magnetic susceptibility) is established. By translating these values into grey-scale images, for example, the land is rendered into a delimited and preselected structure of information, a representation that depicts a particular landscape configuration derived from the land surveyed.

Like the satellite, the phenomenological archaeologist, because he or she is physically embodied, also engages in causal transactions with the land. This sensual experience means that there is organizing work being done upon the archaeologist. Unfortunately for the phenomenologist the organizing work afforded by the landscape cannot be harnessed to produce useful representations for archaeological purposes. The failure of representation with phenomenology stems from the fact that its phenomena are always already lost in plenum – the hopelessly circumstantial overwhelming details of everyday activities, which, not being representations, are in all detail identical with themselves (cf. Garfinkel 1996). Faced with the overwhelming details of life the temptation is to retreat into abstractions.

Archaeologists should at the very least give *From Space to Place* a browse because it displays the impressive variety of remote sensing and allied research going on around the globe. But in the context of remote sensing, landscapes as objects of archaeological cognition emerge only from within the creation of representations by remote sensing technologies. Remember, it was artists who gave us the concept of landscape, and representation – as a structure of information – has remained its *sine qua non*.

REFERENCES

BENDER, B., 2002. Time and landscape. *Current Anthropology* 43(S4):S103–112.

GARFINKEL, H., 1996. Ethnomethodology's program. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 59(1):5–21.

MACKAY, D.M., 1961. Informational analysis of questions and commands. In C. Cherry (ed.), *Information Theory. Symposium held at the Royal Institution, London, August 29th to September 2nd 1960*: 469–476. London: Butterworth.

WILDEN, A., 1972. *System and Structure: Essays in Communication and Exchange*. London: Tavistock.

David S. Webster
Archaeological Services, Durham University, UK

Philip Duke, *The Tourists Gaze, the Cretans Glance: Archaeology and Tourism on a Greek Island*. (Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 2008, 154 pp., pbk, ISBN 978 1 59874 143 8)

This is the first volume in the *Heritage, Tourism and Community* series of Left Coast Press. Following the line of works in archaeology that seek to understand constructions of the archaeological past in the present, the book studies how the Minoan Bronze Age on the island of Crete is presented to tourists. Duke argues that public archaeology on Crete (i.e. sites, museums, and various tourist information media) produces mainly one message about the Minoan past, which is a projection of the present; the social inequality of socioeconomic class in the past is a legitimization and naturalization of contemporary social inequality. This emphasis on socioeconomic class he deems important, because 'class' voices have been overlooked in contemporary archaeological discourse.

Duke's argument is the following: since particular countries market themselves through tourism as a destination for western tourists and tourism participates in the management of the past, its study reveals not the reconstruction of the past in the present, but the reconstitution of the present in the past. Third world countries, seeking the economic benefits of tourism, set up staged performances, where the host culture balances between the exotic and the familiar. Archaeological museums are such staged tourist performances that combine myth with science.

Duke describes the research he conducted in spring 2002, and in visits during the following years, as part archaeological and part ethnographic. For archaeological matters, he used published sources, and professional and personal observations; for ethnographic matters, he accessed informal insights, but he principally did self-ethnography.

In the first chapter Duke presents his argument in detail. Concerning the question what information about the past is on offer to the tourist and why, Duke focuses on the filters of archaeological information on sites, arguing that the public is presented with one version of the past as the only reality, without any opportunity for dialogue or questioning.

In the second chapter he presents the history, the debates, and the present state of

Bronze Age archaeology on Crete. He provides the relevant information that shows the indeterminacy, conjecturality and historicity of the archaeological knowledge, and notes that, even so, the public engaging with Minoan Crete is presented with a rather coherent narrative.

Chapter 3 gives a brief overview of the history of tourism and of sociological and anthropological approaches to tourism, in order to inform the discussion on tourists' visits to museums and archaeological sites. Duke argues that tourists do not consider the possibility of the staged presentation of the past – of 'inauthenticity' – in museums and sites, because the idea of scientific authority prevails. Sites and museums, however, as enterprises and means for economic development, present a past comfortable to the visitor, practically reflecting 'our present' (p.63).

In Chapter 4 Duke discusses the visual and verbal information on the Bronze Age on Crete, presented in sites, museums, web pages, guidebooks, brochures, pamphlets and so on. These performances of the past do not raise questions of authenticity and inauthenticity, or incorporate controversies. They present a romanticized and out-of-date narrative, balancing between science and myth. The analysis of sites, of museum exhibits, and of information to the public leads to the conclusion that non-élite everyday Minoan life is downgraded and all Minoan life is presented as paradisial.

Chapter 5 discusses the hegemonies within which the particular past was created. Minoan archaeology came into being in the context of the military and archaeological colonization of Crete. Modernity and the nation-state established a belief in progress and a national identity. The middle- or upper-middle class status of practitioners of archaeology has influenced Minoan studies. The archaeological paradigms in Minoan archaeology supported greater social complexity. The Greek state established control over archaeology and information about the past. The middle-class status of visitors influences the presentation of the past, because archaeological tourism is national revenue. Cretans are excluded from the creation of the Minoan past, despite it being national heritage.

In Chapter 6 Duke concludes with his disciplinary contribution – presenting tourists with more than just the 'pretty' objects and promoting sites different from Knossos, provides different metaphors and, therefore, different pasts.

As an anthropologist, I found the book informative and thought-provoking. To analyse archaeological performances beyond conventional boundaries, as both a disciplinary insider and outsider, is a complex task. The perils are obvious. The book is a disciplinary hybrid and many would argue against such hybrids, because they seem to carry more limitations than advantages. I too will focus on limitations, hoping to enrich rather than discourage endeavours like this.

To start with, Duke's main title is misleading, perhaps so only to an anthropologist. The allusions to Urry's analysis and to Kazantzakis's book fail, because readers see neither tourists gaze nor Cretans glance. Is it museum managers and archaeologists who count as Cretans and their assumed perspective for how Cretans (or even Greeks) glance? Even so, glances are not reducible to staged performances. Similarly, we do not get to see the tourists. Duke may claim to 'focus on their experiences when tourists engage with the Minoan past' (p.72), but it is not really their experiences that he focuses on; at least not in an anthropological sense. Duke may also be right in that most tourists on Crete are 'westerners', do constitute the majority of visitors in sites and museums, and may also form the target group. Not all visitors, however, just like the assumed readers of this book as well, are necessarily 'we in the West'. But even so, to support the homogeneity of the visitors and the significance that their different social identities might or might not have, necessitates bringing their voices and views to the forefront. Thus the question of the accuracy of certain of Duke's assumptions – 'I would suspect that most of the visitors to Knossos fit this tourist profile' (p.58) – even if they are correct, remains. 'Visitors' (local and national visitors, as well) should not be taken for granted, but instead researched both as an intended public and as an actuality in terms of what they think. The same, of course, applies to site and museum decision makers.

Duke's exploration of the question of authenticity is problematic. Despite lengthy discussion and his final analysis of it as a red herring not worth attempting to grasp, Duke eventually argues against 'dissolv[ing] entirely

the boundary between the authentic and the inauthentic with a living culture ...' (p.61). Of course, tourists' perceptions of authenticity depend on a number of things beyond the staged performance itself, for example the relationship they have to their own national past and its representations. Such realizations have drawn attention to what happens in the name of authenticity. Duke's conformity to the distinction between authenticity and inauthenticity with regard to sites (p.72) begs his definition of authenticity. What would make a site authentic and not a construction? The myth of scientific fact, he argues, dissolves for visitors the distinction between the authentic and the inauthentic (p.76). Should we assume then that making people aware of a site's constructedness would make it authentic? Or that the incorporation of 'authentic scientific arguments' in public archaeology would make sites and museums authentic? The question of the definition of authenticity is a problematic quest, as analyses have shown it to be a powerful, hegemonic concept.

In the various performances that Duke analyses, he definitely wishes he also knew how the message is perceived; but he only knows and talks about the message that is sent. He also acknowledges that 'only an extended ethnographic study would capture all the nuances' and that what he collected by overhearing and observing are 'impressionistic vignettes' (p.114). Not claiming, however, to have done anthropological work, he neglects to mention anywhere in the book or in the index the discipline that he implies, anthropology. On the other hand, by incorporating fieldnotes into the text – a common ethnographic convention – Duke undoubtedly flirts with ethnography as a 'genre'. But then again, the kind of research he admits to have done is 'self-ethnography', he being his own informant.

The foregoing observation about anthropology concerns the fact that Duke's argument is very convincing when he focuses on archaeology, but less so when he moves into another field. Despite any disagreements one might have over the explanations for the particular views about the Minoan past, Duke's analysis of the archaeological discourses is thorough and particularly comprehensible for non-archaeologists. His analysis, however, of the touristic context is far less convincing. Particularly in one direction he himself might wish to criticize; he relies heavily on the dichotomy between the West and the Rest, thus essentializing the West and reproducing to a certain degree that very same hegemony he wishes to disclose. That is probably one of the side-effects of moving between disciplines. My feeling is that such cross-disciplinary endeavours will be all the more successful, if and when they manage to balance perspectives with data and methodologies.

Eleftheria Deltsou
Department of History, Archaeology and Social Anthropology
University of Thessaly, Volos, Greece

Sabine Rieckhoff and Ulrike Sommer (eds), *Auf der Suche nach Identitäten: Volk – Stamm – Kultur – Ethnos. Internationale Tagung der Universität Leipzig vom 8.–9. Dezember 2000.* (Oxford: Archaeopress [British Archaeological Reports, International Series S1705], 2007, 255 pp., many illustrations, pbk, ISBN: 978 1 4073 0149 5)

Under the suggestive title 'Looking for identities', this highly interesting book constitutes one of the most recent examples of the running debate on ethnic identity in archaeology. Originating in a congress held in Leipzig in December 2000, this collection of articles includes contributions from Germany (the majority), UK, France, The Netherlands, Poland, Czech Republic, Romania, Serbia, and Slovenia. Published mostly in German (15 to 6 in English), these articles cover a wide thematic, chronological and geographical spectrum of themes, a clear reflection of many of the hot topics regarding the controversial ethnic-interpretation approach.

For more than two decades now, archaeologists have begun to reassess the relationship between ethnicity and material culture, a theme that originally was mainstream but, after the Nazi experience, became widely discredited. British and American schools have been fundamental in this reconsideration of ethnicity (e.g. Jones 1997). German Archaeology, on the other hand – as a consequence of the so-called 'Kossinna syndrome' – has consciously excluded this theme from archaeological agendas, at least in its most explicit form. But things are beginning to