carved stone heads; burials; rich bone and stone tools; fishbones.

Interpretations: symbolic (including Jungian); domus; structuralism; gender division of labor; Goddess; art; the demise of hunter-gatherers when agriculturalists come on the scene; the result of sedentary living; the first domestication of humans in Europe.

Relevant literature (some references provided in the reader, and 3-4 extra readings recommended)

At the same time as we were encouraging the interpretive challenges and grounded storytelling, using specific sites or artifacts as the focus, we - as feminists - wanted to explore with the students the demystification of authority of scientific facts and the challenges involved in writing prehistory at a microscale. We felt one vehicle for this would be this investigation into the alternative ways in which prehistory can be presented. It was for this reason that we suggested early on that it was "OK" for students to bring themselves into the interpretation of archaeological materials by the use of strategies such as narratives, personal experience and perception.

The use of narratives and other alternative media was encouraged. We provided some background in the very first readings by including three articles. The first was by Terrell (Terrell 1990), addressing explicitly the issue of "storytelling" in archaeology and anthropology, using the Pacific area as his example. Secondly, we provided the article by Janet Spector (Spector 1991), now expanded into a book (Spector 1993), that takes a specific archaeological artifact and presents an empirically-grounded "story" about its owner and maker. And finally we provided a chapter from one of the best fictional accounts of Ice Age Europe, Reindeer Moon (Thomas 1987).

Thus the panel participants in following our guidelines were encouraged to take up different interpretations and viewpoints, which could be that of the different archaeologists or even that of

the prehistoric social actors, basing their constructions in the archaeological literature as well as their imaginations. They did this through with various skits (as at Maiden Castle, Varna, Malta, and Oetzi) wearing costumes and incorporating multimedia effects, such as music. They grounded their interpretations in the empirical archaeological data with slides, overheads, and handouts (fig. 4).

Insert fig. 4

[For those students who did not wish to participate in a panel or could not do so (e.g., had certain disabilities, or lived too far away to have group meetings between classes), there was an alternative to the Panel Assignment: to write a paper 3-5 pages long. The topic of the paper was to read one of the recommended fictional narratives of prehistoric/protohistoric Europe. Their task was to compare the narrative version with the conventional academic interpretations and reporting of the same general archaeological evidence, in terms of (a) the contribution that the narrative makes to our (Re)construction of prehistory, and (b) the contribution that the academic literature has made to the narratives. This assignment, which would be worth following up in a more structured and supervised way, allows the student to examine the interplay of mutual contribution between the public media and the academic (usually more) authoritative view of prehistory.]

[The other main creative assignment that all students were required to do in one of the area courses was the term paper (10-15 pages). The topic was to take a particular place (a mountain, a valley, an island, an archaeological site, a modern city, a tree) in the Mediterranean or Europe and trace its changing history from 10,000 BP (or earlier if they wish) until the present. Obviously this means talking about the humans for whom this place has been an arena for their social action, and for whom this place has meant something in more than just "space container" terms.

We gave the students some advice such as

"Don't worry, we know that your "histories" will be spotty - empty at some times, very full at others, depending on what you can find out about the archaeological evidence available etc. In other words, for some periods of this time, you will be passing through time very quickly, for other periods you will dwell on a particular time in more detail. That is fine, as long as you tell us what you are doing".

We also gave some guidelines as to how to proceed, based on our experience from the panels:

" for knowing where to start, choose a place where there seems to be enough archaeological data, e.g., a site that we have mentioned in class, such as in the panels. The best of these places to choose would be one that is relatively close to a place that you know from personal experience or is written about in guidebooks, e.g. London, Oxford, Rome, Florence, Paris, Vienna, Athens etc."

With this paper topic our aims were similar to those for the panels, in that we wanted to focus on the specific place and imagined social actors in their broader socio-historical-geographical context. At the same time we wanted to draw attention to the fact that places are seen by both

prehistoric and modern (e.g. tourists, archaeologists) social actors, all of whom themselves have different life-histories and cultural experiences.

On the basis of the papers that were written in this course, we were fairly certain that we were on a "right track" in the construction of prehistory for undergraduates. Many of them threw themselves into the creative business of constructing prehistory in many fascinating, inspiring and enterprising ways. We must insist here that these were all required to be based on the empirical and available evidence; these were not to be - nor were they - flights of fancy detached from the archaeology and archaeological record. The best papers took up the suggestion that prehistory cannot be written in a linear fashion but is of necessity discontinuous. Many used the "time-machine" format, but these were by no means the most successful. The best ones were carefully and explicitly aware of the empirical data on which their interpretations were based.

We would like to mention some of the inspiring examples (fig. 5):

Insert fig. 5]

III: A Topic Course: Prehistoric Art

This turned out to be a large course (c.100 students), which met for two 1.5 hour meetings each week. We had not previously had the longer time bloc for panels, which then take up half of the week's class time instead of only one-third. This class was taught by Conkey alone and it was to focus primarily on the "arts" of both prehistoric and some ethnographic-ethnohistoric gatherer-hunter/small-scale societies. The idea was to try to see how anthropologists and archaeologists have and could study the visual cultures of the past.

Seven panel topics were established and sign-up lists posted outside the instructor's office. A hand-out was given along with the course syllabus that described the kinds of topics one might take up for each panel and what the idea behind each panel was. The panel groups could decide on their own format. Rather than these being individual monologues or somewhat disconnected summaries of sets of information, alternative and imaginative formats were encouraged. Individual panelists could choose to be certain authors or analysts or to take on the opinions, roles, or positions of different interest groups (e.g., what a "shaman" might say about the relation between shamanism and imagery; what a 1993 Australian aboriginal might say about bark paintings, etc...).

The panels were scheduled mostly for the second half of the course. By limiting the panels to no more than 8 (preferably 6) participants, only half of the class could participate in panels, so the other half were asked to write not only a 5-7 page research paper but also a one-paragraph evaluation (not summaries) of 6 out of the 7 panels. Even panelists were asked to self-critique their own panel and their own contribution to the panel. Students were instructed to evaluate the panels on the basis of both the individual contributions as well as on the integration of the different individual parts of the panel. The panel and the research paper each were 33% of the course grade.

The specific hand-out for the panels is included with this article (fig. 6). Here we shall discuss some of the strengths and weaknesses of teaching with panels by focusing on a few specific panels

Insert fig. 6

Two of the panels were deliberately set up as debates with two different stances on an issue to be taken up. In both instances, the students themselves managed a presentation that demonstrated that neither issue could be reduced to a simple for/against debate, and that the issues were more complicated and that the duel-ism of the debate format did not do justice to the issues at hand. For some of the students, it was somewhat difficult to accept that there was not a real "one-side versus the other side" kind of situation, if only because such dichotomies are easier to understand. However, in terms of critical thinking, grasping that issues are too complex, too ambiguous, and too much the products of specific interested stances was an important pedagogical gain.

Some panel topics were overly ambitious in that they were too abstract and were hard to translate into a panel format in front of a large class. This was particularly the case with Panel # 4, where there was to be a debate that considered which might be more crucial in understanding image-making, the very making of imagery (techniques, technologies, the *praxis*, and thus the objects themselves) or the circumstances of imagery (the social and cultural contexts). The debate broke down since everyone wanted to argue that both "sides" were important. Moreover, this topic comes with a huge and long history of theoretical debate within art history and anthropology, which also made it hard for the students to develop their own opinions.

The other ambitious panel was the group that chose to exhibit a selection of native California baskets from the Hearst Museum's collection in the Museum's teaching area. Given the museum's staff shortages and the complexities of organizing 8 people's schedules to work with the materials in the museum, the students felt they put in an inordinate amount of preparation time and found themselves more frustrated than inspired by what they came to see as the limitations of museum collections. This was a rather sophisticated group of students that experienced a lot of argumentation over what they should attempt to "say" about the baskets without the voices of the native makers. They, of course, found themselves quickly embroiled in some of the most interesting but difficult issues of museums and anthropology today (e.g., (Stocking 1985) among many): who speaks for the makers, what is "authentic", how to display objects without people, etc. While they effectively communicated their differences in their panel, they all were quite pleased to be able to indicate on their resumes that they had actually co-"curated" a mini-exhibit in a major anthropological museum.

The class all went to see the exhibit for their evaluation of the panel, and we were able to take advantage of the schedule problems in that the materials went up without labels for a few weeks and people tried to go both before the labels - to imagine the themes or the issues or the stories of the baskets - and then after the labels. The no-labels exhibit was greatly enjoyed, given the background reading both in general on the anthropological understandings about material and visual culture and on California basketry.

Because of their courage and imagination, the last panel - the Summary panel - was also particularly effective. While some students in the class really wanted this group to give them a straightforward summary of what we studied, this panel chose instead to do an honest and imaginative critique of some of the course materials, including a constructive but pointed critique of the course organization and the topics that were *not* considered. Conkey, as instructor, was

both surprised and pleased at this healthy and mature critique, which pointed out topics that were given too much attention, where the instructor's biases showed through too clearly, and why these panels were always an experience like treading on more-or-less thin ice. Overall, they thought the experience well worth it, but there were indeed a few "feet" (and legs, and torsos?) that fell into icy water !

Always Teaching Fragments

The above descriptions of some of our panel experiences can hopefully provide some of the specifics on how we have experimented with what we believe to be feminist-inspired methods for teaching archaeology in a variety of course contexts.

In the Archaeology and the Goddess class, we found that *theoretical questions and debates* - about feminist interpretations, material culture, archaeology and speculation - served to provide the most substance to the class and the panels.

In the topical course (on prehistoric art), we found that the topical approach worked well for panel foci, especially topics with some edge of controversy: gender, museum exhibits, what is a "continuing tradition" in the emergent capitalism of international art markets; or with outright attempts at debates with "sides".

In our area courses, on the other hand, we have found that the panels that focused on the *specifics* of the archaeological record for interpretation - a site, a feature, even just an artifact (such as the massacre at the entrance to Maiden Castle or Oetzi, the Iceman) - were more satisfying and provoked more stimulating discussion than those panels treating a wider topic, such as a cultural group (e.g., the Natufians). especially with our encouragement for grounded but imaginative alternative interpretations. Not all specific microscale topics were successful, however. Examples of topics that "bombed" were Opovo, Dereivka and Mas d'Azil.

In all courses, the panels were more successful when the material to be addressed in the panel was already somehow familiar in the personal experiences of the panelists, whether from previous reading, coursework, media, or through general life experiences of travel, household dynamics, power relations and so on.

Failing this, a possibility to read about the topic for themselves (usually meaning publication in English) helped the success. This is particularly a problem when teaching an "area" course such as European archaeology. Thus, exotic sites such as Lepenski Vir (Yugoslavia) and the cemetery at Varna (Bulgaria) that have extensive, often quite interpretive, publication in English provided more successful "take-off points" for the panels than geographically less exotic sites such as the Princess' grave at Vix, that seemed to us equally provocative.

In almost all cases each and every panelist rose to the occasion, but it was again clear that the success of the panel was often directly linked to the enterprise and confidence and coordinating abilities of at least one or two leaders among the student participants in each panel. Some panels were threatened, though, by very strong leaders who had their own agenda and viewpoint to insist on, which took some resisting: a hard lesson for undergraduates but a necessary one should they face group life, as they inevitably will!

It was quite clear that there was a development by the students who had taken a number of our panel-courses in their skill at panel organization and discussion. They learned after two or three classes that it is important to start organizing the panels early, to plan the panel as a whole, and to plan the timing of their own presentations. They learned that it's all right to use their imaginations and narratives, as well as multimedia devices and props such as clothes and handouts. They also learned that it was to their advantage if one or two people took it upon themselves to lead the panels. They did get emboldened by the success of their predecessors, so that as the semester went on, the panels were overall better. They *do* learn from their peers! By 1994, the panel presentations were often so ambitious that they left little room for discussion - this is an important aspect of panel discussions that is difficult to control given the 50 minute classroom time.

In the official instructions to students for evaluating panels for the "Prehistoric Art" class, Conkey asked them to evaluate the effectiveness of each panel to communicate their stated goals and objectives and their abilities to contribute to the understanding and interpretation of prehistoric and anthropological arts. In our own minds we have evaluated "panel success" by the degree to which the participants were able to demonstrate the ambiguity of the archaeological record, and a critical appraisal of interpretations of this data, at the same time as drawing out the multiplicity of possible interpretations that may be made of the data as prehistory is written from different vantage points, whether it be vantage points of the interpreters and archaeologists or the vantage points of people in the past.

In trying to be coaches rather than performers, we encouraged guests as other "voices" in these courses: an archaeologist from the Classics department in the Mediterranean course; a social anthropologist to talk about the anthropology of art; an author of one of the popular Goddess books; a visiting researcher working with contemporary aboriginal arts. In our large introductory archaeology course each semester, we expect that all the archaeology faculty, including those in other departments and traditions, and each of the course teaching assistants will give lectures on their approaches, their research concerns. This view and practice is shared by all our archaeology faculty.

Other "techniques" have included a video that presents one strong or controversial view with an article to "balance" it (such as the Rogers article) (Rogers 1975) to balance the film on Greek gender rigidity that, it is claimed, "goes back to the origins of Mediterranean societies"); or to show a set of images or reconstructions of particular periods or events in prehistory, along with an article that raises our consciousness about the powers of the "visual language of archaeology" (Conkey 1992, Gifford-Gonzalez 1993, Moser 1992, Tringham 1992).

We have experimented with using graduate students as inter-generational coaches for specific panels or debates, for sometimes the undergraduate students feel they can explore unknown topics more freely with them. This has been especially beneficial for the debates.

[We have tried to structure some exam questions for which there are no "true" or absolute answers, such as using a slide "identification" in the prehistoric art class. Here they must identify an image and make a case for *why* the image could be identified as from that group or culture or time, but the answer is graded on the case they make not on the absolute veracity of their identification. The identification can be "wrong" but the "reasons" could be right! We find that

study questions given in advance promote collaborative learning among groups, and we try to provide a space for such groups to meet for their discussions. At the same time, for the area courses, we insist that students know the geography of Europe and of some site locations, using map quizzes.]

We do not advocate these panels as a formula nor as an easy way to substitute for our own lectures. We find that we put in more, not less, time in coaching the students, but the gains have been extraordinary. We have had more meaningful contact with students, and we believe we have been able to foster collaborative peer activities among the students that extend beyond that particular class or panel. We have received our strongest teaching evaluations of our careers, with particularly encouraging scores on such aspects as "encourages critical thinking", "defines their viewpoint openly", "explore various perspectives" and that the course was "challenging and stimulating".

There are, of course, student anxieties about any kind of open-endedness in courses, and the panels and what we try to do in them always bring these out: "Why isn't there *an* answer or *an* interpretation?" We find we always have to be on guard about not letting the creativity that we encourage backslide into intellectual paralysis and nihilism. We have to be much more forthright with examples as to why this is not free-floating and where and how there are parameters and constraints (e.g., (Wylie 1992). Students need to be guided somehow through the inherent ambiguity of so much of the archaeological record and of so much of the practice of archaeology. We quickly came to the conclusion that our responsibilities in these kinds of courses are in some ways greater.

We do not envision that we will be able to simply re-use the panel topics and techniques year after year. Rather, the interactive "fields" are always changing: the discipline of archaeology is always changing, the students, of course, are usually new and, in any event short-term. Each course brings a different constellation of experiences and personalities. From one class to the next we ourselves have new experiences and have done new readings and thinking. There can be no "notes from the last time we taught this class"; they no longer will do.

We are always teaching fragments. Because we are enmeshed in a momentary historical specificity, all of what we do is provisional and emergent, but the tensions of this can be both creative and productive. We hope that with this kind of experimentation that we are working toward accepting and communicating that "knowledge is always provisional, open-ended, and relational" (Luke and Gore 1992):7): this is both its strength and its challenge, and as we move - we hope - *through* the received views, the master narratives and the authorities, we are inspired by the emancipation of the archaeological imagination that can be mobilized to encourage critical thinking as much as to gain greater understandings of the human past.

Acknowledgments

Special thanks go to the large number of undergraduate and graduate students who have passed through our classes and have been wonderful participants in our experiments in feminist pedagogy. Many of you were not so pleased at first to have to go through the "panel" experience, or to use a fictional narrative format in writing about archaeological data. We thank you all for staying with us and allowing us to benefit from your patience and creative responses to our challenge.

Bibliography

Bourdier, Jean-Paul

1989 Reading tradition. In *Dwellings, Settlements and Traditions: cross-cultural perspectives*. J.-P. Bourdier and N. AlSayyad, ed.. pp. 35-51. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Conkey, Margaret

1992 Mobilizing Ideologies: The Archaeo-logics of Paleolithic "art". symposium "Envisioning the Past: Visual Forms and the Structuring of Interpretations" at the 91st Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association,. San Francisco, CA, 2-6, December 1992:

Conkey, Margaret W. , and Ruth E. Tringham

in press Archaeology and The Goddess: Exploring the Contours of Feminist Archaeology. In *Feminisms in the Academy: Rethinking the Disciplines*. A. Stewart and D. Stanton, ed.. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Eisler, Riane

1987 *The Chalice and the Blade*. San Francisco: Harper and Row.

Freire, Paul

1973 *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Seabury Press.

Gadon, Elinor

1989 *The Once and Future Goddess*. San Francisco: Harper and Row.

Gero, Joan, and Margaret Conkey, (ed.)

1991 *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.Review:

Gifford-Gonzalez, Diane

1993 You can hide but you can't run: Representations of Women's Work in Illustrations of Paleolithic Life. *Visual Anthropology Review* 9(1):23- 41.

Gimbutas, Marija

1989 *The Language of the Goddess*. San Francisco: Harper and Row.

Gimbutas, Marija

1991 *Civilization of the Goddess*. San Francisco: Harper and Row.

Keller, Evelyn Fox

1985 *Reflections on Gender and Science*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Luke, Carmen, and Jennifer Gore, (ed.)

1992 *Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy*. London.: Routledge.

Maher, Frances, and Mary Kay Thompson Tetreault

1994 *The Feminist Classroom*. New York: Basic Books.

Maxwell, Andrew H. , and Pam Davidson Buck

1992 Teaching as Praxis. Decolonizing Media Representations of Race, Ethnicity, and Gender in the New World Order. Paper presented at the meetings of Transforming Anthropology,

Merchant, Carolyn

1980 *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology and the Scientific Revolution*. San Francisco: Harper and Row.

Middleton, Sue

1988 *Educating Feminists: Life Histories and Pedagogy*.

Moser, Stephanie

1992 .

Rogers, Susan C.

1975 Female forms of power and the myth of male dominance: A model of Female/Male interaction in peasant society. *American Ethnologist* 2(4):727-756.

Rosser, Sue V.

1986 *Teaching Science and Health from a Feminist Perspective. A Practical Guide*.

Rothschild, Joan

1988 *Teaching Technology form a Feminist Perspective*.

Spector, Janet

1993 *What This Awl Means*. Minneapolis: MN: Minnesota Historical Society Press.

Spector, Janet D.

1991 What This Awl Means: Toward a Feminist Archaeology. In *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory*. J. M. Gero & M. W. Conkey, eds. pp. 388-407. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Spretnak, Charlene

1982 The Politics of Women's Spirituality. In *The Politics of Women's Spirituality*. C. Spretnak, ed.. pp. 393-398. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Stocking, George, (ed.)

1985 *Objects and Others: essays on museums and material culture*. Madison: WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Stone, Merlin

1976 *When God was a Woman*. New York: Dial Press.

Terrell, John

1990 Storytelling and Prehistory. *Archaeological Method and Theory* 2:1-29.

Thomas, Elizabeth Marshall
1987 *Reindeer Moon*.

Tompkins, Jane
1991 Teaching Like It Matters: a modest proposal for revolutionizing the classroom. *Lingua Franca* (August):24-27.

Tringham, Ruth
1991a Households with Faces: the challenge of gender in prehistoric architectural remains. In *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory*:. J. Gero and M. Conkey, ed.. pp. 93-131. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Tringham, Ruth
1991b Men and Women in Prehistoric Architecture. *Traditional Dwellings and Settlements Review* III(1):9-28.

Tringham, Ruth
1992 Visual Images of Archaeological architecture: gender in space. symposium "Envisioning the Past: Visual Forms and the Structuring of Interpretations" at the 91st Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association,. San Francisco, 2-6, December 1992:

Tringham, Ruth
1993 Review of M.Gimbutas "Civilization of the Goddess". *American Anthropologist* 95(1):196-197.

Wylie, Alison
1992 The Interplay of Evidential Constraints and Political Interests: Recent Archaeological Research on Gender. *American Antiquity* 57(1):15-35.

Fig. 1. Archaeology and the Goddess Panels

"Is the Goddess literature feminist?": The topic of the first panel actually turned out to be the most important one discussed. This panel worked because the panelists had had previous exposure to the feminist critique. All panelists pointed out in their own way that a consideration of women is not the same thing as feminism.

Does a discovery of the "origins" of the Goddess in deep prehistory give the movement a greater legitimacy? The "no" side of the debate team brought up the important point that in seeking for origins and roots and continuous evolution, the only legitimacy that the Goddess Movement gains is in the eyes of conventional presentism in the construction of "prehistory".

The place and role of speculation in archaeology. The panel came to the consensus that speculation is an essential part of the scientific enterprise. They also noted, however, that in the Goddess movement literature speculation often poses as an authoritative statement about "true facts". The panel raised a further problem that when speculation is presented in an authoritative statement, the ambiguity and possible multiple interpretations of the archaeological data are lost because the process by which the speculation was conceived has been mystified and is never stated.

Plausibility, Reality and Ambiguity in the Goddess literature. This panel focused explicitly on the writing of Marija Gimbutas and reconstructed how she would construct her arguments by assertion and make inferences from the archaeological data? The panel did not give Gimbutas much of a chance. Obviously, we were not impartial enough in our suggestions.

The Meaning and Treatment of Material Culture in Archaeology. The point here was to try to understand the theories of material culture used by archaeologists. The panel addressed a very core issue that there is variable perception and meaningfulness of symbols.

The megalithic "mystery"- does it have to be unraveled? This panel focused on the Megalithic monuments of prehistoric Western Europe and their incorporation into the Goddess Movement "repertoire". The panel put the presentation of "megaliths" as a mystery into the context of conventional science which demands closure and resolution, i.e., a single "truth".

Archaeologists' demise when dealing with things spiritual. This panel inquired into why archaeologists seem to have real difficulty in dealing with the symbolic or spiritual. It had the most vigorous debate over archaeological epistemology and "how we know what we know".

Archaeology and the history of religion. The idea here was to explore other ways in which archaeology has been used in the construction of belief systems and how the archaeologically-grounded Goddess accounts of religion in deep prehistory have been received and considered by scholars in religious history and religious studies.

Christa Wolf's Cassandra and the Creation and Power of Myths. The theme was to consider the creation and power of myths in human life and culture. Cassandra was presented as an example of this. We asked the panel to examine the idea that myths reside in our consciousness in many places, and they affect our everyday lives in ways that we are not aware of (including the academic construction of prehistory). We asked each panel member to tell the class how myth had affected their everyday life or is affecting it right now. The panel responded wonderfully to these suggestions and told parts of their own life-story as myth. One student related how she had been ordained as a witch. In many ways, this was the most stimulating panel, but it was obviously building on much of the coursework that had preceded it. The students in this panel were all, as it turned out, serious feminists, which helped. The only problem was that the telling of the myths took a very long time and left little time for participation from the rest of the class.

What is the point of a critique of the Goddess Movement's use of archaeological sources? Do archaeologists weaken the power of the Goddess Movement by their critique of its use of archaeological sources? Does archaeological data strengthen or legitimize the Goddess Movement? The panel came up with a wide range of reasons as to why we should engage in such critiques. We were, however, also pleased that somehow enough of a balance had been achieved so that the power of the critique did not seriously undermine the very enterprise of "doing archaeology", although, as we discuss below, this balance is always precarious.

Fig. 4. European Archaeology, Mediterranean Archaeology Panels: some detailed comments

Lepenski Vir, Yugoslavia, Mesolithic village. This was a good site to choose for such a panel discussion since many alternative interpretations have been published in English. This site came up as a topic in every course with panels, including Archaeology and the Goddess, so that panelists became experienced and their contributions were marked by a much more sophisticated attention as to how the inferences were made and to the multiple interpretations that have been made, as well as to the gender biases of the different archaeologists.

Oetzi the Iceman, Austria/Italy, frozen body dated to 3300 BC. This panel had an advantage in that much has been said and written about "the Iceman" in both the scientific and popular media, with many conflicting interpretations. In addition, it zeroed in on the smallest unit or scale of archaeological resolution: the individual person. Tringham considers this panel on the Iceman to have been the most successful panel taught, due in large part to the participants, who included the experienced Andre Tschan, a Swiss student and archaeology major, who had in a previous year organized the Egozwil (lake-dwelling) panel. Each panel member had a double presentation: the first as part of the story of the Iceman's personal demise, from his home to the point of his death on the mountain: tools, clothes, environment, mission, rituals, death and discovery; the second presentation of each covered the same themes from the point of view of the archaeologist and "objective" science. The contrasts were obvious and thrilling to everyone, especially given the multimedia nature of the presentation.

Maiden Castle, Eng;and. Iron Age hillfort, focus on massacre at the gate. This panel was personally familiar to several panel members and there was support literature in English. The panel re-enacted the 1930s camp of archaeologists excavating the fort, and presented their different interpretations that way, at the same time as introducing the archaeological data and the Roman historians' viewpoints.

Opovo, Yugoslavia, Eneolithic village with a well as the focus. This panel demonstrates that a focus on a specific set of archaeological data that was reported in English - in this case a well - was not always a successful topic for a panel. Opovo was excavated by Tringham, but none of the panelists had participated on the excavations. They had to rely on materials published only by Tringham's team and on the empirical evidence of plans, photographs, diaries etc. This meant discussing, even questioning, their instructor's ideas. We had overestimated the daring and confidence of the panelists. It was too much of a challenge for them.

Dereivka, a Kurgan settlement, Ukraine; Although there was support literature in English and the Kurgans are featured quite dramatically in all of the narratives of Indo-European origins in Europe and the end of the "Civilization of the Goddess", the panel was not able to "play" with this topic because the context (Ukrainian prehistory) was just too unfamiliar to them. Perhaps we should have coached them more intensively!

Varna, Bulgaria, Eneolithic cemetery. Graves without skeletons, assumed male. Successful panel. Interpretive support literature in English. Multimedia. What if you change the gender of the graves.

Maltese "temples" Stone-cut buildings dating 5000-2000 BC. This panel demonstrates that even though these monuments have been described and variously interpreted in English and are part of the important body of literature concerning Archaeology and the Goddess, this condition will not necessarily lead to a successful panel. Part of the problem was that this panel had a hard act to follow (Oetzi the Iceman). The panel members tried to outdo their Iceman predecessors. Rather than present the many different interpretations, they tried a strategy that was bound to happen sooner or later in this kind of teaching. They tried to examine all the empirical data through the eyes of their own alternative single unified model of the interpretation of the "temples", one that had not been suggested by any archaeologist, probably because it was fairly implausible. Their model proposed that the focus of the culture and its rituals was on beer-making and beer-drinking! Another problem was that the focus of the panel - all the monumental architecture of prehistoric Malta - was just too diffuse.

Fig. 2. European Archaeology, Mediterranean Archaeology Panels

Egolzwil, Swiss lake-dwelling .

Lepenski Vir, Yugoslavia Mesolithic village.

Oetzi the Iceman, Austria/Italy; frozen body dated to 3300 BC.

New Grange, Ireland. Neolithic megalithic tomb

Maiden Castle, England. Iron Age hillfort

Terra Amata, France Lower Paleolithic "hut" ;

La Solutré, France Upper Paleolithic "kill site"

Mas d'Azil, France Epipalaeolithic site with painted pebbles as the focus;

Opovo, Yugoslavia, Eneolithic village with a well as the focus.

The Cursus, Dorset, England. Neolithic earthen monument

Dereivka, Ukraine; a Kurgan (Neolithic) settlement

Stonehenge and Silbury Hill, England, Early Bronze Age monumental architecture

Vix, France, Iron Age Princess' Grave.

The "end" of Paleolithic art

Varna, Bulgaria, Eneolithic cemetery.

The Natufian culture, Levant.

Maltese "temples" Stone-cut buildings dating 5000-2000 BC.

The Nuraghi, Sardinia; Stone towers, dating ca. 2000-1000 BC.

Carthage, Tunisia. Phoenician colonial - Roman city

**Fig. 5. European Archaeology, Mediterranean Archaeology Term:
Some examples**

In writing a prehistory of Ain Malaha in Jordan from 10,000 to the present, **Brent** chose to speak through 8 differently gendered and aged voices ending with a UN woman peace-keeper ca. 1978 AD.

Limor wrote about Jericho as the story of a woman 11,993 years old - the oldest woman on earth.

May tells the story of Knossos as the song of a magic harper in Minoan times who can see into and sing about the future.

Jenna wrote about the dreams that five women, including the archaeologist Dorothy Garrod had in a cave in the Mt. Carmel mountains of modern Israel. It was the explicit discussion of dreams, remembering and prehistory as a real issue rather than a trick to cover the assignment that was gripping in this paper.

Dora told the story of Tunisia through the "eyes" of the west winds of winter with the idea being that winds are a constant throughout prehistory, and yet are responsible for the changes that we call prehistory.

Cheryl used an almost feasible format of tablets that had been discovered in Cyprus and gave insight into the original inhabitants' views of their times.

In a divergence from the strict requirements of the assignment, **Michael** presented the prehistory of Akrotiri from 1628 BC to the present in the form of a screenplay for a video using computer generated imagery. In this he integrated the archaeologists' observations with dramatized prehistoric actions. A preview of media methods to come?

Claire used a format that was not taken up as frequently as expected - the alien view. This can be a very tedious format, but Claire's use of the prehistory and history of Bologna from 1 million years ago to 10,000 AD as a field assignment for two cadets in an outer space Anthropology Program was delightful.

Cameron tells the story of Avebury through the voices of 10 participants in prehistory, instilling emotion and a real "feel" for prehistoric social action. He ends the voices with his own as he visits Avebury himself - a wonderful blend of interpretive microscale archaeology based on empirical archaeological evidence.

In Cassandra's Story, **Dejah** reveals the prehistory and early archaeology of the Basel area in Switzerland through the diary of her (?fictional) great grandmother Cassandra who had been a vocational archaeologist in the 19th century. The paper shows an inspired mix of personal experience, history and archaeology, and reconstruction of what it was like to be a 19th century archaeologist.

Figure 6. Prehistoric Art Panels

1: Gender Issues (Gendered Makers, Gendered Images). This panel considered the issue of gender in image making. The participants used two case studies in the course reader as a starting point - Ann Solomon's challenge to Lewis-Williams' idea (see below) by emphasizing the importance of gender ideology in image-making, and the varied interpretations of the Paleolithic so-called "Venus" statuettes. They focused their presentations on questions such as what can we say about images of males or females from past cultural contexts? how do we avoid "reading" our own gender notions into these images? what do we know about how images might be part of defining gender ideologies or of "negotiating" gender relations? are there differences and variations in who makes "art" in different cultures and why?

2: Shamanism Debate (Two "teams" of four). This panel debated the idea that shamanism is the primary source for image-making in not only the rock art of southern Africa but in other rock art traditions elsewhere, which is a view that has become increasingly popular in recent years, especially under the influence of the research and writings of David Lewis-Williams. In the debate one side argued that it is possible to identify so-called "entoptic" designs even archaeologically based on cross-cultural similarities due to human neuropsychology. They thus argued for the power and widespread applicability of the "grand" view of the shamanism hypothesis. The other side arguing against this position.

3: The Science of Art This panel was for those who are more empirically-minded. They presented all the fascinating things that the science of image-making can contribute: including the explosion of recent literature on the microscopic study of pigment composition, at fracturing patterns and breakage of objects, the ways in which underlying technical processes (such as the steps of making bronze ear spools or ceramic pots) can be used to infer mental or ideological notions about cosmology, etc.

4: Another Debate: The Making of Images vs. the Circumstances of Images: The topic for this panel was inspired by an interview with a Cal professor in the History of Art, Svetlana Alpers, who notes that there is often the tendency to differentiate between the "making of pictures" (and thus concentrate on the objects or images themselves) and the "circumstances of pictures". Traditionally, this difference has lined up as the difference between art history (object-centered) and anthropology (context-centered), though recent developments in both fields have blurred this distinction. In this debate one "side" was to argue for the study of imagery in terms of the culture around them and the other "side" was to argue against this position and for the study of the "making of pictures". In fact, (as discussed in the text) they tried to find a way NOT to make it an either/or issue.

5: The Art of Aboriginal Australians. This panel focused on artistic traditions and practices that may date back to >20,000 years ago and that are still being carried out under very different cultural, political and social circumstances. What, in this case, do we mean by "prehistoric" art? What is a "living tradition"? What are the dilemmas raised by the practice of contemporary aboriginals who want to and are over-painting ancient rock paintings? What do we mean by "conservation" anyhow?

6: California Basketry. Even if we weren't in California and did not have available the Hearst Museum collection of California basketry, everyone would have to agree that this basketry is among the finest and most sophisticated in the world. There is a rich repertoire of images and designs, there are specific techniques among some groups for baskets that have different social and symbolic "uses", and there came to be some basket-making specialists - mostly women - who created, defined and re-defined the styles and the forms. This panel presented information about California basketry traditions that was a prelude to the Exhibition that they put together in the Hearst Museum Teaching Exhibition area. The panel also considered the whole topic of "exhibitions" and "collections", as political and ethical issues as well as a cultural and anthropological activities. This panel is described in more detail in the main text of the paper.

7: Course Summary Group This panel presented their views on what this course was all about. We describe in the main body of the paper what they did.