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ABSTRACT

Although rarely addressed in modern scholarship, over the last several decades, design implemented at archaeological and historic sites has become the organizing agent to present ancient cultures to the international public. Using topologies such as site museums, reconstructions, interpretive installation art, and comprehensive site planning, physical construction is now used to metaphorically guide visitors through the chronology and visual culture of a specific place while physically guiding them through the material remains. This dissertation examines the concepts of space, culture, and design and their junction as part of the overarching concept of “heritage interpretation.” Through a series of individual site studies, this document discusses how different types of intervention can affect visitor understanding, experience, and the interpretation of history and ancient cultures by the greater public. As a comprehensive study, the research examines what methods have been used and are currently being used to facilitate public engagement with ancient remains through design, specifically placing physical interpretations within an immersive theoretical and historical context. By utilizing a multidisciplinary approach, the dissertation examines how the concepts of ancient art, cultural heritage, and modern construction interact at some of the most famous world historical sites, and how archaeological interpretation can affect a broader understanding of time, place, and culture.
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CHAPTER 1
Framing the Ancients: Studies in Site Interpretation and Intervention

1.1 Introduction

The built environment has been used traditionally to embody historical ideas or act symbolically as a piece of history itself, effectively becoming a tool in the presentation of cultural traditions through a continuous design narrative. Recently, this narrative has evolved to include the use of design or purposeful construction in the interpretation and communication of history and culture at ancient and historic sites, creating a new design typology specifically aimed at presenting ancient cultures to the public in a way that encourages them to engage with history. Building on the previously established architectural typology of the art or cultural museum, this new trend seeks to present material culture to the international traveling public through the integrated design of exterior space, using preservation strategies such as adaptive reuse, reconstruction, and restoration, together with new installation art, comprehensive site planning, and circulation to create an interpreted historic space. These “interventions,”¹ physically and metaphorically guide visitors through the cultural chronology of a specific place and help to provide visual illustration for historic themes or concepts that may be difficult for visitors to experience without this additional design.

The use of architectural or artistic strategies to help interpret the past is based in the idea that cultural and/or archaeological remains should be presented to the public in an understandable context,² so

---

¹ I am using the term “interventions” to refer to strategies implemented as part of the designed or created environment at historic sites, specifically to provide needed interpretation of existing remains and facilitate tourism. These interventions specifically provide needed interpretation of existing remains and facilitate tourism by providing needed infrastructure or visualization of ancient cultures where previously lacking.

² With regard to any type of museum or archaeological park, context can refer to two different ideas: (1) the physical material surrounding a particular artifact when it is found, and (2) the theoretical cultural history or chronology of an object or particular place. In a joint publication of Management Guidelines for World Cultural Heritage Sites, UNESCO, ICOMOS, and ICCROM together address theoretical context from the perspective of authenticity, suggesting that “allow[ing] the maximum amount of existing historical material” (physical context) creates
that a modern audience will be able to discern the reason and method for their initial creation. This study therefore, is designed to examine instances where design, interpretation, and culture interrelate as part of the overarching theme of “heritage;” specifically how the public is able to interact with important ancient material through additional design strategies.

With development at historical and archaeological sites increasing exponentially alongside cultural heritage tourism in the last thirty years, this study provides a timely analysis of the integral role of design in the public understanding of history, emphasizing methods of and reasons for interpretation and the subsequent perception of images and architectural environments by the public.

1.2 Focus of the Research and Significance of the Project

The basis of this study will be an international group of archaeological sites, each utilizing recent design strategies to present ancient remains to the public: Lascaux Caves, France; Ancient Troy, Turkey; Chichén Itzá, Mexico; and Ancient Thebes/Modern Luxor, Egypt. Each was chosen because of established international tourism with annual attendance of several hundred thousand or over one million people, indicating the popularity of the site as well as a substantial audience for understanding the material. Each site also has demonstrated importance within the local and authenticity (theoretical context), an idea that most modern interpretations utilize (Feilden & Jokilehto 1998). For the purpose of this study, I will be building on this concept to refer to the context that is often reconstructed through interpretive means.

3 Pioneers in contextual education at the archaeological sites include Ian Hodder (Reading the Past: Current Approaches to Interpretation in Archaeology, 1986; The Archaeological Process: An Introduction, 1999; Interpretive Archaeology and its Role, 1991; Theory and Practice in Archaeology, 1992) and Henry F. Cleere (Archaeological Heritage Management in the Modern World, 1989; Approaches to Archaeological Heritage: New Directions in Archaeology, 2009; Public Archaeology and Cultural Resource Management, 1986) who both helped to define the role of context in interpretation as well as methods for presenting ancient remains in context. Although Hodder has focused on contextual interpretation through critical understanding of history, often discussing hermeneutics (the traditional interpretation of ancient text), his theory that any type of interpretation has to be understood as overwhelmingly subjective can apply to physical interventions as well. Cleere approaches the topic from the perspective of managing cultural heritage, therefore introducing contextual interpretation with regard to preservation and tourism, which focuses more on physical methods of placing artifacts in context, particularly with open-air archaeological parks.
international architectural, archaeological, and cultural heritage communities as referenced in research and publication, suggesting that each site is visited by both widespread and scholarly audiences. At each site the manipulation of the surrounding environment is used specifically as an active interpretive element, informing visitors of the cultural, historical, and artistic history of the associated archaeological site, and increasing the general infrastructure and accessibility of the site through design.

Each chapter is an individual analysis that builds on the previous chapters, examining each site and intervention from a multi-disciplinary perspective. This includes a discussion of the scholarly theory and history surrounding the particular architectural design strategy (reconstruction, installation sculpture, adaptive reuse, site/circulation planning), as well as important discourse regarding the chronology and the cultural remains of the site, as these are the basis for the interpretation. Each site analysis includes comparative historic sites where similar strategies have been used with varying results intended to provide a background of development and a context of how the site is incorporated into general cultural heritage practice. In most current literature, individual places are considered microcosms of development, focusing on the individual interpretation, occasionally as part of a national or regional trend. This study specifically uses sites from around the world to begin to establish an international narrative in interpretation. Strategies, therefore, can be compared between sites with similar media on different continents, helping to build the discourse on

---

4 As part of the scholarly community, each site is included on the United National Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization World Heritage List, which identifies sites or places that are important to world history or culture. To be included on UNESCO’s list a site must: “represent a masterpiece of human creative genius; to exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design; to bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared; to be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history” (UNESCO 2013).
interpretation, while providing apt comparisons between places not previously compared. As the general public has been traveling more broadly in recent years, the idea of learning from different types of interventions is much more relevant than previously. The analyses will provide a precedent for carrying out future studies in how the general public perceives presented history, and how these types of studies can create a greater understanding of archaeological and historical tourism.

The project is inherently interdisciplinary in approach; each study is intended to provide integral on-site analysis and promote a cross-discipline and cross-cultural understanding of the design and politics of cultural heritage or historic sites. Each study addresses scholarship from the perspectives of art history, archaeology, architecture, and heritage management, to show how varying themes interrelate when designing cultural heritage sites for the public. The dissertation will also be revolutionary in its cross-regional analysis of how world archaeological sites are interconnected through design, a concept that is rarely seen in cultural heritage discussion. Instead of interpreting the archaeological sites as insular objects, this analysis will present the idea of cultural heritage practice as a world concept, which is more closely related to recent literature on sustaining and promoting the historic past. As a comprehensive document, this study examines how design organizes, narrates, and presents world history, facilitating understanding for a modern tourism audience. Culture is integral to understanding the human past, and its practical relationship to art and

---

5 For example, when looking at Lascaux II, a total reconstruction of a rock art environment, it is also important to examine the greater context of rock art interpretation, which includes other European and regional examples such as the Museo de Altamira in Spain, as well as rock art interpretation as part of a national park, such is the case with the American Southwest and in Africa.

6 Much recent scholarship now addresses the practice of cultural heritage as a world concern, with certain characteristics shared between countries thousands of miles away. Instead of focusing on the specific values of individual countries or populations, many resources now address overarching themes relevant to all world sites, such as: how to mediate group or social identity; visitor perception; preservation; new technologies; and tourism strategies (Smith et al. 2010: 44-73). For additional resources, also see: M. Blockley & A. Hems (Eds.), Heritage Interpretation (2006), and R. Skeates, Debating the Archaeological Heritage (2000), both of which address archaeological heritage and its interpretation from a world perspective.
architectural history is part of an emerging scholarly discourse intended to change the way our society understands, protects, and appreciates heritage. While a discussion of design interventions is the primary focus, the study also demonstrates how the concepts of ancient culture, tourism, and modern planning purposefully collide at some of the most famous world historical sites, and how the architectural intervention can affect a visitor’s understanding of time and place.

This research is intended to be useful in the future development of historic sites by examining the impact of interventions on visitors, to determine if and how the design affects experience and understanding. Although there are a number of internationally recognized museum projects that use architecture or museums as a method of interpretation, the focus of these studies is on other types of design that can be used to interpret as part of an outdoor experience. Open-air projects are perhaps more widespread than traditional museums, and can include anything from adding informational signage to a complete overhaul of the site through reconstruction and circulation design. These analyses will examine this type of design through reconstruction, site planning, restoration, installation sculpture, and any other manipulation of the built environment intended to enhance the understanding or protection of ancient remains. Each is a vehicle through which the site is experienced by a wide audience.

1.3 Methodology

This research examines sites from the often-conflicting views of archaeologists, historians, architects, and visitors. There are few examples of professionals trained in both aspects of artistic/architectural design and historical site interpretation, meaning that there is often a conflict between the archaeological point of view and the design point of view. Most important to each
study is the critical analysis of the historical past of the area, with an examination of the current interpretive feature used, and an investigation of how the public physically engages with and thoughtfully experiences the intervention.

As a comprehensive document, this study can be purposefully considered both limited and broad at the same time. Because of the intentional interdisciplinary nature of the project, and with the objective of bringing several knowledge bases together for the benefit of all fields, it is imperative that the analyses work individually and together in order to address several issues of historical interpretation. The analyses outlined in this dissertation are intended to be addressed at archaeological sites as a visual and researched bibliography of interpretive interventions with visitor reactions, introducing a post-construction type of research study in the practice of design. The case study method also allows for the research to be continued indefinitely as more sites are reviewed, allowing for revisions to improve the current discourse in designing for archaeological tourism.

Important to note is that the choice of examples for study was limited by a number of factors including expense, time frame, and inaccessibility for number of reasons including unstable and unsafe environments for foreign travel, or international or local war status. Because design and archaeology are three-dimensional and site-specific, the study as a whole included only those sites which could be visited in person, in order to gain an understanding of the visual and experiential impact of the intervention for the general visitor. Although many sites around the world may fit the methodology and context of the study, the sites reviewed were chosen based on broad accessibility for world visitors and other previously listed considerations.
As a series of analyses, this dissertation will follow the format of many recent publications in cultural heritage and tourism as associated with architecture, planning, or design. Medina Lasansky and Brian McLaren’s *Architecture and Tourism: Perception, Performance, and Place* (2004), as well as *The Media and the Tourist Imagination* (2005, D. Crouch, R. Jackson, and F. Thompson Eds.) and *International Tourism: Identity and Change* (1995, M-F Lanfant, J. B. Allcock, and E. M. Bruner Eds.) provide ideal precedents for this type of collection, as each includes a series of site studies under an overarching theme, making broad connections between interpretations and expanding the discourse of the chosen theme to include an international collection of sources. Similarly, this study will bring together these different discourses, drawing from each in the broader analysis, but allowing for an acute individual focus for each site study.

1.4 Definition of New Terminology

There are a number of terms repeatedly used in the studies that warrant further definition within the context of the document as a whole. Most importantly is the previously defined “intervention,” which constitutes the entire design of a particular environment for the purpose of interpretation.

Also important to address is the term “interpretation” itself, when viewed within the context of this discussion, as it has multiple meanings as part of different dialogues. Many definitions of interpretation address the understanding of an object as it relates to an opinion of the viewer or creator. Therefore to interpret something in this way is to place it within an understandable context, or to view it in a way that allows for broader understanding. For the purpose of this document, “interpretation” will follow a slightly different definition, more related to the act of
presenting material to an audience by an imposing authority rather than a visitor “interpreting” material individually. The noun, “interpretation,” will refer to the actual physical design presentation, and the verb, “interpreting,” will refer to a governing body dictating that presentation by synthesizing the history and context for a wide audience. This is commonly accepted terminology in heritage practice, and has been the subject of extensive study by professions in the area with regard to the creation of context as part of the interpretation.

According to Graeme Aplin:

[Heritage] Interpretation is taken here to include any form of presentation of factual material and interpreted meaning about a site or other heritage item, whether on site or off site…It should be noted that even in the presentation of a small number of ‘facts’, in whatever form, interpretation is involved, as these ‘facts’ have been selected by someone, and presented in a chosen form using particular words and graphics.

(2002: 30)

A heritage interpretation, therefore, is the finished product of the act of someone interpreting cultural or heritage material. The interpretation involves the physical implementation of individual or group ideas that are based in value systems and knowledge, but in affect it is highly subjective even though it is more often than not based on factual information. Tim Copeland also writes:

Effective constructivist interpretation mediates the present experience for visitors with a new and complex historic environment. Interpretation is at the interface of the individual and the evidence and provides the scaffolding to enable the visitors to make their own constructions.

(2006: 90)

---

7 Several organizations give guidelines for interpretation, most notably those associated with UNESCO. In their publication for ICCROM, Feilden and Jokilehto use the term “treatment” to address physical interpretations and suggest that these treatments particularly should be reversible, authentic, and in context. With regard to design intervention or architecture specifically, they address the understanding that first and foremost the built environment should be functional and used for conservation, but when being used in a museum setting for interpretation, takes on a new role as part of presentation, and should be carefully used as such (1998: 59-65). Therefore, the interpretation and use are left up to individuals, who must determine, within a set of guidelines, how to present the material. Although UNESCO and other organizations suggest that any historic material be presented in as authentic a way as possible, the idea of what is authentic is typically left to the interpreters.
Essentially Copeland is presenting two opposing viewpoints of interpretation. The first suggests that physical interpretations essentially modify the historic fabric of a particular place to present the material in a contextual way, but in doing so, dictate public understanding in a very particular way; the second suggests that these interpretations merely provide some information and expect the visitor to make his or her own connections between the intervention and the material. In line with recent theory, the process of interpretation is based on personal and/or cultural experience; therefore, any physical presentation that is produced will betray some of the value systems associated with those who did physical interpretation, as well as the experiences of the visitor personally interpreting the material presented. As Michael Shanks and Christopher Tilley suggest, “Interpretation is not an optional choice…interpretation resides in our Being or existence in the world. There is no way in which we can escape interpretation” (1987: 105). According to other researchers, this introduced bias has negatively affected the way that we as a world cultural understand the past through interpretation, effectively eliminating much-needed authenticity. Along these lines, Nick Merriman writes “…it can be seen that the overarching effect of archaeological interpretive traditions has been the production of historical myths that have served the needs of different interest groups to construct identities for themselves…” (2000: 300). Merriman, however, refers to presentations specifically as part of museums—which is addressed more in-depth in the following chapter—but while open-air archaeological parks are a subset of the larger museum-oriented discourse, interpretation is similarly present in design. Therefore, as part of defining interpretation, it is important to note that these design interventions are based on an individual or group’s cultural experience, and each will be addressed as such in the individual studies. Any entity controlling a physical interpretation is going to proceed with at least some bias, making each interpretation unique.
1.5 Conclusions

The studies represent a variety of archaeological situations with site design as a common characteristic, as well as the need for critical review of how they each accomplish and facilitate understanding. As cultural heritage and historic site tourism continue to expand and more sites are opened and renovated, these types of studies will be imperative to understanding how the public interacts and engages with world heritage through design, and how aesthetic space can narrate and interpret history. With this document as the catalyst, I hope to introduce world architectural interventions as an area for further study in the practices of architecture, art history, and archaeology, as each act upon and contribute to the purposeful aesthetic design of historical space.
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CHAPTER 2
Heritage, Tourism, and the Built Environment

2.1 Introduction

To establish the theoretical context for individual studies, it is important to examine the historical role of design in the interpretation of cultural heritage for tourism. The significance of cultural heritage is largely expressed around the world through the protection of monuments deemed to be of universal value by a wider governing body (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization; International Council on Monuments and Sites; International Committee on Archaeological Heritage Management, etc.). With the developing trend toward using such monuments to educate the public, design becomes integral to mediate mass archaeological tourism. Henry Cleere introduces the need for understanding cultural heritage practice in his early book, *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Modern World* (1989), as a developing trend in the management of archaeological sites for tourism. Although in 1989 heritage management as a world practice was a fairly new concept, he still identifies the importance of understanding how the public will view an interpretation and therefore the history of a particular place. He writes:

> At a less-elevated level but of rapidly growing importance is the role of monuments in tourism. Mass tourism is a feature of modern economic life, both nationally and internationally…historical and archaeological monuments and sites form an important element in much tourism…there is an intangible benefit in that many of them will be almost subconsciously influenced by a feeling of respect for the past and for the human achievement that such monuments presents…(9).

Cleere’s analysis of the trend at the time relies mainly on the growing awareness of mass tourism in developed countries, but since then, there has been an increasing consciousness of interpretation in developing countries, specifically the purposeful exploitation of these monuments for the purpose of revenue. The role of monuments in the greater political economy will sometimes ensure their protection based on the expected revenue, but sometimes not,
especially where conserving a monument may be more expensive than using the land for more modern development. ⁸

Tourism, politics, and context are just some of the factors that integrate the built environment and interpretation. These factors continue to influence the way that design and culture interrelate, as each is a reason for increased development at heritage sites. Despite recent traditions involving the use of monuments as part of politic discourse and in mass tourism, however, there has been little discussion about how a designed exterior environment interacts with in-situ heritage, which is where the discussion of site-specific intervention really begins. As these types of open-air facilities are rooted in the typology of museums as the first way of providing physical context, it is first important to establish trends leading up to modern cultural heritage intervention, since these are the aesthetic and theoretical precedent for the integration of the new built environment.

2.2 Museums as the Original Form of Interpretation

The interpretation of history and historical artifacts begins largely with the history of museums, as these are some of the earliest examples of design being used to place ancient material into a modern and understandable context. The typology of the museum begins with the practice of collecting and safely storing, followed by the need for exhibiting collections for a variety of purposes. The ancient Greeks, who used temples or sanctuaries to house votive offerings and spoils of war for the gods, could be thought of as some of these early collectors. Objects were put on display for visitors to see, giving honor to the gods and at the same time representing the far

⁸ Many financially struggling countries have seen the economic benefits of cultural tourism and now rely on tourism as part of a wider national income. This will be further discussed in Chapters 5 and 6 as related to Egypt and Mexico.
reaches of an empire, or the wealth of personal patrons. Many authors suggest that this early tradition continued in Egypt with the “museum” at Alexandria,\(^9\) which was founded by Ptolemy Soter (sometimes translated as “Preserver”) and not only housed information, but artifacts of cultural interest – statues and other art, objects of natural history, and important historical documents (see Genoways & Andrei 2008: 13; Erksine 1995). Ancient leaders such as Alexander the Great, Aristotle, and Emperor Augustus were also thought to have private collections that would have housed spoils of conquest and objects of curiosity (Hagen 2008: 40). Essentially, these early museums were collections of general interest and knowledge, where artifacts were protected and displayed for the enjoyment of selected public.

After antiquity, displayed collections became much more individualized with the rise of the common personal collector and the subsequent development of national collections. In the Middle Ages, wealthy individuals such as Jean de France, duc de Berry, sought to collect items of personal significance, which included books or manuscripts, jewels and art, as well as items of natural history, or other “curiosities” (Alexander 1996: 19). Churches or abbeys were known to collect relics associated with religious individuals, but also objects of natural science.\(^{10}\) In these early assemblages, there was little differentiation between the types of objects being collected; most were just considered interesting or relevant to the purpose of the individual or organization housing the collection.\(^{11}\)

---

\(^9\) The museum function was thought to have been attached to the library as a separate area for housing artifacts.\(^{10}\) Hagen specifically cites “medicinal plants, fossils, minerals, and shells,” (2008: 41) which would have either held meaning as associated with the church or patron saint, or be kept for medicinal knowledge.\(^{11}\) It is most likely the Medieval perception of collections that first closely relates to the purpose of the modern museum—a place that houses objects of interest and displays them for the public. Edward P. and Mary Alexander delve into the Greek and Latin etymologies of the words “museum” (Latin) and “museion” (Greek), which each refer to a place for the muses (2008: 11). Although the role of the actual building would have been different in ancient society, a comparison can be made in the purpose of a modern museum as a place to appreciate objects of beauty and art, many of which would fall under the patronage of the Greek and Roman muses.
There seems to have been a slight shift in Renaissance Italy, where collections by wealthy families, particularly the Medicis, were focused almost entirely on art. These merchant families appear to have realized the economic value of both antiquities and contemporary art, and since the Church during this period was overseen by similar wealthy families, the Vatican followed suit in acquiring these types of objects *en masse*, eventually creating one of the largest museums in the modern world (Alexander 1996: 19-20). Collecting and the display of familial curio cabinets remained popular throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but it is the nineteenth century transformation of the private and royal collections into *public* collections that can be considered the most influential shift in the development of the art or antiquities museums. These collections not only ensured the preservation of art and objects for the sake of posterity, but also the display of the objects for public consumption. Family collections were often tied to the practice of connoisseurship, where the “best” items were sought for display to represent a family’s power or wealth, and when many of these collections were eventually turned over to the public, individual pride transitioned to national pride for collections that ranged from antiquity to the present day. Many of these family collections, particularly those associated with ruling or royal families, became national collections, increasing the status of the collection as a whole, and also the family that either owned or donated the objects to the public. As these

---

12 This practice took place primarily between the 17th and 19th centuries in Western Europe. Families, usually aristocracy who could afford to collect art and antiquities, wanted to display the pieces in a way that visitors would be able to see not only the breadth of wealth, but also the intelligence of the collectors in their ability to discern collectable art (Alexander & Alexander 2008: 24-35). The practice of connoisseurship in particular has continued to shape modern collecting practices where curators must still purchase pieces of relevance, a subjective idea.

13 It should be noted that many royal or individual collections were not voluntarily turned over to the public and were instead part of the result of the overthrowing of the monarchy and church. According to Edward Alexander, “The Palace of the Louvre in Paris, opened to the public during the French Revolution, may be regarded as the first great national art museum...the leaders who overthrew the old order argued that the nation’s art belonged to all the people of the new society” (1996: 23-24). This really initiates the idea of public art museums, and suggests that early on, heritage was valued not only by individuals, but by the public.
national collections expanded, many were further divided into specific areas of study: art, natural history, science/technology, botanical gardens and zoos, and other subsets considered to show human or natural progress.

What is lacking in the development of early museums is the interpretation of objects for a widely varying outside audience. Since private collections had a built-in and selective audience, presenting artifacts to the less-educated public was not necessarily a concern, because there was often a housekeeper or family member to walk through the collection with any visitors. Even in early public museums, there was an assumption that visitors were of a certain intellectual status and would therefore be able to interpret for themselves. In *A Social History of Museums: What the Visitors Thought*, Kenneth Hudson cites the reactions of many 18th and 19th century museum patrons, who, when visiting particular public or private collections, felt the need to be educated beforehand, particularly once the pieces were considered to be part of a high status collection. He writes:

> The growth of connoisseurship during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries inevitably made ordinary people feel inferior when faced with works of art. So long as a religious painting or statue remained in the church, it had no elitist associations. It belonged to everybody and had meaning for everybody. Once it was moved to an art gallery, a different set of values came into play. It had to be judged in its own right, as an artist production, and that needed experience and a specialized vocabulary. Museums have a remarkable power of making the uneducated feel inferior (1975: 14).

Although Hudson is writing about a time when public access to specialized museums was not common, and collections were instead available mainly to experts or invited patrons, he initiates the idea that these early collections were not intended to educate, but instead just to be viewed.¹⁴

---

¹⁴ Hudson goes on to say “…it seems very probable that during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries those private collectors who either opened their collections ‘to the public’ or who bequeathed them to the city ‘for the benefit of the public’ had a restricted public in mind” (1975: 27). This would certainly account for the assumed knowledge that patrons were supposed to have before viewing a particular collection, negating the need for any type of interpretive material as part of the collection.
Even as the museum was moving into the public realm, it was still restricted in a way to those with specialized knowledge.

Peter van Mensch continues Hudson’s social history, suggesting that interpretation and education as part of the museum environment seems to have been initiated in the late 19th century, as part of a reexamination of the practice of museology and its relationship to antiquities and other types of art (1992: 5). In this new practice of museology, the purpose of the museum is outlined by Stephen Weil and summarized in three major functions: (1) to preserve, (2) to study, and (3) to communicate (1990: 58). The last of these characteristics seems to have had the most lasting impact on modern museum practice, and centers on establishing connections between the artifacts housed in a museum and the visiting public (Shanks & Tilley 1987: 91). Establishing context by displaying objects with a name, description, or location of the find can be considered minimal interpretation, as it gives a greater understanding to how the object relates to a larger constructed discourse.

In 2007, the International Council of Museums (ICOM), an organization established in 1946 to work with UNESCO and other world agencies, defined a museum as “a non-profit, permanent institution in the service of society and its development, open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits the tangible and intangible heritage of humanity and its environment for the purposes of education, study and enjoyment” (ICOM

---

15 Van Mensch cites J.G.Th. von Graess as documenting the change in museum mentality somewhere between the 1850s and 1880s and his Zeitschrift für Museologie und Antiquitätenkunde sowie verwandte Wissenschaften (1883).

16 It should be noted that in his Museum Manifesto (1970) Joseph Veach Noble, former president of the American Association of Museums, expands these three responsibilities to five: (1) to collect, (2) to conserve, (3) to study, (4) to interpret, and (5) to exhibit (Weil 1990). Essentially, he divides “to communicate” into two subsets—to interpret, which is essentially the ability to understand learned information, and to exhibit, the ability to visually communicate the information. Since it is the interaction of interpreting and exhibiting that closely aligns with the practice of design, leaving the responsibility as communicating seems to be the most relevant for this study.
The idea of a modern museum established in definition as an “institution” suggests that the physical local and design of the museum can take many forms, since “institution” refers more to the collection of objects and scholars, than to physical space. The modern collection can take many forms and implies an evolution away from the initial home and institutional collections, which were housed in specific, grand architectural spaces. Instead, the modern museum seems to be able to take any physical form, which is where on-site and open-air facilities come into the discourse.

As opposed to the evolution of the traditional museum, the development of local or on-site open-air facilities took much longer to coalesce, and instead seems to be a result of changes to the practice of collecting and display in just the last century. Major advances in travel technology following the invention of railroads, automobiles, and airplanes have allowed a wider audience not only to travel within a particular country, but to travel all over the world in much less time and at much less expense than previously (Weil 1990: 4). This ever-expanding technology together with the frequency with which new places are becoming easily accessible has provided more people with the opportunity to see new sites and experience new cultures. According to Marie-Françoise Lanfant, “those peoples who previously remained behind their frontiers are now invited to consider themselves part of great multi-cultural units…” (1995a: 5). This not only suggests the greater availability of these types of experiences, but also the greater public interest in different cultures, or the interest in seeking a heritage connection that was previously undiscovered. By the 1980s, most people were encountering heritage while traveling, a trend that

---

17 ICOM follows this by stating: “The definition of a museum has evolved, in line with developments in society. Since its creation in 1946, ICOM updates this definition in accordance with the realities of the global museum community” (2007). Most recently, the definition has evolved to include the preservation of intangible heritages, further complicating the idea and purpose of the “traditional” museum as physical space.
has continued over the last thirty years (Holtorf 2010: 44; Baxter 2010: 245-247). Instead of remaining within their own previous cultural boundaries, more people are being exposed to different heritages through cultural tourism and museums, necessitating interpretation for an outside audience at these types of sites around the world.

The increase in means and ability of the general public to travel, as well as their newfound desire for cultural understanding, suggested to many researchers that artifact and cultural interpretation should break away from the large, centralized arts and antiquities museums of the 19th century and move instead to smaller, more local open-air facilities. These facilities encompass many of the previously defined characteristics of early museums. They provide education and context for visitors, without the need for enclosed space, allowing large architectural features to be included in the interpretations. Open-air facilities provide much-needed physical context for archaeological remains, which was not previously provided in museums for various reasons.

At the same time that travel was increasing, the theory of contextual education was also developing, suggesting that artifacts and remains should be interpreted where they were both used and excavated, with a known and properly displayed provenance. The objects, therefore, were “put to some worthwhile use” (Weil 1990: 29) as part of a museum facility, which included the design of exterior space in which to showcase architectural remains. With this new type of environment, artifacts could demonstrate the historical significance of a particular place, being

---

18 This refers to the national arts and antiquities museums of the 19th century, usually situated in capital cities. This include institutions such as the British Museum in London, Louvre in Paris, Smithsonian in Washington DC, etc. For additional information on this development trend, please see Barry 2008.
19 Often, artifacts and even architectural fragments were taken from their original archaeological context because of safety concerns and the relative remoteness of many excavation sites. At the time, museums provided safe and sheltered environments that would bring history to the “masses.” With the more recent availability of travel and the relative protection of open-air facilities, this is no longer a concern, and the general public is able to travel all over the world to see artifacts in their geographical context.
inherently tied to the surrounding environment, instead of being solely thought of as objects of artistic significance as was the case with 17th -- 19th century museums. This allowed for the preservation of the artifacts right alongside the study and contextual understanding of history, which then focuses on the artifact’s creation, purpose, and reason for preservation. Where the physical museum originally sought to preserve and showcase, open air facilities and site design allow for these traits as well as context and environmental experience. In this way, people travel to be immersed in the cultural environment, instead of select artifacts being brought to them.

Although the discourse surrounding the creation of localized institutions of culture is generally positive and emphasizes the change from centralized buildings to interpretive exteriors, there is the constant concern that as globalization increases, individual heritages, traditions, and memory will be lost (Lanfant 1995a: 8). People travel with a number of different intentions, from leisure, to education, to necessity. But even with the acknowledged benefit of experiencing new places and cultures, there is also the fear that local culture will be forced to adjust and develop to accommodate the outside influences being brought in by travelers.\(^{20}\) Therefore, cultural heritage interventions at local sites should seek to clearly identify the concepts of heritage, tradition, and memory from a local historical perspective, preserving these aspects while at the same time educating an international audience on their importance, and sometimes even providing entertainment. Cultural heritage practice and the purposeful design of the built environment must balance these characteristics in each physical interpretation.

\(^{20}\) For instance, travelers come with perceptions of what they intend to see while traveling, and when they do not experience this, are disappointed. In order to then accommodate the needs and desires of travelers, as well as to court additional revenue for tourism-dependent societies, particular places may choose to interpret history not based on the present cultural remains, but instead as related to preconceived ideas about what the public would like to find at the site. For more on this, please see Chapter 3.
2.3 Cultural Heritage as a “Practice”

As an area of study unto itself, cultural heritage practice\(^\text{21}\) has become a popular topic for discourse because it helps the international community identify and track human development over the course of millennia. Interpretations and on-site facilities are a method for practicing heritage. Art, architecture, writing, and even intangible heritages, such as recitations and dance, are now the focus of preservation and interpretation, intended to ensure their existence for the study and enjoyment of future generations. Although the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) continues to publish a list of monuments of world cultural significance (defined as World Heritage Sites), cultural heritage is also recognized by individual countries, cities, and ethnic groups that identify certain types of material culture as integral to the understanding of their past, culture, or development.

The practice of cultural heritage can be addressed first as a way to preserve and promote understanding of these identified physical and ethereal “artifacts” of cultural history (McManamon & Hatton 2000: 1-6). Built interventions associated with practice, however, can be manifested in a number of theoretical ways: through cultural heritage site management, through scholarly research, or even through the documentation of objects (Cleere: 1989: 10-11). This study, however, focuses on practice through design, which not only involves strategies of presenting cultural heritage to the public, but also an examination of the environmental and cultural iatrogenesis that has resulted from some of the case study interventions. As with any

\(^{21}\) I refer to “practice” here as the action of identifying, preserving, and interpreting cultural heritage artifacts, architecture, and other information. It can be accomplished through site management, preservation/conservation activities, or through facility design. I use the term practice as a way of differentiating between theories of cultural heritage in purely identifying significance and the act of working with identified heritages for public consumption.
intervention associated with ancient or historic material remains, manipulating the sensitive context causes the immediate built environment to change, and can sometimes result in unintended consequences for the preservation or understanding of the material remains.

It is important to note that in cultural heritage development, there is no one way to go about presenting cultural or ancient remains to the public. Each site has different factors influencing the eventual interpretation of the place as a whole: political, national, historical, temporal, etc.\textsuperscript{22} Therefore, there is no universal system for “practicing” cultural heritage correctly. Instead, it is important to examine what has been done in the past, and what can be learned from the experiences of visitors to better interpret individual sites in the future. This then provides a basis for understanding current theories of cultural heritage practice and how they are manifested through design.

Incredibly important to current theories of practice is the idea of cultural ownership or patrimony, which has been the subject of long-standing debate in heritage discourse.\textsuperscript{23} Cultural heritage practice seeks to put material remains into an understandable context, which often includes associating them with a particular place/region, or ethnic, or religious group, which is

\textsuperscript{22} Tim Copeland argues that there is a distinct dichotomy between the ‘expert’ interpreter and the generic interpreter, each of which comes from a different background of knowledge, and therefore will view a particular place differently. As part of this, the interpretation does not make a linear progress from evidence to audience, but instead the evidence will engage with different factors that will each equally influence it (2006: 83-85). He makes a good point in that each interpretation is going to come from the individual history of a place with outside influences acting on it. But, modern cultural heritage practice suggests that it is the responsibility of the expert to be as objective as possible, demonstrating empirical data, but allowing for some individual interpretation by the generic interpreter.

\textsuperscript{23} Cultural patrimony refers to presumed ownership over culture or heritage. It can be expressed in the suggested return of specific artifacts to a country of group of origin, or even in the relationship of ideas that groups associate themselves with. One of the more current and well-known examples of this is the debate is over the ownership and subsequent location of the so-called “Elgin” or Parthenon Marbles. Current researchers must weight a number of factors in determining who the artifacts belong to, especially those that were excavated under questionable or colonial circumstances. There is no blanket policy or resolution for how to mediate these types of problems, so each is currently addressed on a case-by-case basis, sometimes to the disappointment of all parties.
often where on-site facilities can be utilized. In many cases, especially with ancient remains, the people who created the artifacts have no direct identifiable living descendants and therefore, the remains must be interpreted solely by archaeologists, researchers, and national governments.\textsuperscript{24} It has been argued that one of the biggest influences on interpretation is the value system placed on individual sites by any of the larger bodies that is interpreting it, particularly when the interpretation is governed by a nation and the archaeology is linked to nationalism, ethnicity, or identity. Philip Kohl specifically cites the use of historic material in reconstructing local and national histories, suggesting that archaeology and nationalism are therefore inherently interconnected, and that the nationalist connection not only influences the interpretation of artifacts, but also that potential revenue gain affects the excavation itself (1998: 226-227). This has especially been the case where archaeology and cultural heritage is used by a governing body to assert ownership over the past. Lynn Meskell, in contrast, argues that the actual interaction between archaeological development and nations is much more complex than Kohl suggests, stating instead that the national interests are “less deterministic in their relationships with the past” (2002: 287).\textsuperscript{25} Despite Meskell’s and Kohls’ differences on the level of influence national politics has on the development of sites, the key theory from both arguments is that national or local politics can be one of the many influences affecting an interpretation, and must therefore be

\textsuperscript{24} Although many would argue that archaeologists have the most empirical or objective analysis, Alice Kehoe suggests that even today, money, politics, and other factors determine archaeological excavations and their interpretations, especially when dealing with multiple pasts or real data (2007: 172-7). The job of marketing archaeology becomes as much of a business as anything else, despite the fact that archaeologists are generally seeking evidence of the true past.

\textsuperscript{25} As part of his argument, Kohl is more careful to differentiate between nationalism and the idea of nationalist archaeology, which more often involves the use of ancient material in a propagandistic way: “… it is important to distinguish national from nationalist archaeology. The former refers to the archaeological record compiled within given states. The latter refers more inclusively not only to that record but also to policies adopted by the state that make use of archaeologists and their data for nation-building purposes, and such policies may extend beyond the borders of the state. Nationalist archaeology is frequently involved in the creation and elaboration of national identities, processes that occur not only within states but also as states expand and interact with other states” (1998: 226). Each of these occurs often in the use of the past for individual ideas and practices, but in archaeological interpretation, nationalism is much more common.
examined as a contributing influence in how design interventions are used to present history.

Different countries have different practices for how to interpret material remains, some of which involve more government or national influence than others, especially where a national interest is present. It is important to address each site from its individual situation, and acknowledge the possibility of outside influences that could affect how the greater public understands the cultural remains.

Because of these and other types of discrepancies in interpretation, many researchers have suggested a link between interpretation and archaeology or cultural heritage not unlike colonization where the body coming in to interpret will do so with their own preconceived knowledge of the material and cultural background (Meskell 2002; Trigger 1984). As with gaining awareness of national bias as a contributing factor in cultural heritage practice, non-local archaeologists or organizations can potentially impose outside influences over remains being interpreted, either intentionally or not, due to lack of local knowledge. Although this is no new concept – politics, colonialism, and other outside influences have for a long time played a prominent role in the interpretation of cultural artifacts and architectural remains – it is something that warrants further examination, especially where design is involved, since aesthetic choice can be associated with style or influence, and sometimes viewed as “foreign” or “outside.”

---

26 In his article on Alternative Archaeologies, Bruce Trigger cites three major types of archaeology—“Nationalist, Colonialist, and Imperialist,”—each of which stem from the idea that many archaeologists excavate outside of their own country or culture, and therefore could have different understandings of, or agendas for, cultural remains (1984: 355-7). However, in the last 30 years since his article was written, there has been more of a professional focus on training archaeologists in developing countries, who will have a better understanding of cultural material and potentially a greater desire to see it preserved. Archaeology does not seem to be as connected to colonialism as much in the 21st century as in the 19th and 20th centuries.
For remains that are seen as World Heritage, any number of organizations or cultural entities can claim them as part of their cultural patrimony, meaning that the number of people seeking to interpret them in a specific way is increased significantly. For example, the Origins Centre in Johannesburg, South Africa, is publicized as a museum “for the people of the world,” intended to provide a location for all people to celebrate “what it means to be human” (Holtorf 2010: 45). By establishing the museum as one for everyone in the world, or those who consider themselves “human,” the museum inherently creates billions of individual stakeholders who all potentially identify with the interpretation in some way and will therefore bring their influences to the general understanding of the material presented. Exhibiting this type of cultural heritage as all-inclusive helps with its popularity, publicity, and participation, but at the same time must still be designed by a select group, with a select cultural experience.

These are just some of the factors that cultural heritage practitioners must mediate in order to interpret and present cultural remains to the public. The next logical step in the analysis becomes looking at how design has been used in the past to accommodate these characteristics, and identify extremes in cultural heritage practice that must be mediated.

2.4 Design in the Cultural Heritage Narrative

Creating aesthetic or interpreted space as part of the greater built environment has become a major component in cultural heritage interpretation, specifically with concern to archaeological site or material presentation, as it can significantly influence the behavior of visitors. Yet, with development at historical and heritage sites increasing exponentially alongside cultural heritage tourism numbers in the last thirty years, design has mainly been publicized through controversies
surrounding new site museums. Projects by “signature” architects such as Richard Meier’s *Ara Pacis* museum (1995-2006, Rome, Italy), and Bernard Tschumi’s New Museum of the Acropolis (2003-2009, Athens, Greece) [Figure 1] demonstrate the polarizing effect that design can have on the general public when attempting to present ancient architectural and cultural material to a wide and unspecialized audience. The projects both represent examples of site museums, where architecture is brought to the archaeological site to work alongside other on-site facilities. Although the projects discussed in later chapters are not enclosed buildings as these are, the discourse is relevant to the overall study as these museums are attempting to accomplish the same type of contextual integration of material remains that the other design facilities are as well.

The debate surrounding the New Museum of the Acropolis has been well-documented and can be considered representative of the international museum design competition process. The first

---

27 The term “signature architects” refers to those designers who have become successful through their use of a signature style or characteristic. Often, they can command more for their services because of the notoriety associated with their individual aesthetic.
or many public controversies began when the government held and international competition for the design. In part, the local community disagreed with the government decision to award the project to a foreign architect, Bernard Tschumi, something that Tschumi eventually paid the price for in the media.\textsuperscript{28} Despite winning a number of international design awards, including the American Institute of Architects Institute Honor Award for Architecture (2011), the British Guild of Travel Writers’ award for Best Worldwide Tourism Project (2010), and the International Association of Lighting Designers Award of Excellence and Sustainability (2010), the project was marred by additional debate related to the location of the museum at the foot of the Acropolis [Figure 2], and the destruction of the original Acropolis museum [Figure 3], which was located directly on the site and designed by Greek architect Patroklos Karantinos. The destruction of the Greek building in favor of Tschumi’s modern design, which many felt was not integrated well into the 18\textsuperscript{th} and 19\textsuperscript{th} century neoclassical city, was seen as favoring international revenue and style over Greek culture and art.

\textsuperscript{28} Please see Berg 2007; Dawson & Zarifeh 2002.
Figure 2: View to the Athenian Acropolis from the Parthenon Gallery of the New Museum of the Acropolis. Photo by author, 2012.

Figure 3: The Parthenon Museum from 1950-2007, designed by Greek modern architect Patroklos Karantinos. Photo by DerHexer.
Furthering the controversy, the building itself is design specifically to spark conversation over the cultural patrimony of Greece. Tschumi’s design included a gallery at the top of the museum intended to house the Parthenon/Elgin Marbles [Figure 4], should they ever be returned from their current location in the British Museum in London. This continued to keep the building in the international news, and reintroduced the centuries-old debate over who owned the marbles excavated on the Acropolis. In this way, the building became immersed in a greater meaning, purpose, and argument, attracting its own attention and interpretation, beyond the cultural material housed within its walls.

Figure 4: The Parthenon Gallery in the New Museum of the Acropolis houses fragments excavated from the Parthenon and plaster casts of the marbles now residing in the British Museum. The gallery faces the Acropolis so that the Parthenon can be viewed from the room, and the marbles can be viewed in a similar light condition to their original design as part of the Parthenon building. Photo by author, 2012.

29 The finished gallery looks out toward the Acropolis and Parthenon through floor to ceiling windows and houses plaster replicas of the Parthenon Marbles. The purpose of the gallery was to suggest the return of the marbles from the British Museum so that they could be placed in context to where they were found, and according to Tschumi, create a feeling of “reciprocity,” where the gallery and building were in dialogue (Mauss 2010: 20).
Although Tschumi rarely responded to critics with regard to the building, he gave an interview after it was completed to express the precise intentions behind the design, many of which were in line with modern cultural heritage theory. In response to a question about how the building fits into his design repertoire, Tschumi responds:

> Never before had the context played such a strong role as at the new Acropolis Museum. We used to emphasize concept and content until then. The design of the museum was entirely shaped by the context, both architectural, urbanistic, and cultural to such a degree that we went back and looked at how this had been at work in other projects (Mauss 2010: 15).

He suggests a complete awareness that the design of the building must fit into the context in which it is being placed—temporally, stylistically, and culturally, as dictated by heritage practice. Some might argue that some of these things, especially culture, could be beyond his understanding as an outsider, but he does make the connection that the architecture is influential on visitors and the local population, and therefore the design must respond carefully to this.³⁰

Tschumi’s museum is integral to the discussion of design and archaeology because of the range of topics relevant to heritage practice discourse that it introduces. The first is the use of design in highlighting the practice of archaeology, as addressed previously. Tschumi’s intention behind the building was to provide areas to view an active excavation, much like on-site facilities enable. This helps to give context to the artifacts in the building, while serving experiential purposes.

But the building’s position within the cultural patrimony debate is much more complicated. The Parthenon gallery itself is meant to illustrate that there is a safe place for the artifacts, and to specifically encourage the return of the marbles from the British Museum. The inclusion of such a space seemingly suggests that Greece has cultural patrimony over the artifacts from the

³⁰ To reiterate the concept of context in the design, he made sure that an active excavation and archaeological remains were visible as part of the building, suggesting that “the archaeological remnants below the museum were our *objets trouvés*” (Mauss 2010: 20). This, in theory, suggests the emphasis of the archaeological remains on the design of the facility, where remains are the intended focus of the greater interpretation.
Acropolis, and is an ideal representation of how design is specifically used to illustrate or encourage cultural heritage principles. Although the patrimony debate continues to be waged around the world and in relation to other sites, the New Museum of the Acropolis provides a precedent for aesthetic interpretation of remains.

Tschumi’s museum is also representative of the difficult task of integrating design projects by a foreigner into an existing cultural fabric. Like many similar projects, Tschumi’s museum design was chosen through closed competition by national officials looking to promote their country through the new architecture, following in the example of the Bilbao Effect. Because museums, especially those by signature architects, are extremely expensive to build, economics and expected revenue can sometimes influence the decision heavily, and the government can fail to acknowledge the relative importance of good interpretive design, site integration, and public expectations. These can be just as influential in the design process for many sites not necessarily seeking to gain notoriety through their design choices at the site, and instead remain focused on minimal disturbance of the site through additional construction.

---

32 It will also be discussed in Chapter 3 in relation to the Archaeological Site of Ancient Troy and the artifacts excavated there.

33 The Bilbao Effect refers to the substantial economic growth that took place in the former-industrial Basque region of Spain after the construction of the Guggenheim Bilbao art museum by Frank Gehry. The building not only promoted tourism to the area by being an attraction itself, but was the catalyst for further development as part of the cultural theme, quickly turning a deteriorating industrial city into a European arts capital. Other countries hoping to capitalize on similar architecture tourism have used signature architects to design cultural centers to take advantage of the dual tourism and economic growth (Plaza 2007: 2-3).

34 An exception to note here is Rafael Moneo (full name José Rafael Moneo Vallés), a signature architect who was lauded for his design of the National Museum of Roman Art in Mérida, Spain, by both national and international design and archaeological communities. Some critics feel that this is because Moneo is “the architect’s architect” but at the same time “doesn’t covet attention the way some architects do…” (Netto 2013: 1). As evidenced by his museum design, Moneo is very careful to critically examine that history he is trying to present in the museum; he takes inspiration from Roman brick construction and modernizes it, while still having it act as a blank canvas for the artifacts. His success in the archaeological community seems to be in the understated quality of the architecture, allowing the actual history to be highlighted, not the building. It must also be noted, however, that although the project was internationally known, he was designing in his home country, and therefore not competing with local architects for the commission as an outsider would have.
With museum design as an active precedent, on-site archaeological interpretation through design was revolutionized over a century ago when amateur archaeology was common among the wealthy elite, thus introducing a new way of providing context for artifacts. Opening up an archaeological site to the public has historically meant that the environment must be enjoyable, but also controlled and safe, both for the protection of the artifacts and visitors (McKercher & du Cros 2002: 36). By designing specific access areas and controlled circulation through the archaeological site, visitors are able to engage with the monuments and artifacts but not physically touch them, much like a museum, but without the roof or full enclosure. This type of total site planning was begun early on in the modern practice of archaeology to make sites accessible to wealthy travelers interested in cultural tourism.

One of the first examples of this type of intervention, and the beginning of purposeful design of the built environment, is the complete relocation and reconstruction of the Manitou Cliff Dwellings [Figure 5], now in Manitou Springs, Colorado. The architecture, which was installed in 1904 and opened to the public in 1907, was originally located near Mesa Verde, over 300 miles away, and represents the traditional architecture of the Ancestral Puebloans.  

---

35 This is the current name given to the native population who were previous referred to as the Anasazi by the Navajo (a later arriving group in the area), which means “ancient enemy.” The term “Ancestral Puebloan” was more recently chosen by a group of native descendants.
Reportedly fearful that the original site would be looted for artifacts after excavation, possibly leading to the destruction of the architecture of an authentic cliff dwelling, Virginia McClurg and William Crosby set out to protect the site. As the 1906 Antiquities Act had not yet been passed into law, they determined that the best way to accomplish this was to carefully deconstruct the architecture brick by brick and relocate it to a more easily protected location near Colorado Springs (“History” n.d.).

Although the intentions of McClurg and Crosby may have been noble, the cliff dwellings represent a common problem for the cultural heritage narrative. The site uses a design intervention, specifically construction/reconstruction, to both preserve and interpret the
architectural and archaeological remains of an ancient people. Troy Lovata, a researcher on archaeological tourism, suggests in part that the relocation of the site represents the move toward archaeological engagement for visitors, writing:

The cliff dwellings at Manitou Springs, Colorado, are an archaeology site built specifically for tourists. The story of their construction and how they continue to cater to visitors—many who know little of their suspect authenticity—offers insight into how people engage with the past and how an archaeology site functions as a tourist destination” (2011: 195).

In this case, the site is acting specifically as a tourism destination, with potentially less focus on authenticity\(^3\) and more attention paid to gaining additional visitors.

But to examine from the perspective of modern cultural heritage practice, the architectural reconstruction itself is one form of intervention. Relocating the remains (or possibly fabricating them), causes them to be removed from their authentic regional context, southwest Colorado, where the landscape dictated the form of the architecture [Figure 6], something some might argue is integral to the understanding and the interpretation of remains. To move the architecture to a completely different geological location means either recreating or ignoring the original context where it was found. With modern cultural heritage practice intent on putting remains in as much context as possible, if this intervention happened today, it would create a discrepancy in heritage design discourse. Although it may not seem like the geographical/geological context would matter to visitors, especially since a cliff shelter is reconstructed around the dwellings, the Manitou Cliff Dwellings heritage site does present a confusing interpretation. To exacerbate the geographical incongruence, the tourism site also features other types of American Indian architecture [Figure 7] from all over the greater region, putting several different heritages

\(^3\) On this note, Lovata goes on explicitly to say: “The site is a fake. The site was conceived to match a growing interest in Southwestern prehistory. It proved popular and persists, in part, because of the idea of the Anasazi is so attractive” (2011: 195). Lovata maintains that the site was both planned and constructed as a fake, but the facility itself still claims to be a careful and authentic reconstruction.
together under the broad theme of “native.” Since these types of structures would have never been seen in relationship to one another in the ancient world, the differences in the cultural traditions of each must be explicitly stated if visitors are to understand the authentic history of each.

Figure 6: A cliff dwelling site *in situ* known as Fire Temple that is a part of the Mesa Verde National Park. Photo by author, 2013.

---

Relocating culturally historic buildings that are at a risk of otherwise destruction has been a common trend in building preservation over the last century and a half. Projects such as Greenfield Village (Dearborn, Michigan), Old Sturbridge (Massachusetts), Norsk Folkemuseum (Oslo, Norway), and the Skansen Museum (Stockholm, Sweden), and multiple wooden architecture museums in Russia, etc. all bring together historic architectural traditions from all areas of their respective countries. This type of preservation complex helps to preserve awareness of traditional building techniques and designs, but at the same time removes the structures from their geographic context, which, like the Manitou Cliff Dwellings, the design traditions have often evolved to accommodate, creating a discrepancy in the interpretive discourse.
As part of the presentation upon first opening, the Manitou Cliff Dwellings also included interaction with American Indians from various backgrounds in traditional dress and performing as an early form of living history presentation. This is another type of adaptive cultural heritage practice where visitors can watch “authentic” performances and take photographs with the participants, thus helping to engage them in the greater cultural understanding of some American Indian traditions, but again creating a discrepancy in the presented historical record. Since each piece of architecture featured at the site (which includes the cliff dwellings, a multi-story pueblo moved from the Taos region, a traditional tipi from the American plains, and a mesa store house) comes from a different region and time period and is also associated with a different cultural
group, the American Indians performing did not have much relationship to several of the architectural constructions at the site. Using all of these as part of one large interpretation could be thought of as melding all of the individual cultures together into the imposed heritage of “Indian” in the early 20th century.  

In the intervening time since the Manitou Cliff Dwellings and other contemporary projects were initiated around the world, the idea of architectural reconstruction or restoration as part of interpretation has evolved substantially. The UNESCO Athens Charter of 1931 outlined seven practices to follow when restoring ancient buildings, including the use of up-to-date techniques and materials in new projects. This was followed 30 years later by the more substantial Venice Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (1964), which followed the framework of its 1931 predecessor, but emphasized the importance of the context of monuments and keeping the general aesthetics of the ancient structures. The meeting that produced the Venice Charter also established the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), which continues to work alongside UNESCO and other institutions such as the

---

38 The concept of imposing heritage through architectural construction on populations, particularly those will living participants or descendants, is discussed in further detail in Chapter 6. The idea can also be related to the faux ethnic villages at World’s Fairs, and other situations where entire heritages are streamlined into single representative structures or complexes.

39 The seven main resolutions (Carta del Restauro) are: 1. International organizations for Restoration on operational and advisory levels are to be established; 2. Proposed Restoration projects are to be subjected to knowledgeable criticism to prevent mistakes which will cause loss of character and historical values to the structures; 3. Problems of preservation of historic sites are to be solved by legislation at national level for all countries; 4. Excavated sites which are not subject to immediate restoration should be reburied for protection; 5. Modern techniques and materials may be used in restoration work; 6. Historical sites are to be given strict custodial protection; 7. Attention should be given to the protection of areas surrounding historic sites (UNESCO 1931). Important to note is the use of the term “modern techniques,” which represent methods that have evolved over time, but have not changed in theory. These include concealing consolidation techniques, as well as avoiding damage to original monuments when preserving portions.
Getty Conservation Institute to update national and international standards for reconstruction and restoration.  

As the principles of design interpretation have evolved through reconstruction, examples of implementation can be seen at archaeological sites all over the world. These provide a timeline of technical standards extant when the interventions were initiated. Techniques have evolved so quickly that reconstruction and restoration projects completed in the mid-20th century using concrete [Figure 8], once considered a modern technology, are being completely reversed, as it has been determined that interventions done primarily with concrete are too destructive long-term. Not only have conservation materials evolved to better accommodate ancient material properties, but the idea or typology of interventions has also developed substantially, to move beyond reconstruction and restoration to include other built interventions such as site circulation planning and signage, conservation/preservation shelters, and installation sculpture or other less-invasive graphic representation. In the last several decades, design has not only provided some of the most basic needs at ancient and historic sites (cafes, stores, paths, signage, etc.) but has also become a necessity for modern interpretation, incorporating the concepts learned from museum


41 Ephesus, Turkey was partially interpreted through reconstruction in the mid-20th century and features several projects that utilize extensive concrete in place of missing ancient materials. In its 2001 bid to join the UNESCO World Heritage List, reviewers acknowledged concerns with these reconstruction and conservation attempts, and cited the different types of interpretations that have happened over time at the site, creating a variety of architectural interventions that were difficult for visitors to understand (ICOMOS 2001: 3). The bid was successful and since becoming a part of the list in 2001, the site has been working to integrate all conservation and reconstruction projects to make a comprehensive visitor interpretation in line with Ephesus’ record of constant occupation in antiquity, and retain the authenticity and protection of all architectural remains. Although Ephesus is one of the most extensive examples of varying architectural techniques, it is by no means the only one.
evolution and reconstruction practice, and fully illustrating the history of a particular place as through the built environment.

![Figure 8: Anastylosis project from Ephesus, Turkey. Photo by author, 2011.](image)

### 2.5 Designing Entertainment vs. Education

As opposed to the earliest interventions at sites like the Manitou Springs Cliff Dwellings, researchers today tend to interpret with a different intent and understanding of history, but with no less enthusiasm than this early southwestern tourist experience. Although the goal for archaeological sites is to interpret with as much educational value and authenticity as possible, the line between education and entertainment is still often a blurred one, as historic sites still need to garner an audience in order to gain revenue (Silberman 2010: 68). One of the issues that has stemmed from this need is the creation of “archaeological Disneylands,” which are seen by
some researchers as placing more emphasis on the entertainment value of design and less on the historical or cultural material (Cleere 1989: 14). The term has been used to refer to many different sites all over the world in a negative context, and is often used as a model that one should avoid in developing archaeological sites for public consumption.\(^{42}\)

The assertion that additional entertainment could overpower archaeological or cultural remains was supported in part by increased availability of new technologies for use in designing interpretations. Real-time video and digital reconstructions were developed to help visitors facing primarily unexpressive foundations to understand how the buildings might have looked in their original form. Projects such as the Timescope at the archaeological site of Ename in Belgium [Figure 9] were revolutionary in showing how historic architecture could be completely reconstructed digitally, instead of through a complicated and invasive physical reconstruction.\(^{43}\)

\(^{42}\) While developing the site of Naqa, an Egyptian/Roman/Greek settlement in modern Sudan, Professor Dietrich Wildung gave a lecture specifically stating “We don’t want that at the end of our work Naqa looks like a Sudanese Disneyland…Naqa will remain ruined, not only showing how these temples look two thousand years ago, but also show the history of destruction over two millennia…We don’t want to reconstruct history by hiding the past (2006). Wildung is referring here to the contemporary issue of over reconstruction where a site is rebuilt to completion, suggesting that one period of inhabitation was more important than another or erasing an important historical period entirely for the sake of “whole” or complete architecture.

\(^{43}\) The Ename Timescope allows visitors to see real-time video of the archaeological site and architectural foundations on a television screen and choose digital reconstructions to project over the live feed, enabling visitors to see different periods of development at Ename with a focus toward real scaled depictions. The live feed also allows visitors to walk around the site and be seen on the video as if in the reconstructed buildings.
Although projects like this help visitors interpret remains while at the same time protecting archaeological data, the overuse of technology combined with design can lead to a focus on entertainment beyond presenting historical material. Technology can also be used to help perceived “boring” material be more entertaining, but this can be a problematic with sites intended to be educational. Architectural design in particular has become very involved both in preventing archaeological Disneylands and creating them, and many archaeological sites feature characteristics of each. One such example is the Jorvik Viking Centre in York, England [Figure 10], which has been a constant subject of controversy and discourse since opening to the public in 1984. The Centre focuses on the Coppergate excavation in York, (begun in 1972, and run by the York Archaeological Trust) that originally opened as a salvage excavation when material was found while digging foundations for a new shopping complex. The initial excavation revealed substantial remains of a Viking settlement in which timber, clothing, household goods, and even human excrement were preserved. Over the next six years, the area was excavated further in anticipation of a major development project that the York City Council had proposed, producing substantial architectural remains and material goods from the Viking and medieval periods.
Upon realizing the extent of material that was revealed, the development project was scrapped, and an interpretive facility was proposed to display the remains with as much context as possible, thus necessitating a construction project on the site of excavation.\(^{44}\)

![Image of Jorvik Viking Center entrance in York, England](image)

**Figure 10:** Jorvik Viking Center entrance in York, England. Photo by author, 2013.

\(^{44}\) Renfrew and Bahn suggest that Jorvik’s financial success stemming from a salvage excavation has inspired other cities seeking revitalization to capitalize on archaeological projects located within cities (1996: 354). The act of making the area into a cultural destination follows the same theory as the Bilbao Effect, where people are encouraged to come to the area by a number of cultural heritage projects. York in particular has substantial Medieval remains, and together with Jorvik, these have helped to promote cultural tourism to the city center.
The first gallery of the Jorvik Viking Centre houses an excavation plan below a glass platform [Figure 11], allowing visitors to walk across and interact with a reconstructed archaeological level, complete with in-situ artifacts. This has become a fairly common interpretation method, used to show visitors an archaeological context, helping them to visualize the site as it was being excavated, while still protecting the original artifacts and continuing research.\(^{45}\) Up until that point, the interpretive center is fairly standard. Upon leaving the excavation gallery, visitors board a full theme-park style ride [Figure 12] that will take them through a reconstructed Viking settlement, complete with animatronic villagers, animals [Figure 13], and even the smells that one would have encountered upon entering the real Viking settlement. After disembarking the ride, visitors continue through other traditional galleries that house the authentic artifacts excavated at the site, including the petrified excrement.

\(^{45}\) Similar examples include the Uppsala Universitet Museum Gustavianum in their Viking gallery, where visitors can walk across a drawing of an archaeological level, and several examples where the actual archaeology can be viewed beneath a visitor’s feet at Capernaum and Caesarea, Israel; Crypte archéologique du parvis Notre-Dame, Paris, France; Ephesus, Turkey; and at many more archaeological sites around the world. There are also numerous examples where archaeological sections are reconstructed on a wall surface to show the vertical progression of excavation and at which level certain types of artifacts were found. Examples of this include the New Museum of the Acropolis and the Metro Museums, Athens, Greece; Stockholms Medeltidsmuseum, Stockholm, Sweden; and Brú na Bóinne Valley Interpretive Center, Ireland.
Figure 11: Viking greeter and entrance gallery with archaeological level reconstruction. Photo by author, 2013.

Figure 12: Theme park ride as part of the Jorvik experience. Photo by author, 2013.
The reconstructed architectural complex helps to create a 3-D experience for visitors who may not otherwise identify easily with archaeological foundations, by highlighting spatial qualities of a waddle and daub settlement, which is often not possible for archaeological sites originally constructed with sensitive materials. The entire interpretation is housed indoors, which allows for the total control of the space, but also removes the remains from other atmospheric context.

If the design intervention at Ename is the one extreme of the invasiveness of design (minimal), Jorvik is the other. The complex uses modern design to create a total environment for the interpretation, and has been criticized mainly for the tourism experience. The initial criticism from heritage professions was predominantly the result of the original 1984 Jorvik interpretation, which consisted mainly of the ride and very little archaeology, thus suggesting that it was
commercializing the archaeology it by eliminating the educational value and instead promoting entertainment. The artifacts gallery at the end [Figure 14] was added in 2001 and the archaeological glass-floored gallery at the beginning in 2010, with living history displays being in place from its inception (York Archaeological Trust 2013). The addition of artifact galleries helped to quiet many critics, since the newer spaces create an archaeological beginning and end to the center entertainment experience. The commercialization of the history, however, remains a highly debated topic in cultural heritage practice, and one that will be addressed in-depth in later chapters.

Figure 14: Display in the artifacts gallery at the Jorvik Viking experience. Photo by author, 2013.

The York Archaeological Trust also implemented an Archaeological Resource Centre (ARC), which includes an Archaeological Activity Center, close to Jorvik in York, intended to provide educational resources for the archaeological and historic sites around York. In the early years of the ARC, researchers saw a rise in attendance, topping 51,000 visitors in 1996 (up from 33,000 in 1990-1), showing that the educational resources were readily available and used.
Despite how far the interpretation has come since originally opening in 1984, Jorvik still has its critics. Henry Cleere defended the project as “remarkably effective” (1989: 14), but other researchers have suggested that projects such as this demonstrate and encourage a ‘heritage industry,’ wherein archaeological sites are commercialized and marketed mainly for entertainment value and to increase revenue from tourism, both at the site and in the region (Smith 2004; Lanfant 1995b; Shanks & Tilley 1987). Since Jorvik has been wildly successful commercially, some feel that the commercialization is to the detriment of the practice of archaeology and the interpretation of sites. In a discussion about the relative extremes of the heritage industry in Great Britain right around the time that Jorvik was built, however, Christopher Chippindale wrote: “Jorvik does everyone good. The Trust earns $1.6 million annually from it for archaeology. The tourists evidently enjoy the place and they get to learn about archaeology and the Vikings” (1989: 62).

Chippindale initiates one of the more relevant points in the argument for increased entertainment—if the entertainment works to draw in revenue that can be used for future excavation, conservation, and research, and patrons are happy learning about the archaeology, what is the harm of these types of glamorizing projects? But it is really the suggestion that archaeologists themselves are condoning the architectural entertainment that some critics take aim at. In writing about the idea of popular culture and its effect on history, Pat Cook writes:

That Jorvik is a real success and a genuine ‘experience’ is not in question. What seems invalid, however, is the line of ambivalent reasoning that archaeologists seem impelled to use in describing

---

47 Helen Temple sardonically refers to the project as “the jewel [British] of archaeological marketing,” but goes on to say that its popularity with visitors, who often wait in excess of an hour and a half to even go in the Centre, has “put archaeology on the tourist map in the United Kingdom,” and “raises vast amounts of money to further archaeological research on other sites” (1986: 5). Commercially successful archaeological sites can be self-perpetuating revenue machines, particularly when national or outside funding for archaeological research is difficult to come by. Sites that can produce their own revenue and even help less established sites can remain comfortably in operation, furthering research and continuing to educate in some capacity.
the nature of that success, an ambivalence which seems to define a residual bad-conscience and uncertainty as to what might be the full implications of this kind of populist exercise for the traditional values of the profession (1991: 26).

His argument is not that Jorvik has attracted a lot of people or made a lot of money, but instead that is has set a precedent for interpretation that has perhaps changed the way that the greater public views archaeology, and sets a visual standard for other sites.\textsuperscript{48} Although York has a number of heritage sites, including York Minster, York Castle [Figure 15], and a preserved medieval shopping quarter, Jorvik is the main tourist attraction, and certainly the most popular. In fact, with the number of visitors in the past 25 years reaching 15 million,\textsuperscript{49} Jorvik can be seen as presenting history to a substantial population, something that Cook condemns since it is merely one example of a Viking settlement, and other more authentic but less entertaining interpretations exist around the country. The public can identify with and understand Jorvik, but might be drawn to it merely because of entertainment value, and not education. Although Cook brings up a legitimate point, especially since he was writing about the project prior to its most recent archaeological renovations, if Jorvik were presenting inauthentic or incorrect history, it would be much easier to condemn it, but the Centre has always presented material based on archaeological evidence, despite what Cook or other critics may say about the method of presentation. It remains, however, an extreme to which design can go in interpreting history while providing entertainment.

\textsuperscript{48} This will be discussed in more depth in Chapters 3 and 6 in relationship to tourists’ expectations of heritage sites and entertainment at Ancient Troy and Chichén Itzá.
\textsuperscript{49} Estimate given by the York Archaeological Trust in 2013.
2.6 Cultural Heritage, Authenticity, and Commodity

The New Museum of the Acropolis, the Manitou Cliff Dwelling, and Jorvik Viking Centre represent different ways in which interpretations are carried out through the purposeful design of space and landscape. But they also suggest the role that authenticity can play in such presentations, or what authenticity really means when looking at the interpretation of archaeological or cultural remains. Jorvik and other similar projects represent a modern archaeological development trend, using entertainment to help visitors understand remains, with arguably positive or negative results. But according to Cornelius Holtorf, it may be the visitor’s
preconceptions and idea of “authentic,” that drives these types of interpretations as much as the historical record. He writes:

… it is almost beside the point of heritage to convey to visitors any specific information about what actually happened in the past. If heritage is mostly about who the visitors are (or would like to be), and what stories they are telling about themselves while they are enjoying entertaining experiences, there is little need to get into intricate stories about a time long gone by. Whether or not this conclusion holds true in its totality, it is certainly the care that heritage managers are rightly careful to confirm certain preconceptions and not to deconstruct too many stories visitors tell themselves at heritage sites… (2010: 48).

Holtorf implies that a large part of heritage interpretation is to provide a way for visitors to experience what they intend to or hope to see at cultural heritage sites, instead of solely presenting empirical knowledge. In a way, this then allows visitors to dictate some of the subject matter presented and even possibly the method of presentation. More likely, however, it is a combination of these preconceptions and historical material that informs interpretations today, since sites are constantly updating their presentations to involve the viewing audience, and as new historical material becomes available. It is much easier at archaeological sites to place an emphasis on excavated material since there is generally an abundance of it, but most site managers will listen to the comments collected from visitors to continue to develop the site in a way that people identify with. In this theory, authenticity is also related to who is doing the interpretation and what is to be gained from presenting the material in a specific way. Cook also addresses visitors’ perceptions when authenticity becomes something that convinces them to be excited:

When visitors are told that the objects before their eyes are based on real archaeological evidence the effect is more likely to be psychological than forensic. In this sense, the function of the notion ‘real’ is to reinforce the conviction that this was what Viking life was really like. The role of the ‘fact’ (the archaeological evidence which the reconstruction Platonically shadows) is to aid the process by which disbelief is suspended (1986: 26).

Essentially, reaction is determined by presentation, not necessarily object or history. People are told to be excited by seeing something, but they may not have come to it on their own without the interpretation. Additionally, if the audience does not easily understand what it being
presented, then it is more difficult for them to place value on it or feel ownership over it. Without this feeling of ownership, they may not value the need for preservation. The traveling public is just one stakeholder in cultural heritage, however, so the intention becomes finding a balance so that the public and researchers will both benefit from an interpretation.

2.7 Conclusions

Design has played a controversial role in introducing archaeological and historical sites to the public. As the designed environment is often the mediator between the public, archaeologists, and history, it often betrays biases and influences beyond a strict and authentic interpretation of empirical information. Instead, design has been used to enhance, interpret, and even exclude, as part of a variety of tourism conditions around the world, which warrant further discussion and analysis from which themes can be drawn and interconnected. Although each example in this chapter presents an individual and sometimes extreme design solution, there is much to be learned in the greater context of how design and the built environment can help to interpret history for the purpose of public consumption. As will be shown in the following chapters, design has a previously unrecognized way of engaging visitors in the history or visual culture of a particular through implementation and construction. The individual studies in the following chapters begin to weave a pattern of discourse around what has been done to use design as part of site interpretation, and the iatrogenesis associated with creating concrete visual imagery as part of interpretation.
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CHAPTER 3
The Trojan Problem: The Archaeological Site of Ancient Troy as seen through the ‘Tourist Gaze’

3.1 Introduction

As part of heritage interpretation, design can be used in a variety of ways to enhance or manipulate the understanding of place, particularly where important and recognizable ancient material might be lacking. As evident at Jorvik and the Manitou Cliff Dwelling, designing new interpretive facilities or recreating an understandable visual language that has since been lost can help visitors visualize an ancient environment. When this involves reconstruction of known buildings, such as with the Manitou Cliff Dwelling, there is enough empirical evidence to design an architectural environment that is authentic in order to engage the public. With some archaeological sites, however, the designed interpretation and created visual culture that is produced can overwhelm archaeological evidence, and evolve from an innocent tourism experience into one of the most iconic visual pieces of the archaeological site.

The Archaeological Site of Ancient Troy, Turkey [Figure 16] is one of the most enigmatic archaeological sites in the world, and also one of the most misunderstood historically. Added by UNESCO to the World Heritage List in 1998, the archaeological tell\(^{51}\) at Hişarlık survived for thousands of years as a testament to ancient fortification and architectural construction.

Consisting of at least nine identifiable occupation layers, the site today is popular with tourists, averaging 350-500,000 visitors annually (Riorden 2009: 19). Although the archaeological

---

50 The area was famously assumed to be the site of Ancient Troy by landowner Frank Calvert and subsequently Heinrich Schliemann in the mid-19th century, but was officially recognized as such when added to the UNESCO World Heritage List.

51 The term “tell” refers to an archaeological site with multiple accumulated layers that have over time formed a distinguishable mound in the landscape.
material excavated at the site over the course of 130 years is extensive, the authentic remains at the site cannot help but be overshadowed by the shared public perception of what the name “Troy” suggests, and the interpretation of the site as part of an iconic story. A portion of the modern association can be attributed to the onslaught of visual culture established by books and other media, as well as the popular Wolfgang Peterson movie, *Troy* (2004), but the geographic area and archaeological site also each have a long history of using design as part of the interpretation to create visual culture for the purpose of ancient tourism, a practice that dates back over 2000 years. The purpose of this particular study is not to debate the possible existence of either Ancient Troy or the Trojan War, but rather to investigate this history of interpretive visual culture, in order to understand how visual media can affect the understanding of the archaeological evidence by the general public.

![Figure 16: The Archaeological Site of Ancient Troy, Turkey. Photo by author, 2008.](image)

---

52 For a basic summary of sources on this, please see Wood, 1996.
Drawing from a collection of media available to tourists before or at the Archaeological Site of Troy, this study examines how imagery presented to tourists impacts their impressions of history. Interpretive architecture added to the site over time is key to this study, because it helps to create a visual experience at the site for visitors, imposing particular images on them as part of the interpretation, and at times influencing the way that history or myth is perceived.

3.2 Archaeology through the Tourism Lens

In recent years, a number of studies have focused on the impact of visual media on tourism, from photographs to motion pictures to brochures (please see Larsen 2006; Hudson, Brent Ritche 2006; Jenkins 2003). Archaeological tourism, however, is often overlooked in such studies, because it has traditionally represented a small sector of the tourism community, and site interpretations were considered insular, or of regional concern. However, the constantly increasing number of tourists visiting historic sites as part of leisure tourism suggests a timely reanalysis of these types of locations as modern tourism destinations. It is important, therefore, to bridge the gap between traditional tourism studies and art historical and archaeological research by examining visitor interpretation of Ancient Troy. Together with a historical analysis of the site as a tourism destination, these disciplines are most influential on the design of the built environment.

---

53 These can include photographs, cinema, brochures, sculpture and tourist arts.
54 The exception to this is analyses that document how mass tourism impacts conservation and sustainability, which has become a more popular topic in recent years. Although this is inherently linked to commercialization through revenue, there are fewer studies that focus less on the physical impact of tourism and more on the cerebral impact of human understanding.
55 I am using the term “insular” here to refer to archaeological sites that have been developed typically using local practice, method, and influence, with little ideological reference to other regional, national, or international sites developments, and not focused on the introduction of a broader discourse or analysis in an international method.
A major aspect of interpretation studies is understanding how people view and experience tourism sites. John Urry’s *The Tourist Gaze* (1999),\(^{56}\) defines this influential tourist phenomenon that was previously difficult to identify from a sociological perspective. The book adapts Foucault’s *The Birth of the Clinic* (1976) to apply the concept of the “gaze” specifically to the study of tourism, breaking down the idea to its simplest form: how we view the environment around us as part of a social experience (Urry 1999:1-2). When he relates the gaze to the study of how people interact with history, Urry writes: “Tourist sites can be classified in terms of three dichotomies: whether they are an object of the romantic or collective tourist gaze; whether they are historical or modern; and whether they are authentic or inauthentic” (1999: 104). Ancient Troy not only falls under all three broad categories, but also exhibits elements of both sides of each dichotomy, with the public’s perception of Troy largely defined by outside media.

The gaze as conceptualized by Urry is not only present, but the associated visual media was necessary to the continuous survival of the site as a tourist destination. The gaze itself may be a modern concept, but the practice of Trojan War representation impacting visitors to the site has a history of several thousand years. Critical to understanding the perception of the site through the built environment is an examination of the area’s geography and historical background as these help to authenticate and establish a precedent for interpretation. Making new information about history readily accessible is one of the acknowledged benefits of introducing archaeological material to the public; thus, the purpose of the built environment is to facilitate this accessibility.\(^{57}\) Introducing these theories to the Ancient Troy interpretation will help to broaden

\(^{56}\) The book has two more editions (2002 and 2011), where Urry expands some of his analyses, but for the purpose of this study, the initial publication is the most relevant.

\(^{57}\) Francis McManamon identifies the major benefits of public archaeology as: (1) the Heritage Benefit, which allow people to connect and associate with their own cultural past and experience, and (2) the History Benefit, which
the discourse of how and why sites are interpreted in a particular way, and what type of impact outside media has on general archaeological tourism.

3.3 Brief History of Investigations at Hişarlık

The initial discovery together with the presumed association of the archaeological tell have each proven to be influential factors in the design of the later interpretation. The area’s connection with the Trojan War not only initiated the excavation, but has also influenced the interpretation of the remains since the mid-19th century. Following the likely private discovery of the site by Frank Calvert and soon-after public unearthing of the site by Heinrich Schliemann in the 1870s, excavations began under the direction of Schliemann with the permission of the Ottoman sultan (Easton 2006: 110-2). Like most 19th century archaeologists, Schliemann’s main concern was finding the levels at the site that would date to the period of the popular myth-history. However, after several years of excavations, Schliemann had found only settlement layers that he deemed too small and not advanced enough to have been associated with the Homeric epics, of which Schliemann was an avid enthusiast, and which were the driving force behind his investigation. In his attempt to find the levels he equated to those of the Trojan War, Schliemann inadvertently excavated through those layers (dated at a later time to the correct probable period), and instead reached much earlier levels, predating the height of the Bronze Age by about 58 allows people to access more information about a general history and human settlement (2002: 32-35). The purpose of most interventions is to encourage and facilitate public archaeology as a way of preserving heritages and encouraging connections to the past.

58 The rediscovery of the site by either Calvert or Schliemann has long been debated by scholars attempting to determine whether Calvert, who owned the land, was aware of the importance of Hişarlık when he revealed the tell to Schliemann or whether it was Schliemann who identified the site as the probable location of the Trojan War (Wood 1998: 52-57; Easton 2006:107-10). Frank Calvert and his brother Frederick excavated several sites in the Troad region that were later identified by scholars as associated with Troy, and the entire family had an obsession with the stories. Frank had found other sites, particularly Ophryneion and Larisa, mentioned in historical records as associated with Troy, and Frederick partially excavated what is now referred to as the “Tomb of Achilles.” But, Calvert seems to have believed for a long time that Troy lay more likely at Pınarbaşı than Hişarlık, since this was documented in Strabo. This caused substantial disagreement among other scholars, and culminated in Calvert allowing Schliemann to excavate Hişarlık (Allen 1999: 56-72).
1000 years. In the process, however, he did locate a substantial hoard of gold and other early artifacts [Figure 17], which helped bolster Schliemann’s appreciation for the site as that of the Kingdom of Priam.\textsuperscript{59} The investigation created a series of massive trenches through the center of the tell that were only partially excavated and documented,\textsuperscript{60} and remain at the site today [Figure 18], adding to the complicated public presentation, but most importantly providing Schliemann and the world at large with convincing evidence of the importance of his discovery.\textsuperscript{61}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{gold_diadem_earrings.png}
\caption{Gold diadem and earrings/pendants excavated by Heinrich Schliemann at Hişarlık, now in the Pushkin Museum, Moscow, Russia. Photo by Sailko.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{59} Interestingly, this hoard of gold has inspired comparisons to the patrimony issue of the Elgin Marbles. The majority of the gold was supposed snuck out of the country by Schliemann and brought back to Germany. At the advent of World War II, however, the gold was apparently removed and thought to have been lost until the 1990s when it was rediscovered in Russia. At the moment, there is no plan to return the gold to Troy, despite the Turkish government’s wish for repatriation for the interpretation of the site.

\textsuperscript{60} By today’s standard of excavation, which suggests that the past be sought through objectivity (Shanks and Tilley 1987: 8), Schliemann’s investigation was flawed from the beginning; he came seeking something specific, and therefore associated what he found with what he wanted to find. Although we today would consider it not properly excavated or documented, his investigation was typical of the mid-19\textsuperscript{th} century. Archaeologists at that time were largely romantic in their interest and often looking for specific evidence either related to biblical or classical history, therefore seeking out evidence for what was “known,” not the knowledge itself. In using this as a motivation, he was always destined to find what he wanted to find, thus leaving the site with associations that may have not been present if the site were excavated fully 100 years later.

\textsuperscript{61} Schliemann immediately proclaimed that the hoard was the Treasure of Priam, which helped him not only publicize the find internationally, but also helped to provide “proof” to the world that Schliemann had found the location of the Trojan War.
It was Wilhelm Dörpfeld, originally hired by Schliemann to draw accurate plans of Hişarlik, who later began what are considered to be the first “scientific” excavations at Troy, and who identified Schliemann’s discovery as predating the accepted date of the Trojan War. Dörpfeld’s drawings of Hişarlik proved very accurate; in fact, most architectural drawings of the site since then have been based on the Dörpfeld renderings [Figure 19].\(^\text{62}\) Carl Blegen and his team from the University of Cincinnati followed the investigations by Dörpfeld (1932-8), producing a number of scholarly works from the site and generally building on Dörpfeld’s investigation. Eventually excavations were continued into the present by The Troy Project under Manfred Korffmann, who established *Studia Troica* as the main publication of Hişarlik and related sites

\(^{62}\) Dörpfeld’s excavations were also well-documented and published in *Troja und Ilion: Ergebnisse der ausgrabungen in den vorhistorischen und historischen schichten von Ilion 1870-1894* (1902, Dörpfeld et al, Beck & Barth), an important resource for the early archaeology of Hişarlik.
from around the Troad.\textsuperscript{63} At Korfmann’s death in the late 20\textsuperscript{th} century, the directorship was passed to Ernst Pernicka, and then on to Ruestem Aslan, who currently holds the permit (Riorden 2009: 6-7).

Figure 19: Map of excavated remains at Ancient Troy by E. Riorden, C. Hunsaker, and K. Barry (from Riorden 2009), based on original architectural drawings by Dörpfeld.

The modern excavations under The Troy Project have focused on surveying the expanse of the settlement, particularly the lower city, in an attempt to find the exterior fortifications and palisade. Due to the wealth of material that has been excavated over the years, substantial work has been put into documenting and publishing the material remains before additional excavation work is initiated.

\textsuperscript{63} Please also see Korfmann’s \textit{Troia: Archäologie eines Siedlungshügels und seiner Landschaft} (2006), a collection of articles on different and more specific archaeological aspects of Ancient Troy.
As a result of the extensive excavations, archaeologists cite Troy as significant to the understanding of the historical world from the Early Bronze age through the Ottoman occupation of the area. The Bronze Age construction of the citadel and the dry moat surrounding the lower city remain exemplary examples of fortification practice, and Troy II boasts a particular pottery style that was exported all over the world in antiquity [Figure 20]. The city was mainly employed in agriculture and trade but the archaeology also speaks to the melding of cultural traditions at the transitional site over time. Despite a consistent history of settlement, the site was occupied by multiple ethnic or cultural groups, each of whom brought different traditions. This knowledge was gained from the excavations, which have been the source of substantial information about the daily life of Troy’s inhabitants beyond the gold and “treasure” that was originally publicized by Schliemann. Since his discovery, however, researchers have continued to debate not only whether there was a Trojan war, but also if the archaeological site could be the home of the famous citadel. Despite 150 years of wavering back and forth, there has never been any visual culture excavated at the site that would indisputably verify either claim. Therefore, excavations have progressed to research the site for what it is—a Bronze Age citadel that was resettled over several millennia with different intentions. Interestingly, despite the extensive archaeological research and publication about the known past of Troy, this information seems to be less well-known to travelers, whose experience, like Schliemann’s, tends to focus on the myth-history.

---

64 The most recent publication on the archaeology of Troy is a synthesized overview of the excavations, particularly for Greek and Roman Troy by Charles Brian Rose that was published in 2013. The book gives the most extensive account of the archaeological excavations up to this point, as well as the information learned from them.
Each research team since Schliemann has added to the information about the archaeological material, as well as the physical interpretation. In 2008, a masterplan was drawn up by Elizabeth Riorden from the University of Cincinnati, who identified future plans for the site, particularly with regard to the continued interpretation and presentation of the remains. The plan, published in 2009, identified conservation problems, redesigned many of the tourist facilities at the site, and perhaps most importantly, interviewed tourists to establish a baseline of how people viewed the archaeological site and interpretation. Many of the different excavators’ conservation and interpretation efforts remain a part of the current presentation, and were constructed under

---

65 This masterplan is used throughout the study to understand how tourists interact with the site and how the presentation affects their experience.
different funding sources, different directors, and during different periods of scholarship. As such, the conglomeration of design elements creates a varying interpretation for a site already difficult to present solely based on historical associations.

Although the presentation of the site as it exists today is complicated and potentially difficult for visitors to understand, it may be the extensive history of Trojan War visual culture and iconography that causes the biggest discrepancy in the modern understanding of the site. As artistic and literary interpretations of Ancient Troy and the Trojan War predate the current site interpretation by thousands of years, these specific associations that tourists can identify with may prevent them from seeing the archaeological excavation for what it really is.

3.4 Ancient Trojan War Tourism and Iconography

Even before Schliemann or Calvert’s discovery, the Troad peninsula experienced documented tourism specific to the Trojan War for thousands of years. The first believed descriptions of the geographic region as the site of the war and citadel of Priam begin with Homer in his iconic Iliad, which most modern scholars agree was composed in the 8th century BCE (please see Rose 1998; Luce 1998; Raaflaub 1998). The Iliad mentions a number of geographic features, including the Scamander and Simoeis Rivers, the proximity of the coastline, and Kallikolonê, a feature known today as Kara Tepe (Luce 1998: 55-67). These indicators around the Troad pointed to Hişarlık as the location that Homer was describing, and also helped bring Schliemann, a Homeric scholar, to the area. Well before Schliemann’s time, however, Greek colonists

---

66 Private funding sources for the site include Daimler-Chrysler and Seimens. Since funds are often provided for specific projects such as new signage, designs are usually approved or created by the company who is sponsoring the project, not necessarily those in charge of the archaeological site. Since the Daimler-Chrysler funding went to new signage, the company designed the new material, which did not necessarily match pre-existing signage.
traveled from the mainland in the 8th century BCE with the intent of reestablishing the ancient city, possibly using these and similar features to locate the same site (Wood 1996: 29). Because the city was never truly abandoned, as evidenced in the archaeological record (Rose 1998: 405), it is possible that the place-memory of Hişarlik as Troy remained until the arrival of the Greek colonists, who so believed in the site as the city of Priam, that they named/renamed the city Ilion after the repeated reference to Ilios in Homer’s poems (Luce 1998: 55; Wood 1996). This was the name of the city when Xerxes, the first documented Trojan War tourist, arrived at the site in the 480 BCE (Rose 1998: 407). His march through the area is described in Herodotus’ *Histories* (5th century BCE), as is his intentional visit to Hişarlik because of its Trojan War association. Herodotus writes:

> Then when the army had come to the river Scamander...when I say Xerxes had come to this river, he went up to the Citadel of Priam, having a desire to see it all; and having seen it and learnt by inquiry of all the events of the Trojan War, he sacrificed a thousand heifers to Athene of Ilion, and the Magian poured libations in honour of the heroes.

*Histories, 7.43.1-2* 67

Certainly the association was enough to draw Xerxes to pay homage to the place, and Herodotus specifically mentions his want “to see it all,” referring to the citadel, and presumably the architectural remains. At the time of his campaign, Xerxes would have had access to the stories, which must have sparked his imagination to see what the city may have actually looked like. Like many modern travelers, Xerxes seems to have been inspired to see the place presumably based on the literature that he had previously read or heard, and traveled with the intention of experiencing the built environment as a way to enhance his understanding and impression. What is interesting, however, about the ancient description is that, beyond the reference to the Citadel of Priam, there is no additional mention of any additional Trojan War visual culture that would

---

have been available to Xerxes. The archaeological record suggests that during the period of
Xerxes’s visit, the city was in economic decline but inhabited, meaning that the local population
must have pointed the ruler in the direction of the supposed citadel. But, there does not appear to
be any evidence to suggest that the inhabitants of the city were providing any association to the
ancient stories beyond the occasional visit from an interested and well-versed traveler (Rose
1998: 407). Even if visitors familiar with the stories came through, there was essentially
nothing to see as a tourist, beyond the ruins of a city that could not be visually tied to the ancient
fortress of Priam, as the city had since evolved in architectural style and population. But, Xerxes
apparently came with the intention of seeing something and, as suggested by Phillipe Borgeaud,
“behaves like a compliant tourist” as someone ostensibly shows him around (2010: 341).

After the visit by Xerxes, the mentality of Troy inhabitants seems to have changed as the local
population developed a way to promote and profit from ancient Trojan War tourism by the Late
Classical/Early Hellenistic Period (Rose 1998: 407). This may have been necessitated by an
increase in visitors specifically seeking the Trojan War site, and thus hoping to see something
directly associated with it. By the time Alexander the Great famously came to the site in 334
BCE, Plutarch describes him making sacrifices at an identifiable art/architectural feature
dedicated to Achilles:

Then, going up to Ilium, he sacrificed to Athena and poured libations to the heroes. Furthermore,
the gravestone of Achilles he anointed with oil, ran a race by it with his companions, naked, as is
the custom, and then crowned it with garlands, pronouncing the hero happy in having, while he
lived, a faithful friend, and after death, a great herald of his fame. As he was going about and
viewing the sights of the city, someone asked him if he wished to see the lyre of Paris. ‘For that
lyre,’ said Alexander, ‘I care very little; but I would gladly see that of Achilles, to which he used to
sing the glorious deeds of brave men.’

---

68 Important to note here is that written evidence from an ancient source cannot necessarily be read as specifically
literal and must be interpreted for some generic meaning. Many historians, Herodotus included, document accounts
after-the-fact, based on evidence that they do not always specify. They are also often accompanied by specific
quotes or speeches, which are even more difficult to verify.
The gravestone of Achilles referenced in Plutarch’s description has been tied to modern Beşik Tepe (also written as Beşiktepe) [Figure 21], the Turkish name for one of several tholos constructions that currently resides as part of the Troad landscape. The description also mentions a ‘lyre of Paris,’ which may be another piece of visual culture introduced in the city, intended specifically for tourism. Unlike Beşik Tepe, which survived to be excavated for evidence, there is no proof of a lyre having been preserved in the city, nor is there proof that the family of Priam as described by Homer ever existed at the site. The idea of a lyre surviving for a thousand years and being attributed to a member of the Trojan royal family is suspect enough, but it appears that, despite the lack of authenticity in the object in question, the local people could have been promoting such individual objects and places associated with the Trojan War for ancient tourists to see, further enhancing an early interpretation of the site.
Another account of Alexander’s travels in the area, described by Roman historian Arrian in his *Anabasis*, also mentions Alexander’s interest in Trojan War sites. This helps to solidify the claim that this was his purpose in visiting, but also complicate what is known of the visual culture at the time:

At Elaeum he offered sacrifice upon the tomb of Protesilaus, who was supposed to have been the first man of Agamemnon’s army to set foot on the soil of Asia when the Greeks sailed against Troy…Once ashore, he traveled inland to Troy and offered sacrifice to Athena, patron goddess of the city; here he made a gift of his armour to the temple and took in exchange, from where they hung on the temple walls, some weapons which were still preserved from the Trojan war. These are supposed to have been carried before him by his bodyguard when he went into battle. He is also said to have offered a sacrifice to Priam on the altar of Zeus Herkeios, to avert his anger against the family of Neoptolemus, whose blood still ran in his own veins.

*Anabasis*, 1.11.13-1.12.2

Like Plutarch, Arrian was writing well after Alexander’s conquest, so it is easy to assume that some specific details may have been fabricated for the sake of the story. But what is interesting

---

to note with both descriptions is that there appears to be specific objects, structures, or other visual culture identified by locals as evidence of the Trojan War. Arrian mentions weapons that are “still preserved” from the Trojan War and another presumed tomb located in the area as well. Although both Plutarch and Arrian detail different portions of the travel, the theme is the same—Alexander visits Troy to experience it, and finds many objects of visual culture to see.

These ancient sources help to corroborate some of the archaeological evidence in the area, and suggest that by Alexander’s visit, the Troad featured several architectural constructions related to the Trojan War: a series of tombs each dedicated to a hero or important figure, including individual tombs for Ajax, Achilles, and Patroclus, among others. Visually, the tombs must have been believable to ancient travelers, because even Alexander associated the design with the Trojan War, believing the Tomb of Achilles (Beşik Tepe) to actually possess the remains of the hero, and therefore leaving an offering at the site. Modern excavations [Figure 22] by Manfred Korfmann of the University of Tübingen, Germany, revealed that the so-called tomb had, in fact, been built in the Hellenistic Period.\(^{72}\) He writes: “Thus the ancient visitor to the port of Troy was confronted with a gleaming white cone in the midst of the landscape” (Korfmann 1988: 193).\(^{73}\)

Beyond the presumed association that this architectural type would provide for ancient visitors, there is no other logical explanation for constructing the feature as a *tholos* [Figure 23], a type of architectural feature that had not been used for new construction in more than a thousand years. This suggests that the design was a fully intentional act on the part of the local inhabitants to

---

\(^{72}\) The site was previously excavated by Schliemann and Dörpfeld, who discovered a limited amount of pottery, all from the fourth/third century BCE, which would date to the Hellenistic occupation of Troy (Alcock 1997: 27).

\(^{73}\) Cook asserts that the ancients themselves struggled with the discrepancy in Homer’s described Troad and what they actually encountered for tourism. He writes: The ancients too had their ‘False Troy’ heresy, their problem of the ‘Springs of Scamander,’ their ‘No Space for the Battlefield’ quandary…(1973: 188). Constructing the tombs seems to be the method that the ancients used to rectify one of these discrepancies for visitors.
reference the accepted date of the Trojan War, and provide visual culture that would believably associate with it. It is therefore safe to assume that the site was already experiencing a significant number of visitors interested in experiencing Trojan War sites, which Alexander’s visit would further encourage, and that the Hellenistic inhabitants seem to have believed that having one or more iconographic monuments would encourage the visual association, as the rest of the site was lacking in identifiable Trojan War architecture.

Figure 22: Utta Gabriel standing in form front of the excavated profile of the so-called Tomb of Achilles. Photo courtesy of the Troia Projekt.

74 Brian Rose suggests that at the time that this tumulus was constructed, Troy was inhabited as a “fully Greek” city, with similar culture to that of mainland Greece (1998: 408). This would suggest that the inhabitants had an awareness of Bronze Age remains on the mainland, particularly those popular at Mycenae, and were replicating this style for other Greek travelers to recognize.

75 Although the style had not been used since the bronze age, there were once other examples of tholos tombs in the general area of Troy. Susan Alcock cites an example at Boeotian Orchomenos, which was excavated by Schliemann, and found to have been modified in the Hellenistic period to accommodate sanctuary practices, possibly honoring the hero Minyas (1997: 28). This would provide a direct correlation for the tholos acting as the architectural style for hero worship, and may be part of the reason that the Hellenistic designers chose the style.

76 Interesting to note is that at the same time as the Classical and Hellenistic populations were enhancing the built environment around the site, the Trojan War was beginning to be depicted as iconographically different in art as well, suggesting a greater interest in the particulars of the legends and their development, and also how the visual culture was being presented to a wide audience. Brian Rose suggests that it is the connection being made between the Trojans and the Persians that not only draws the stories again into popularity, but possibly changes original sympathies toward the Trojans and enhances the profile of the Greek heroes, necessitating the tombs for the now-Greek population: “Prior to the fifth century B.C.E. the iconography of the Trojans in Greek vase painting was more or less indistinguishable from that of the Greeks-they dressed the same, worshipped the same gods, and engaged in the same kinds of everyday activities. But during the Persian Wars in the early fifth century the iconography begins to change, and by the end of the century there are artistic representations of Trojan men in oriental garb more or less indistinguishable from that of the Persians. In other words, the Trojans and Persians were grouped together as peoples of Asia and the former was assimilated to the latter” (1998: 407-8).
The tumuli were essentially acting as some of the earliest tourist architecture in the world, encouraging visitors to engage with the ancient remains and leave goods as offerings to the heroes. Through visual association, the constructions served as a concrete reference to a shared cultural or literary heritage that was previously not established architecturally with the actual remains of the city. This was the beginning of the manipulation of the local built environment with the specific intention of enhancing it for tourism, creating a designed experience in order to accommodate visitors. Although the tumuli began the trend, further development around the Troad continued the tradition of referencing the Trojan War through architecture and design, a practice that has continued even to the modern interpretation of the site.

Figure 23: Tholos construction at Mycenae, Greece. Photo by author, 2012.
Following Alexander’s visit to the Troad and his promise of patronage to the city, the expanding area became the center of a new league celebrating the cult of Athena Ilias. This helped to reinforce the connection of New Ilion to the Trojan War stories, and would have brought additional international fame to the geographic region. As a result, new Trojan War visual iconography became much more prevalent in the Troad, helping to continue the promotion of Trojan War tourism. By the 2nd century BCE, the frieze of the Temple of Apollo Smitheus [Figure 24], a structure referenced in the Iliad and located in the Troad south of Hişarlık, even featured a unique scene of Odysseus carrying wood to build the Trojan Horse (Rose 1998: 407).

This increased activity in Trojan War iconography provides insight into the ancient inhabitants’ possible mindset when tourism really began to increase in the area. The growing inclusion of
Trojan War-associated monuments could mean that either the local population believed that Greco-Roman New Ilion/Hişarlik was the actual site of the war, or that they were specifically exploiting foreigners’ beliefs by marketing it in such a way. In his article “Troy and the Historical Imagination,” Charles Brian Rose, an archaeologist who previously worked with The Troy Project, discusses the extensive data found at Hişarlık and around the Troad that can be thought of as associated with the Trojan War, as well as the competing narratives that these remains provide. Rose asserts that it is really the myth-historical narrative that influences the physical development of the area as evidenced by artifacts found depicting Trojan War scenes, as well as historical accounts beginning with Herodotus in the 5th century BCE (Rose 1998: 407-10). Following the rise in popularity of the legend during the time of Julius Caesar, and later due in part to Virgil’s Aeneid, Augustus took the small city on the Troad under his patronage specifically because of its association with the Trojan War, deemed a part of his own “family ancestry,” and that of Rome itself. Rose writes:

It should be clear by now that Troy was not just an ancient city, but rather a concept that could be molded to fit a variety of times and places. One is left with the question of what ‘Troy’ means today to the occupants of the Troad...Most of them have visited the archaeological site and heard about the legends since they were child, and they would tell you that Troy would always occupy a central place in their lives (Rose 1998: 412).

Essentially, it was likely irrelevant to the ancient inhabitants whether the area had physically seen the battle of heroes, because for the purpose of tourism and ancestral beliefs, the site could be considered that of the Trojan War, and used in this association.

It is important to note that these architectural references to the Trojan War were not the only visual culture associated with the stories of which ancient people would have been aware, and which helped to reinforce the idea of a visual depiction in the minds of ancient peoples. Heroic themes in particular were popular motifs for painted vessels, and after the declaration of Troy as
the mother city of Rome in Virgil’s *Aeneid*, Trojan War-themed frescoes and paintings also became a popular option for the walls of wealthy Roman citizens. These helped to develop and reinforce a visual history that was being formulated thousands of miles from the Troad. They promoted the continued belief in certain stories and elements of the Trojan War, and provided specific depictions, imagined from literary scenes, which helped to build a collection of associated imagery thousands of miles from the proposed site. Together with the tumuli, this visual culture was already establishing a tradition that can be associated with Urry’s tourist gaze, centered at Troy, encouraging tourists to visit the site through the newly created imagined landscape.

### 3.5 Troy and the Development of the Modern World

Since the stories of Ancient Troy were never really lost, the historiography has been significantly perpetuated through literature and supposed familial connections into the 19th and 20th centuries, which continued the ancient tradition of Trojan War visual culture, but also used the proposed associations in early nation-building. By the Middle Ages, Ancient Troy had become a popular literary theme [Figure 25], and a central catalyst of royal European familial heritage. Most ruling families in Europe and the Ottoman Empire sought to trace their lineage back to King Priam as a way of establishing their noble right to rule—making Troy the “first” real kingdom in their minds. Royal families from France, England, Sweden/Norway, Iceland, Italy, etc. have all tied their histories back to the famous war, and have claimed Troy as their homeland, even when accounts were potentially contradictory with either traditional religious beliefs or political conflicts. For example, at one point several European kingdoms and the Ottoman Empire were fighting over the same plot of land in western Turkey, both identifying the area as that of their forefathers. In both cases, they were claiming to
“artifacts” or visual culture, since many of these countries felt the need to prove ties to Troy through visual means.\footnote{Over several centuries, these types of founding stories and their associated artifacts littered Europe and the Near East, creating an interesting array of hybrid visual culture, where representations of Ancient Troy or its literary elements were commonplace and used as national symbols. The French identified with stories of heroic love, and translated Ancient Troy into a have descended from the same family of Priam, making them relatives according to the genealogy, but due to contemporary political issues, neither would share claim to the land (MacMaster 2013). Similarly, in order to solidify the right to rule, one Icelandic royal family tied their blood line back not only to include the family of King Priam, but also Biblical heroes Noah and Adam, as well as Scandinavian gods Odin and Thor, with one source in the Prose Edda stating that Thor himself was a descendent of the family of Priam (Walther 2013).\footnote{Perhaps most notable of the European Trojan War artifacts is the Brutus Stone, the spot where Brutus of Troy supposedly stepped ashore in London, England to found the country after arriving from the ancient citadel (MacMaster 2013). These types of artifacts become sacred to their home countries, since physical objects are often used as “proof” of historical accounts. Although archaeological evidence cannot tie the Brutus Stone in any way to Ancient Troy, the fact that there is a physical object associated with the story helps to perpetuate the idea of visual culture having an impact on history.}
romantic tourism destination. The individual ideas and stories stemming from the Trojan War were routinely referenced in relation to contemporary warfare in modern literature and media.\footnote{For examples of each of these, please see Desbois 2013, Vivante 2013, Goldwyn 2013, and Jenkins 2013.} By the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, Trojan War cultural production included everything from references to Achilles in heavy metal music to the animated reimagining of the Trojan War starring the Cossacks as the historical Greeks and being held at bay with pickles and vodka by the “Trojans” (Johansson 2013; Andrianova 2013). Although many of these representations have little to do with the archaeological site now identified as Ancient Troy, they do help to show the cultural influence of the stories and different types of media that were drawn into the association when assessing the Trojan War’s continued to impact world visual culture beyond the site of Hişarlık.

3.6 The Modern Tourism Gaze: The Archaeological Site of Troy

Today, visual culture is no less influential for modern tourists than was true for ancient ones. However, with the development of technology and the previously-described possibility of creating “archaeological Disneylands,” sites that initially focused on education are now forced to combat the impressions created by outside and entertainment influences. Like many historic sites, Ancient Troy is faced with these concerns, particularly through associations with the myth-history of the Trojan War and its iconography.

As with its ancient counterpart, the most common influences on tourists prior to arrival at the archaeological site are forms of visual media; in present-day, these include film or other widespread or popular visual resources. Movies allow stories to be told to millions of people, while also providing a visual and sometimes iconic backdrop associated with a historical place. Troy presents a clear example. Core parts of Homer’s \textit{Iliad} can be found in Wolfgang Petersen’s
2004 blockbuster film, *Troy*, which alongside the story itself, provides an entire imagined architectural landscape for the city of Priam [Figure 26]. Although many sites have found that historical movies help to draw visitors to struggling places, they also provide a readily available interpreted landscape, rarely based in reality. Urry writes, “Places are chosen to be gazed upon because there is an anticipation, especially through daydreaming and fantasy… Such anticipation is sustained through a variety of non-tourist practices, such as film…” (1990: 3). In the case of *Troy*, the architectural and artistic landscape rendered on the screen does not match the archaeological evidence uncovered at Hişarlık, nor what tourists to the area find upon arrival. Rather, the film provides an aesthetic experience based in a fictional landscape and intended to engage the senses, the main purpose behind this type of action adventure. The created stage of *Troy* successfully produces a backdrop for an epic story, but is in no way authentic to the history of the excavated archaeological site. It seems as though the decision to diverge from the authentic landscape was a purposeful one, since it would not provide the visual qualities that the producers had in mind when seeking locations. When archaeologists at the site approached the production company to provide information on the ancient landscape, producers politely declined their offer and stated that they wished to make representation of Ancient Troy on film as large as it would be in viewers’ imaginations, suggesting that people seeing the film would have a preconceived notion of how the city of Troy should look, and the production wanted to live up to that standard (Rose 2013). Despite questions of authenticity by the specialized audience, after the release of the film, tourism revenue at the site rose 73% (Hudson & Brent Ritchie 2006: 389),

80 For specific resources on film’s impact on tourism, see Hudson & Brent Ritchie 2006, Rewtrakunphaiboon 2009, and Edensor 2005, each of which explains the phenomenon through statistical analysis of tourism numbers and film dates. Hudson & Brent Ritchie specifically cite “popular” films as influencing tourism to filming locations (2006: 389-90). In the case of Peterson’s *Troy*, however, the visuals were created and shot in Malta and Mexico, not in Çanakkale, Turkey, which is the region that experienced the growth in tourism after the release of the film. This sets the archaeological site apart from other filming locations, because the destination that tourists are seeking through destination film tourism actually exist, and are used as backdrops, whereas for *Troy*, the visual that is being seen on film and the destination to travel to are two different locations.
showing the impact that the film had on destination tourism to the area by a more general audience.

Figure 26: Widely-distributed publicity image for Petersen's *Troy* film depicting the city of Priam, 2004. Image copyright of Warner Brothers Production Company.

While increasing revenue is integral to the survival of many archaeological sites, the increase in tourists specifically inspired by the film means a rise in the number of people arriving at the site with specific visual expectation, hoping to relive the architectural landscapes represented in the movie. Unfortunately for Ancient Troy, the archaeological remains and existent visual culture in no way reflect the fictional architectural landscapes or large-scale marble sculpture suggested by the film [Figure 27]. As a result, interviews at the site conducted in 2008 and 2011 revealed that
some visitors were less impressed with the archaeological remains than other features at the site, and some also expressed that the site was not what they expected it to be (Riorden 2009: 24-27). This suggests that modern visitors to the site, like their ancient counterparts, arrive with certain expectations that are not met. These may be experiential or visual.

![Figure 27: Existing architectural remains at Ancient Troy. Photo by author, 2008.](image)

There is one feature at the site, however, that provides visitors with the visual culture that they seem to expect in relation to the Trojan War: a large, wooden sculpture, titled *Trojan Horse*, by

---

81 The 2008 survey documented in *The Troy Site Management Plan* (2009) used seven main questions to observe where tourists were coming from and what they liked and did not like about the site, including which aspects of the site were most impressive to them. Low on the list of response were the “authenticity” and “seeing archaeology,” with both competing with strong responses from “The Horse” (to be discussed further in detail) and “Specific Monuments.”
Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism\textsuperscript{82} architect Izzet Senemoglu, completed in 1975 [Figure 28]. The 60-foot installation was proposed by the director of the Çanakkale Archaeological Museum and funded by the Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism\textsuperscript{83} as a centerpiece for the 1975 Troia Festivali, or International Troy Festival. The festival, which celebrates a long history of peaceful resolutions in the Çanakkale region, often includes activities at the archaeological site and is a large draw for tourism each year.\textsuperscript{84} Although the design was conceived from Senemoglu’s imagination as an “homage to the original” (“Wooden Horse of Troy” 2010: 1), the very presence of the horse seems to confirm for visitors, an association of the site with the Trojan War, and particularly the story of the Trojan Horse.

\textsuperscript{82} This title is sometimes listed as “Turkish Tourist Association” or “Turkish Tourist Development Agency” (Ottaway 1991: 55-59).

\textsuperscript{83} What is interesting to note here is that although the excavation has worked with the Ministry of Culture as an overseeing organization for many years, archaeologists were not involved in the construction of the horse as part of the archaeological site. Maria O’Donovan and Lynda Carroll note: “As a theme and a context for understanding the recent past, tourism has largely been ignored by archaeologists…the changes initiated by the rise of tourism over the past 150 years have created not just an industry but also a culture of tourism within the context of global capitalism and consumer society” (2011: 192). This means that archaeologists and governments can be at odds between encouraging mass tourism and encouraging authenticity. Senemoglu’s Horse sits as the crux of these two concepts, having been conceived and built by the government to encourage tourism, but in opposition to the scientific research taking place.

\textsuperscript{84} Although the festival is meant to celebrate continuing peace in the region, the construction and presentation of the sculpture as part of the festival was within a year of the Turkish invasion of Cyprus in 1974, creating a complicated discourse between the festival, horse, and the troubled political situation. There is no evidence to suggest that the construction at the site in 1975 had anything to do with government military action, but the significance of timing cannot be ignored, particularly with the continued use of the horse as a graphic element in subsequent Troia Festivali posters and the continuation of a festival celebrating peace that is not necessarily being practiced. Although the average visitor may not be aware of the political significance of the horse, it can still be seen as representative of a false history encouraged in a propagandistic way and as influential on another type of associated gaze.
The sculpture serves a purpose similar to that of the Hellenistic tombs, that is providing visitors with a reference to the Trojan War where none existed previously. But recently the horse has become more recognizable to an international audience than the archaeological remains, tilting the balance at the site in favor of entertainment and away from education. Beyond its very presence, a number of factors accentuate its visual impact and growing infamy. Its placement at the entrance to the site in the center of a cleared area [Figure 29] makes it the first and largest piece of visual culture experienced by entering visitors, helping to further impact initial impressions and create a preconceived visual ideal of what the archaeological site will present. The horse is the first encounter that visitors have at the site, creating a possibly dishonest, even inauthentic, discourse between the archaeological remains and the potential myth-history. At the same time, it must be acknowledged that Senemoglu’s sculpture was always intended to be an
innocent photo opportunity or interactive experience for visitors. Created during the 1970s when personal photography was a growing trend, the horse provided a way for visitors to interact physically with part of the archaeological site [Figure 30], which is often not permitted with material remains in an effort to preserve world heritage. The sculpture allows people not only to touch and experience a feature at the site, but also to climb into it, and in a way, become a part of history.

It is not just experiencing Senemoglu’s *Trojan Horse* first hand that has led to both its notoriety and its influence on visitor perception. The development of photography has also played a large role in helping to establish the sculpture as an icon directly related to the site. Susan Sontag suggests in her iconic *On Photography*, that “To collect photographs is to collect the world” (1977: 3), a statement that is certainly valid in historical tourism. Although for Sontag, the ability to share pictures was dependent on having them printed, the development in digital technology has helped photo-sharing to reach an all-time high. When Senemoglu’s horse was constructed, photos would have to be published in popular periodicals to be shared worldwide. Now, internet search engines, such as Google Images, Flickr and even social networking sites like Facebook, allow interested people to have hundreds of thousands of photos at their fingertips instantly, without having any physical connection to the photographer or more importantly, the object.
Figure 29: The approach to the archaeological site from the parking area, featuring the horse as the centerpiece of a small sculpture garden. The sculpture towers over the column fragments and even the small museum, whose roof can be seen to the right behind the horse. Photo by author, 2011.

Figure 30: People interacting with the horse. Photo by Radomil, 2005.
For archaeological sites with little publicity, this availability of images is a way to promote awareness of what the site has to offer. In the case of Troy, however, the most available photo opportunity is the Trojan Horse sculpture, making it one of the most commonly distributed images related to the site. In a reworking of Stuart Hall’s “Circle of Representation” (1997: 1) Olivia Jenkins approaches the subject through imagery, illustrating how travelers view tourist destination images prior to arrival at the site and specifically attempt to repeat the image once there [Figure 31] (2003: 308). Urry agrees, suggesting that cameras and the availability of imagery have changed travel and enhanced the concept of “sightsee,” meaning that images that tourists are exposed to ahead of the site are what will be repeated by later travelers, and therefore that the same travel “memories” are sought (2002: 129). For Senemoglu’s sculpture, the standard image is consistently repeated, helping to reinforce its iconographic status as one of the main pieces of visual culture available at Troy. Unlike other visual media intended for tourism, the popularity of the horse is perpetuated mainly by other tourists. In a series of image searches through the Google Images search engine, the term “Trojan Horse” provided an average of more pictures of Senemoglu’s horse than any other single representation of a Trojan Horse [Figure 32]. Before the 2004 Troy film produced another constructed horse and new tourist destination in Turkey [Figure 33], Senemoglu’s sculpture would have been by far the most recognizable and represented example.

85 Searches were done once a week during the months of December 2011 and January 2012. On average, the search engine provided a total of 234 images over 8 pages. Senemoglu’s sculpture averaged 52 photos of the 234. Following Senemoglu’s Trojan Horse, the sculpture used in the Wolfgang Peterson 2004 Movie Troy that is now in the Çanakkale harbor had an average or 42 images out of 234.
Figure 31: Revised Cycle of Representation (after Hall 1997) for Senemoglu's sculpture. Image by author.

Figure 32: Google Image search (January 2012) for the term "Trojan Horse," showing Senemoglu's sculpture as the preferred depiction.
This rapidity of images accessed through modern technology has contributed to the notoriety of photos of Senemoglu’s Horse as a particular image composition, enhanced by the ease in replicating an exact image. Before the advent of digital photography, to experience the image, one would have had to be in contact with the photographer or visit the site in person. With constant advances in technology, images are more and more accessible, without the need for travel, creating a type of digital tourism, promoting destinations through popular imagery. Urry seems to describe the phenomenon best writing, “People are tourists most of the time whether they are literally mobile or only experience simulated mobility through the incredible fluidity of multiple signs and electronic images” (1995: 148). Even with the availability of hundreds of different images, constantly repeated subject matter will have the most impact on what is both recognized and understood by those accessing the images. In the case of Troy, these images construct a visual myth, suggesting what tourists expect to see.
Generally, the photos taken and shared are of people climbing on the sculpture and having their picture taken; however, the horse is also mentioned in a number of tour books as a “don’t miss” monument and features prominently in the government-produced promotional brochures for traveling in Çanakkale (Republic of Turkey Ministry of Culture and Tourism 2007). The horse is, in fact, the most replicated image in the brochure, which could show a perceived preference. In other distributed imagery, such as a cultural heritage postcard available for purchase all over Turkey, the horse is included as the sole indicator of the location of the site [Figure 34]. The horse may be considered the most culturally recognizable piece of architecture and thus helpful in encouraging tourism by playing to what the public will already know something about or easily understand.

Figure 34: Map of tourism cultural heritage tourism site postcard, depicting Senemoglu’s sculpture as the indicator for Ancient Troy.

86 In the government produced brochure of the entire Çanakkale region, Senemoglu’s Horse is the cover image, which is followed by an inset image on the introduction page, and a full page image as part of a four page spread about the archaeological site, whereas archaeological remains at Troy are only shown in two smaller images. The brochure was produced by the Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism but edited by A. Kasım Sonkaya and Serap Şahin Durmuş, both archaeologists. It appears to represent the influence of tourism even over national archaeological authenticity.

87 Jonas Larsen writes that “the ‘tourist gaze’ suggests that tourists are folded into a world of texts, images and representational technologies when gazing in and upon landscapes,” meaning that they are constantly consuming these types of images during travel, helping to perpetuate ideas of places to visit, and constantly involved in reinterpretation (2006: 246).
The sheer number of tourism photographs shared publicly in this way is representative of a growing travel trend, known to researchers as “‘I was here’ tourism.” As digital cameras have continuously become more affordable, making them available to the general public, there has been a significant rise in this type of tourism, where photographs themselves have become one of the most common souvenirs of travelers. These souvenirs also help to spread the international knowledge of the site as a result of the immediacy with which they can be shared with others (Bell & Lyall 2005: 139-140). Digital photographs taken on cell phones can be texted or emailed to friends a world away or even posted directly to Facebook pages and other types of social media. As Urry writes, “To photograph is in some way to appropriate the object being photographed” (1990: 138).

Senemoglu’s horse allows the visitor to photograph and therefore appropriate the visual culture, but also become a part of the visual culture itself by climbing inside the horse and being part of the photograph, and then sharing this experience with friends. Not only does it result in the distribution of the photograph raising the feature’s iconic status, but it is letting visitors inhabit “history,” consequently enhancing Urry’s concept of the tourist gaze. The horse provides a way for archaeological visitors, especially children, to interact with history in a way that the ancient walls and adult-oriented signage do not. Additionally, Senemoglu’s Trojan Horse is the representation often used in inexpensive souvenirs available for purchase.

---

88 Claudia Bell and John Lyall coin the term as part of their publication on image-sharing and tourism (2005: 135).
89 This has been further perpetuated by the invention of the camera phone, which means that travelers can quickly photograph something without the having to even carry a separate camera.
90 It appears that Susan Sontag would agree with this, writing “As photographs give people an imaginary possession of a past that is unreal, they also help people to take possession of space in which they are insecure” (1977: 10). She is essentially saying that people can experience the world, and potentially history, through photographs, and that they are then inherently and personally tied to the subject matter of those photographs. Particularly with travel photograph of historical monuments, it adds to the experiential quality of a place, and the architecture at the site (Senemoglu’s Horse) encourages this association.
91 One travel writer specifically remarked: “Standing 10 metres high, the horse…is impressive but ought to have made any recipient immediately suspicious. Those wooden steps and handrail leading into its belly are something of a giveaway, as is the little hut, with shuttered windows, where the saddle should be. If the Trojans didn’t suspect anything when Agamemnon left this booby-trap behind, then they deserved to be slaughtered. Still, it makes for a good photo, unlike the ruins themselves” (Mourby 2004: 1).
outside the Troy gates [Figure 35]. Through the souvenirs, this particular sculptural representation becomes portable, allowing people to physically appropriate that particular horse representation as a reminder of their visit to the site.

Figure 35: Wooden figurine of Senemoglu's sculpture, purchased outside the Archaeological Site of Ancient Troy, 2008.

The impact of the sculpture on visitor impressions of history is further exacerbated by the lack of visible signage properly identifying its provenance [Figure 36]. Subsequently, several tourists interviewed in Riorden’s 2008 study expressed their belief that the sculpture was in fact the ancient horse from the stories and that it had been excavated at the site. The same study revealed that over the course of observation in the summer of 2008, multiple tour buses arrived with patrons who disembarked, photographed the horse, and left without viewing the archaeological
material at all. For groups that did experience the archaeology, many ranked Senemoglu’s horse
as one of the elements that impressed them most, above “authenticity” and “archaeology”
(Riorden 2009: 24-27). For these groups, the horse appears to be the most important piece of
visual culture related to the historic site, and likely what they expected to see, as opposed to the
archaeological remains, a concrete example of how perceptions upon arrival can impact what
people choose to see as part of history.

Figure 36: Garden featuring Senemoglu's sculpture without visible signage identifying provenance. Photo by author, 2011.

But there are other factors potentially influencing people’s preference of the sculpture to the
archaeological remains. The horse can be seen as the most visually relatable and understandable
structure for a wide audience at the site. With audiences less-experienced in archaeology visiting
historic sites in the last century, ancient architecture can be difficult to present to the public in an easily understandable way. Compared with other popular archaeological sites in Turkey, Ancient Troy lacks gleaming marble reconstructions and recognizable architectural forms [Figure 37], and instead presents the results of numerous confused conservation attempts and includes unidentifiable defensive walls, many of which retain only their foundations [Figure 38]. In contrast, Senemoglu’s horse provides a recognizable architectural representation, making it easy to understand by itself, playing a similar role to the Hellenistic tombs for ancient travelers. The sculpture provides tourists with a piece of history related to the familiar story. Put simply, the average visitor would not recognize the significance of a Troy II mudbrick wall [Figure 39], but most have heard the story of the Trojan Horse or seen it referenced graphically in some way.  

---

92 Ephesus and Pergamon, two of the other highly-visited sites in Turkey, each feature marble reconstructions on a massive scale, which is more in line with what visitors expect to see at ancient Greco-Roman sites. According to Hartwig Schmidt, this relates to the idea of “completeness” and when sites do not feature complete architecture, they are more difficult to accommodate for tourism. He cites a similar problem in Greece, where visitors come with impressions that are not always met through the ruins that exist. Schmidt explains: “Today’s tourists, mostly on tours around the Peloponessse, arrive by bus expecting a quick and simple presentation of impressive ruins. In this respect Olympia cannot compete with other sites, for in the third century AD its buildings were systematically dismantled in order to build the fortress walls around the innermost sanctuary” (1999: 63-64). Troy falls under a similar category—its location and rules of the Turkish government dictate that most visitors arrive by tour bus for a specific period of time, and expectations are not met when they observe defensive architecture instead of what they would ordinarily recognize. One reviewer who visited the region remarks “After experiencing Ephesus and Pergamon, Troy is a bit of a let-down, as you don't have the same feeling of understanding the way of life as it once was,” despite the fact that a lot of the archaeology at Troy has been focused on Bronze Age life (“OK, if you happen to be in the neighborhood ... but not really worth an out-of-the-way visit!” 2013: 1).  

93 The greater public’s understanding of the Trojan Horse may also be related to the broad cultural exposure individuals have to the object or idea. “Trojan Horse” is referenced repeatedly in our modern culture as a concept, rather than in reference to an actual horse. It has been used to describe types of deception, including computer viruses, helping to perpetuate the term even when disassociated from the actual Trojan War, and making a representation of the horse more commonplace in modern and even ancient culture. It is also one of the more popular stories of the Trojan War for a modern population, perhaps because it is the culmination of the action. Although a few examples of Trojan Horse depictions exist from Greek antiquity, the most famous of which is referred to as the Mykonos Vase (ca. 7th century BCE), the more popular artistic themes related to hero stories, most of which are associated with Homer’s Iliad and Odyssey. But, during Roman antiquity, the horse begins to graphically eclipse the hero stories, and continues to be a more common theme in the modern era. The hero stories, which include themes of heroism, triumph, and the overcoming of adversity, seem to be an ancient draw to the site, particularly for leaders in the process of waging war, but there are few graphic standards for depicting these after Greek antiquity. The Trojan Horse may be a more easily grasped iconic symbol associated with the same stories, allowing for a certain standard of scene. As part of the ease in graphic depiction, the Trojan Horse also becomes an
Figure 37: Hellenistic-Roman architectural remains at Ephesus, Turkey. Photo by author, 2008.

Figure 38: Architectural remains at the archaeological site of ancient Troy. Photo by author, 2008.

iconic idea, representing trickery or intelligence, helping to increase the range of recognition. With the reemergence of the ancient stories during the Renaissance, the Trojan Horse once again became popular for artists, seemingly because of the story concepts. With examples ranging from 15th century woodcuts to an 1880 depiction of “The Democratic Trojan Horse” in Harper’s Weekly, the evolution of Trojan Horses has led to increasing associations with the concept, sparking hundreds of years of visual culture from which a modern audience can draw understanding.
3.7 The Legacy of Interpretation at Troy

The ongoing development of the archaeological site may also indirectly influence the preference for Senemoglu’s *Horse* over the archaeological remains. Many of the archaeological remains are in various stages of conservation [Figure 40] or are difficult for a non-specialized audience to understand or enjoy, creating a discrepancy between the historical importance of the site and

---

94 Mourby writes: “Excavation of the site in the 20th century was much more painstaking but the presentation remains inadequate. Only one attempt has been made at re-creation: a small section of outer wall from Homer’s time where the lower levels are of local stone and the top built up out of red mud bricks. Everything else is disappointing and the site seems to know this. It has a weary air - it knows that an opportunity was missed” (2004: 1). But, other visitors with varying levels of experience with archaeological tourism enjoyed the site, even while acknowledging the problems with the interpretation. One writes, “I thoroughly enjoyed the visit to the site. Schliemann’s actions are part of the discovery of ancient Troy and its excavation. The site does not downplay his mistakes. It was enlightening to visit his original trench. The site is quite complicated, with remains of 9 civilizations excavated at various locales within the site. They do a very good job of clearly presenting the various civilization ruins” (“Ancient Troy Excellent to Visit” 2013: 1).
the current presentation for a wide audience. Despite the money that was allocated to restoring Senemoglu’s *Horse* in 2007, there are still a number of conservation issues that have yet to be address from the 2009 Troy Masterplan suggesting a preference to tourism on the part of the government as well as the average patron.

![Partial gate reconstruction as part of the Troy citadel. Photo by author, 2008.](image)

But Senemoglu’s sculpture and the Hellenistic tumuli continue to influence the international architectural community in yet another way. They represent the emergence of battlefield monuments; designs intended specifically to commemorate battles, moments, or people associated with war, a tradition that began in antiquity. There is a substantial amount of historical evidence to suggest that the acknowledgement of the victor was considered important to ancient civilizations after a critical war or battle, which is evidenced in inscriptions and even artistic
portrayals from Egypt, Greece, and Rome. The ancient Greek landscape was once scattered with sculptural depictions of Nike, goddess of victory. But the architecture at Ancient Troy is significantly different from these other types of visual culture, since they are tomb constructions specifically installed at a supposed battlefield and named for individuals. This type of depiction is much rarer and far fewer examples exist in the ancient world.\textsuperscript{95}

The Hellenistic tombs were intentionally designed not in the aesthetic of the time in which they were constructed, but to look much older and be associated with the accepted date of the Trojan War in the ancient world. This shows not only the insight of the local population to the possibility of tourism promotion, but also that as battlefield monuments, the tumuli needed to be believable to the traveling public. They provided visual culture to a site that was lacking it, but were also objects specifically designed to look ancient, as opposed to other contemporary war monuments, such as numerous victory depictions, or even grave markers.\textsuperscript{96} The biggest difference seems to be that the Hellenistic tombs at Troy were built several hundred years after the assumed date of the Trojan War, as opposed to being produced in the few years after, leaving it up to the local inhabitants, as opposed to the victors, to interpret the battlefield for a visiting audience through visual culture, something commonly done today with battlefield tourism.

From a cultural heritage standpoint, battlefields are notoriously difficult to interpret, since most consist mainly of a rolling landscape with little associated visual culture. But, the tumuli and

\textsuperscript{95} It must be noted that the concept of a constructed tomb is common in the ancient world, but not necessarily at the location of a battle. Instead, these types of tombs are typically associated with rulers or members of the aristocracy and are either installed in a particular person’s home area, or as part of a larger cemetery complex, and singular battlefield monuments are more closely associated with individual sculptures or markers, not architectural spaces.

\textsuperscript{96} An example of usual battlefield markers can be found at Marathon. These inscribed constructions, including a column with sculpture and a stele with epigram, and are detailed by A. E. Raubitschek in the \textit{American Journal of Archaeology} (1940). These are much more commonly erected by the victor to acknowledge bravery, and give thanks to the gods for success.
even Senemoglu’s sculpture provide a precedent for the installation of architecture as a source of visual remembrance, intended for use by visitors wishing to pay respects to the heroics of battle participants, with a much more substantial presence than individual sculptures or grave markers. Since the construction of the Hellenistic tombs, battlefield monuments have been designed and constructed all over the world, including just across the Dardanelles from Ancient Troy at Gallipoli. Famous for the World War I Gallipoli Campaign, another foreign invasion from the sea for the Trojan Peninsula, several architectural constructions are included as interpretive elements as part of the battlefield landscape [Figure 41]. This creates an interesting parallel to Troy, mainly because of architectural construction of monuments is the visual cultural used. The Gallipoli battlefield and monuments, however, are more typical of battlefield interpretation, where the monuments become beacons or markers for specific events or groups of people. In contrast to the tumuli or horse, these monuments often fit into the style of the time that they were erected, not necessarily the time in which the event happened. They also tend to commemorate groups of people or moments, as opposed to individual heroes or reconstructed siege engines.

Figure 41: An architectural monument at Gallipoli battlefield, Turkey. Photo by author, 2008.
According to Alois Riegl in his *Der moderne Denkmalkultus, sein Wesen und seine Entstehung* ("The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Character and Origin"), the purpose of creating monuments with commemorative value is to help place past historical events into the context of the present, keeping a moment or person from being forgotten to history and instead allowing the moment to live on by experiencing the monument (1928: 75-78). The constructions at Gallipoli and Ancient Troy therefore perform the same purpose, to help a modern audience identify with events of the past in a real way. War may be a difficult medium for many individuals to grasp, and the erection of battlefield monuments allows for an individual to have an aesthetic experience related to a past conflict. Riegl writes that “Deliberate commemorative value simply makes a claim for immortality, an eternal present, an unceasing state of becoming…the fundamental requirement of deliberate monuments is restoration” (1928: 78). All of the Ancient Troy visual culture is seeking the same idea that goes beyond mere tourism revenue: to create a continuing memory of the Trojan War, real or not, that defined thousands of years of history before now, and will continue to define future generations.

### 3.8 Conclusions

The Archaeological Site of Ancient Troy is representative of many of the recent trends in the interpretation of archaeological or historical sites for the public. The idea that visitors come to the site with a preconception of what should be there is applicable to most world-renowned historic sites, although not addressed in literature outside of the leisure tourism demographic. It is perhaps more important to examine it for historic sites, since these are focused on education and presenting the historical past of a particular place. Similarly important is the impact that

---

97 Translation from the original 1903 essay by Karin Bruckner and Karen Williams.
modern photography is playing on how these sites are promoted through visual culture, often unintentionally. Photography has proven to create notoriety of certain monuments where it previously did not exist, something that complicates the interpretation by adding importance to particular pieces of history or myth-history and slighting other types of excavated visual culture.

It seems that presentation through visual culture often leads to increased tourism, sometimes sacrificing authenticity, but always creates an aesthetic experience for visitors. Ultimately, there is a delicate balance between the intentions of archaeologists, often focused on presenting the educational aspects of a site, and the national government, often dependent on tourism income, which is evident with the modern presentation of the site through installation sculpture and feature films. However, the conclusions of this study introduce a new and more difficult issue to overcome for archaeological tourism, namely, how the discourse will proceed.

As a result of its influence on visitors to Troy, Senemoglu’s sculpture has become an integral part of the history of the site, despite the fact that it was constructed almost 2000 years after most archaeological remains were produced. Modern archaeological interpretation practices would dictate that the horse remain and be itself interpreted to the public, especially because of the history of tourism at Hişarlik, as represented through this type of created visual culture. Senemoglu’s Trojan Horse has lived at the site for almost 40 years, becoming itself a piece of the area’s historical past. As one of the more influential pieces of the modern interpretation, it has changed the way that the site is perceived, perhaps permanently. The horse visually identifies Hişarlik/Troy as the famous site, without any reference to the archaeological record (or lack thereof) solidifying the claim. While it seems harmless to allow visitors to believe that the site is
Ancient Troy—after all, if any site on the Troad fits the ancient geographical and architectural description, Hişarlık does—the actual archaeology of the site is sometimes lost in comparison with the ancient stories.

But whether the site can be archaeologically proven as Ancient Troy or not, for tourists, it already is the site of the famous war, as perceived through Urry’s conceptualized gaze. Although when compared with the ancient ruins, Senemoglu’s Horse does not have the age value that the ramparts have, it aesthetically represents an association with one of the most famous events in ancient history, and the bringing together of people from all over the world under a shared heritage. As one of the site’s most identifiable images, the horse exemplifies the importance of a collective memory and particularly graphic association when dealing with archaeological remains.

The ruins at Troy tend to evoke Romanticism in both the antiquarian traveler and also the modern, but the designation of the site by UNESCO and the subsequent name recognition perpetuated by the interpretation will help to promote the association for years to come. If the site were merely identified as Hişarlık, the name would have little meaning for the thousands of people coming to Turkey, and therefore it can be suggested that tourism in the area might drop significantly. It cannot be denied that most tourists come to Hişarlık because of the belief that it is the site of the famous war, and to deny the possible myth-history would be to a detriment of the income of the area, which is largely dependent on the masses of tourists hoping to discover Ancient Troy for themselves.
But whatever is decided by site and government administrators, the enigmatic idea of Ancient Troy and its associated local and international visual culture will constantly expand as additional visual culture is produced and more archaeological information is uncovered. As for Senemoglu’s *Horse*, it will most likely remain with the tombs at the site as representative of the Trojan War stories, and also the impact that art and architecture can have on perceptions of history.
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CHAPTER 4
For Art’s Sake?: Reading “Values” in the Presentation of Rock Art

4.1 Introduction

The discussion of Senemoglu’s *Trojan Horse* and the Hellenistic tumuli at the Archaeological Site of Ancient Troy introduce some of the influences that the built environment can have on patrons to sites, suggesting that sometimes the more imagined or mainstream intervention can eclipse the popularity of the excavated history. But, interpretive design has other roles in presentation, particularly when public access to authentic material is limited because of conservation concerns, which is where the total reconstruction of space becomes necessary. When compared with the created visual culture of Troy, reconstructions for non-accessible heritage are integral for interpretation, but their design can be similarly controversial. Although many types of architectural reconstruction exist, there is a growing trend in recreating rock art or cave art sites, since these are becoming increasingly sensitive to deterioration form tourism. These sites focus on experience and atmosphere and with the help of reconstruction, can facilitate tourism, while at the same time protecting ancient art.

The construction of Lascaux II (1983) [Figure 42], a total artistic and spatial reconstruction of Lascaux Cave, represented a revolution in the presentation of archaeological rock art for the purpose of public interaction. Featuring a totally immersive tourism experience, the architectural space allows visitors to engage with the ancient art in a “sustainable” way by removing them from the original cave, closed to the public in 1963, and at the same time creating a memorable and artistic experience, seemingly leading visitors through an identical environment. But Lascaux II and similar projects have become much more of a theoretical puzzle for the principles of cultural heritage interpretation, because the tourism environment is completely fabricated,
meaning that visitors are not viewing the authentic archaeological or heritage site. The creation of the total interpretive space through a combination of modern architectural design and fine art provides visitors with a sensory, but in some ways inauthentic, experience. By focusing primarily on the totality of the aesthetics as part of the artistic interpretation, the spatial immersion eliminates the traditional age and other values associated with the anthropological history of the monument, which may create a confusing dialogue for international visitors.\textsuperscript{98}

![Figure 42: Lascaux II cave replica. Photo by David Martin, 2009.](image)

Although the Lascaux II facility and other similar projects around the world support the idea that total reconstruction of aesthetics is integral to the contextual understanding of ancient rock art

\textsuperscript{98} Like with Ancient Troy, the created architecture becomes its own interpretation, suggesting that no matter how good the replication is, visitors are still experiencing and identifying with something that is not “original.” This is further complicated by the fact that some visitors perceive the reconstruction as being the original cave prior, or even after, experiencing it. This will be discussed in detail later in the chapter.
where the original is unavailable, it may be the totality of the reconstruction at Lascaux that helps to perpetuate the inauthentic dialogue between ancient cultural remains and modern patrons. Building on the perception ideas surrounding architectural construction established in the Ancient Troy study, this chapter explores the practice of the architectural reconstruction of rock art spaces as a total aesthetic experience and how this can change perceptions of cultural heritage values when necessary interventions are introduced into the historic preservation narrative.

4.2 Rock Art within the Cultural Heritage Narrative

Found on six of the seven world continents, rock art is one of the most ancient and widespread forms of human artistic expression, often bridging the concepts of fine art and architectural space. Dating back millennia, rock paintings and engravings\(^9\) have appeared on free-standing stones [Figure 43], under rock shelters [Figure 44], and in caves [Figure 45], and appear as a way of manipulating a preexisting environment for various purposes.

\(^9\) Artistic themes consist primarily of geometric themes, local and sometimes extinct animals, and occasionally humans, and can vary by location and population creating them. The art can be produced through careful incision into the rock, the application of pigment, or a combination of both. Over the last several decades, inquiry into specific methods has provided researchers with an understanding of the chemistry of ancient art, dating, and methods of production. For more information on this, please see Arlette 1982, Lewis-Williams 1983, Ford et al. 1994, and Pettit & Pike 2007.
Figure 43: "Newspaper Rock," located in San Juan County, Utah. Photo by author, 2013.

Figure 44: Kamberg Rock Art Shelter, Amafa aKwaZulu-Natali, South Africa. Photo by author, 2012.
With its inherent aestheticism, rock art represents the beginning of art to many modern scholars, as some of the paintings date back tens of thousands of years. But the paintings also serve to influence anthropological and ecological studies as a result of what is depicted and the role of art in ancient society. Historically, rock art has existed in a precarious place between the worlds of art history, archaeology, and anthropology, and as such has assumed various roles in cultural heritage practice, particularly with concern to its initial discovery in Western Europe. With a significant concentration of sites for study, France and Spain defined early research in prehistoric rock art, but in doing so developed two parallel associated cultural heritage practices based on 19th and early 20th century religious and cultural beliefs. For early French archaeologists, the existence of sophisticated and three-dimensional paintings and their subject of extinct animals created a philosophical problem, seemingly creating discontinuity in the accepted principles of social evolution. It appeared that stylistically the paintings were modern, while at the same time
archaeologically proving to be much older. In Spain, the technique of the paintings was not as much of a concern. Since many of the Spanish researchers were priests, the creation of art so early was seen as in line with the biblical account of creation, which suggests that people came into being fully formed, in opposition to the French progressive social evolution theory (Bradley 2009: 5). Much research has been done in both Spain and France since the early discoveries and preliminary research, but these initial biases have continued in the way that the art is interpreted for a modern audience.\footnote{There is significant discourse on the role of archaeological practice in interpretation. Some researchers suggest that archaeological knowledge, combined with a social community affects research design, meaning that archaeological science is influenced by social context (Mackay 2006: 133). This is certainly the case in French and Spanish rock art interpretations, where early cultural influences determined archaeological practice, resulting in two different interpretations of the same medium.}

In each case, the discourse begins with whether to identify the paintings and engravings as art or artifact. As a form of prehistoric production perceived without a utilitarian role in the 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries, the rock decorations in both France and Spain were interpreted early on as purely art, something that has helped define their continuing presentation within a natural architectural landscape. With the suggested discrepancy between ‘decorative’ and ‘fine’ arts in 19\textsuperscript{th} century research, rock art in western Europe accepted a prestigious role as ‘fine art,’ which disassociated it with other prehistoric production, such as portable sculpture or tools.\footnote{As perceived utilitarian objects, these were consider artifacts, and therefore a part of anthropological, not art historical research.} The denotation was driven by the intricacy of the painting and the seeming talent of the painters, which allowed contemporary researchers to understand it within the context of what they knew from early modern art history, which included the study of master painters. This eventually led to the designation of the individual painted chambers in larger caves as “galleries,” [Figure 46]
affectively making them equivalent to the shops where fine art could be purchased at the time, or art museums (Bradley 2009: 6-7).

![Map of Lascaux cave with identified galleries. Drawing from J. E. Pfeiffer (1985).](image)

Figure 46: Map of Lascaux cave with identified galleries. Drawing from J. E. Pfeiffer (1985).

Although in simplest terms this is merely a language distinction, it becomes very significant for the eventual role of these “galleries” in displaying rock art as part of cultural heritage interpretation, especially given that individual “panels,” another language distinction from the same period, are often interpreted differently. In the 19th century, researchers were using an already established archaeological, artistic, and linguistic framework for working with the rock art, but at the same time creating the dialogue of future interpretation. By introducing these terms to refer to the prehistoric paintings, rock art was defined specifically as art, placing more emphasis on aesthetics than utilitarian value. This distinction has continued to

---

102 “Panels” refer to distinct pieces of art, often seen on separate free-standing rocks, or as removed individual scenes from large shelters. In each case, they are removed from, or never existed in, a greater architectural context.
define the basis for interpretation in many countries, including France with the Lascaux II
interpretation, and other areas where the concept of rock art has traditionally been more
influential as art than artifact. This differs substantially from countries or areas where the
discovery of rock art led to a more utilitarian interpretation to include the material as part of the
anthropological timeline of human existence. Although many are now moving to an approach
where rock art is seen to possess value in both areas, multiple interpretations in Spain, Southern
Africa, and Australia place an emphasis on the rock art as part of a larger cultural context and
less on the aesthetic importance.

Figure 47: "Mapoto's Stone" panel, housed in the Origins Centre, Johannesburg, South Africa. Photo by author, 2012.
4.3 Meaning and Understanding in Rock Art Aesthetics

There was a call to interpret the meaning behind known rock art in the early 20th century using ethnoarchaeology in order to gain insight from living descendants of rock art creators particularly in Southern Africa and Australia, and perhaps discover a reason for the widespread production of artistic media in the Paleolithic period. Researchers were hoping to construct a human narrative surrounding the practice of this artistic typology and its relationship to the surrounding natural setting and within context of supplementary archaeological remains and cultural narratives. Work by Wilhelm Bleek, a German philologist, and Lucy Lloyd in the late 19th century helped to provide a written source for traditional South African stories and beliefs, many of which have since been interpreted to be related to the production of art. Lloyd and Bleek documented stories from the /xam and !kun,103 as well as their art in an attempt to understand the cultural traditions of the groups as southern Africa was being colonized by Europeans. The main purpose behind their research was not necessarily to fully understand the artistic production, but to record and translate cultural traditions that were rapidly fading, thus making the stories a good starting place for research.

Using these stories and other ethnoarchaeology, by 1903 a connection was established between the paintings and hunting magic and this continues to be one of the prevailing theories to explain why the depictions center on geographically local wildlife, and human-animal hybrid forms (Laming 1959: 155-156).104 David Lewis-Williams has suggested that many of these paintings,

---
103 Lloyd and Bleek include interviews given by locals named /a!kunta, //kabbo, #kas!n, Dia!kwain !kweiten ta //ken, and /han#kass’o. The interviews include descriptions of traditional belief systems as well as genealogical histories, which help to put different types of local art into an ethnographic context. The Lloyd and Bleek research is fully documented in Claim to the Country: The Archive of Lucy Lloyd and Wilhelm Bleek, Stokes 2007.
104 This subject area begins with Salomon Reinach’s controversial L’Anthropologie, later revised as La Tiare de Saïtapharnès (1903), which includes a chapter on “L’Art et la Magie.” The chapter specifically discusses the idea of magic, and hunters “putting a spell” on animals, and the paintings being involved in this process (1903: 125-36).
particularly those in Southern Africa, depict a ritual in which a volunteer is said to go into a physical trance in order to assist local hunters in finding animals or rain (2002a: 204-227). This is integrated into art production, which involves mastering of one’s environment through human consciousness and the understanding of mental images produced by the brain during different physical and mental scenarios. The imagery is considered to be wired into each human’s brain to be experienced during an induced trance, but interpreted differently based on the cultural or religious contexts in which people live. Lewis-Williams identifies three stages in which people experience mental imagery and attempt to understand what they are seeing. Stage 1 images consist of geometric forms, zigzags, grids, etc., many of which can be seen incised on rock surfaces around the world [Figure 48]. During Stage 2, the participants experiencing them attempt to make sense of the images, and during Stage 3, the images progress to full hallucinations of an individual’s surrounding environment based partly on the interpretations of the previous imagery. Although the interpretation of the imagery Lewis-Williams attributes as culturally based, he cites the practice of seeing the imagery as developing in all humans through the central nervous system. As our system matches that of the Paleolithic rock artists, he suggests that they would have experienced trance in the same way, thus producing the same mental imagery (2002b: 179-87). Lewis-Williams’ and similar conclusions were based on research with the help of local South African San, who continued to practice rock art until the mid-19th century, and are among living populations believed to practice similar traditions to their ancient relatives.

Laming refers to this analysis as “elementary,” but the theory shows acuity in the connection between the artistic environment and greater cultural practice, making one of the first of its kind to identify the connection. Although the theory has evolved since then, the idea of “hunting magic” has remained fairly consistent in rock art analyses (1959: 156).

Although these experiences are thought to be personal and within the person’s own consciousness, the experience becomes a community one through the trance ritual, allowing others to be part of the larger experience. A group observes the trance, and anything that is vocally expressed by the shaman is taken very seriously, because the ritual then becomes part of their life experience and larger context (Lewis-Williams 2011: 93-4).
Figure 48: Newspaper rock petroglyphs featuring grid and zigzags. Photo by author, 2013.

Although he one of the most cited sources, Lewis-Williams’ research is not the only theory for why and how rock art is created. John Parkinson also examined the rock art from southern Africa in particular using Ju/'hoansi and /xam texts and stories, but places the emphasis behind the art more on “defining” boundaries between the hunters and their prey, and explaining the world through the art. He suggests that previous research has oversimplified what has been said by the 19th and 20th century hunter-gatherers, and assess the tradition was explicitly passed over thousands of years. Parkinson instead recommends examining the art from the perspective of the creators, not descendants, implying a potential change in meaning and practice (2002: 8-13). He specifically cites the idea of selectivity in the production, since archaeology has proven that the inhabitants of the region ate a variety of gathered foods that are not often represented in the art,
suggesting that the paintings have meaning beyond just what locals ate. Depictions of humans are also produced in a very specific way, but cannot necessarily be “contextualized with topographic or environmental frameworks” (2003: 67-72). Hence, it is not necessarily the daily life of southern Africa that is being depicted, but something much more significant.

Bleek, Lloyd, Lewis-Williams, and Parkinson have mainly conducted their research in southern Africa, since this is one of few locations where living descendants can be identified and thus interviewed. This research is often applied to other rock art, such as Lascaux or Altamira in Europe because of the similar focus on selective imagery. Many of the European sites feature vast quantities of images of beasts of burden or commonly hunted animals [Please refer back to Figure 45], but not necessarily fish, flora, or other staples of a hunter-gatherer diet, suggesting an association to similar hunting magic. Ethnoarchaeological research, however, provides but a preliminary source for establishing a cultural context from which to draw interpretation of the art. With the widespread themes and types of decoration scattered around the world, ethnoarchaeology by no means provides a conclusive interpretation of what rock art “means,” and researchers have never presented it as such. It does, however, provide a basis for understanding the rock art from the perspective of utility and in a way, religious belief, beyond its role as fine art. This could account for an emphasis on a more utilitarian value in recent interpretations of rock art sites, as this research has become available and more studied in the late 20th and early 21st centuries. 106

106 There has also recently been work by Sven Ouzman on “non-visual” properties of rock art, particularly sounds and tactile sensations produced when creating it, which ties into the San practice of dancing, and the specific hammering of the rock to create engravings (2001: 238-243). Although Lewis-Williams also culturally ties the practices together, Ouzman’s theory introduces the images and participants as acting together using multiple senses, suggesting the totality of the experience, something that could also be an influence on architectural setting.
What Lewis-Williams refers to as “image-making” – the physical production of the paintings and incisions – also has a long and controversial history. He suggests that the “imagery” already existed within communities through mental and projected mental images and the social discourse surrounding them. Therefore, even those who were not experiencing the mental images directly would have heard about them from those in the community who were experiencing them. He suggests that the shift in thinking about them as part of public or community space came from a social requirement for a tangible image of these “powerful things” where people could physically touch them and therefore control them (2004: 20-1). The idea is that once the images were in the physical realm, people could use them for specific purposes, and painting them on walls where they would be protected from the elements allowed for this practice to take place over generations, with the images constantly being updated as needed.

Although Lewis-Williams freely admits that this is one of many theories, it begins to define a reason for the application of the art in a naturally occurring architectural setting, such as a rock shelter or cave, despite the fact that the paintings themselves depict natural beings but do not necessarily address physical setting. If the paintings represent an important practice over a period of time, the images require an environment that is protected from the natural elements to ensure that they survive. If the depictions are of visions or mental imagery intended to control or associate with spirits, they can be thought of as transient and not dependent on a particular geographic place, which would account for the lack of spatial reference in the drawings themselves. Interestingly, in Europe, the images are often integrated into the natural form of the surface [Figure 49], using the undulations to create character and depth in the paintings,

107 The community aspect of rock art is emphasized by a number of professionals, working in different parts of the world, especially as associated with other hunter-gatherer populations (Chippindale 2004: 31-37).
suggesting the importance of finding a surface where this is possible to produce the paintings, and the significance of the natural architectural space to the eventual artistic outcome.\textsuperscript{108}

![Image of Auroch in Lascaux II reconstruction depicting auroch as part of the natural surface of the cave. Photo by Mauro Moroni, 2012.]

**Figure 49:** Auroch in Lascaux II reconstruction depicting auroch as part of the natural surface of the cave. Photo by Mauro Moroni, 2012.

\section*{4.4 Lascaux as Ancient and Modern Artistic Achievement}

Following its discovery near Montignac by four French teenagers on September 12, 1940, Lascaux Cave became one of the most famous findings in the art world. The paintings found date to the Upper Paleolithic period in France, during which time there was increasing development in art production, both mobile and immobile, resulting in hundreds of decorated caves across

\textsuperscript{108} It must be noted that as the imagery of rock varies significantly, so does the application of the art on the natural surface, meaning that it is sometimes utilized as part of the rendering, but sometimes not. In the Lascaux and Altamira Caves, the varying wall texture is used specifically to show depth in particular animal renderings. In one specific instance at Lascaux, a jagged piece of the wall surface is used to render the shoulder blade of a bull, and at Altamira, three-dimensional nodules on the ceiling structure are used as the bodies of bison.
Europe, and a wealth of *art mobilier* and other artifacts. Although other caves in the general area, such as Chauvet, have proven to be much older than Lascaux\(^{109}\) the pure number of paintings and continued use of Lascaux over many generations illustrates the successive importance of the area to the ancient population and possibly the continued importance of the paintings themselves.

In line with the French art historical tradition, researchers initially divided the natural architecture/topography of the cave into seven galleries [Figure 50], each featuring intricate paintings and engravings that seem to purposefully adapt to the natural walls and ceiling of the cave.

---

\(^{109}\) Chauvet, another well-known cave in the same general area dates back 36,000 years, and represents the “world’s oldest known cave paintings” (“Espace de restitution de la grotte Chauvet,” 2014)
The cave structure and geographical surrounding has mostly survived since the creation of the paintings, but the original entrance was much higher and not surrounded by the thick wood of pine trees that exist today [Figure 51]. The entrance material collapsed at least twice in the last several thousand years, which created a sheltered opening for the ancient inhabitants, but obscured the tunnel prior to modern discovery. The archaeological evidence suggests that before the walls were initially painted, there were Magdalenian\textsuperscript{110} explorers who visited the cave using torches.\textsuperscript{111} Although known for their artistic production, there is no evidence to suggest that these were the people who later painted the cave, but it does show that it was accessible for a long span of time, and yet not ever inhabited as long-term shelter (Ruspoli 1986: 94-5). Structurally, the cave consists of naturally occurring Coniacian limestone, which allowed the top of it to be structurally solid for thousands of years without deteriorating. The limestone also provided a white, crystalized calcite surface on which to paint [Figure 52], helping the pigments used stand out in contrast (Aujoulat 2005: 12-47; Ruspoli 1986: 94-5).

\textsuperscript{110} The Magdalenian culture existed between 11,000-7,000 BCE and can be characterized as a tool making and artistic/painting population during the Upper Paleolithic period in Europe. Chronologically it follows the Aurignacian tradition, also characterized by cave or rock art production, but in a slightly different style and with exponentially more production. The Magdalenian culture is followed by the Azilian culture, where art production was once again not in abundance.

\textsuperscript{111} This was determined by carbon 14 dating charcoal residue found in the archaeological layers that suggested several fires were lit on the floor of the cave, and also by using lamps and torches, which determined two distinct groups of people who used the site (Ruspoli 1986: 27-8).
Figure 51: Natural forest around Lascaux and Lascaux II. Photo by author, 2012.

Figure 52: "Dun horse" at Lascaux showing pigment on calcite surface.
Although the galleries vary in preservation due to their proximity to the natural cave entrances, many of the paintings were in pristine condition at the initial 1940 discovery, providing enough archaeological evidence in the floor levels to understand when and how the art was produced.\(^{112}\)

Based on this and stylistic evidence, many researchers, including Gregory Curtis, have suggested that the cave was painted over different subsequent periods and by many different artists, since many of the 1,963 drawings overlap and are foundationally different in technique (Curtis 2006: 96-100).\(^{113}\)

The art at Lascaux is overwhelmingly dominated by images of animals, particularly large beasts of burden, and animals that would have been frequently hunted in the area during the periods that the paintings were created. The most common image depicted is the horse [please see Figure 52], which outnumbers any other type of animal in each room, but additional animals are distributed throughout the cave, and include aurochs, stags, felines, bison, and bovine. In many cases, additional images are painted over previous ones, sometimes with the same type of animal and sometimes not, suggesting that the galleries continued to serve some important purpose to inhabitants in the region over time, and aesthetically enhancing the feeling of depth when experiencing the paintings.

\(^{112}\) According to Gregory Curtis, Jacques Marsal, one of the first people to enter the cave, identified holes in the wall, since filled in with clay, which would have potentially held scaffolding to allow the painters to gain better access to the wall surface overhead. This, combined with fossil pollen on the floors, suggests that the painters cushioned the surface beneath them to paint for extended periods of time (2006: 105-106). Curtis’ suggestion is consistent with multiple pollen studies that were done as part of the early archaeological investigation, which also suggests that people were using the cave during the summer season and tracking pollen in (Leroi-Gourhan & Girard 1979: 75-80).

\(^{113}\) Curtis specifically suggests that the paintings were produced by a “team,” with individual leaders for rooms and the support of the local community (2006: 99). It must be noted that despite his extensive research into the stories surrounding Lascaux and the experiential qualities of the ancient and modern cave, Curtis is not a historian and instead relies on the writings of other “experts” that are never identified. Although his basic idea of cave painter masters with room workshops cannot be substantiated, the continuous decoration of the cave over the course of about 1000 years is generally agreed upon by most scholars, based on the overlapping shapes and techniques used by the artists.
In his monograph *Lascaux: Movement Space and Time*, Norbert Aujoulat analyzed many of the images to determine what tools were used to compose them and how the physical boundary of the cave influenced the artistic production. For Aujoulat, the entrance to the cave provided a functional purpose for prehistoric visitors, and thus very few drawings were produced here during that time. The ancient painters may have also been aware of the consequences of environmental exposure on the images and therefore the need to reproduce imagery continuously. This may have also led to a decision to create the images in darker galleries with less exposure to inclement weather. Aujoulat divides many of the paintings into thematic groups, suggesting that they were purposefully placed together at one time to achieve a particular effect, questioning whether outlines were practice drawings or paintings that had not finished. Lawrence Barham agrees that the paintings would have meant something to the actual inhabitants of the area, even though the patterns or systems may not be interpretable today, outside of the southern Africa studies. He writes:

> The art of the show caves of Lascaux or Altamira was not the product of random doodling but a structured form of communication. Just what the images meant to their makers and viewers we can never know, because the shared codes are lost (2004: 110).

The time that was spent on the images and the continued use of the site over a period of time gives the best indication that the drawings meant something for the ancient people.

There is no question that art historians examining aesthetics have placed Lascaux prominently within the greater context of art history; Fernand Windels even subtitled his *Lascaux* monograph “The Sistine Chapel of Prehistory,” (1948) suggesting its comparison to one of the more celebrated works of world art. When looking solely at the production of the paintings, there is not only a visual and natural acuity to the forms, but also careful attention to the rendering of
dimension and depth with regard to the natural architectural setting, making Windels’
comparison certainly relevant. As with Michelangelo’s decoration of the chapel [Figure 53], the
natural architecture of the cave appeared to influence the painters, as careful attention seems to
have been paid to the placement of the animals as part of the greater form in order to make them
appear as naturalistic as possible. Limestone pieces jutting out from an otherwise smooth surface
create shoulder blades and backbones of figures [please see Figure 49], and concave depressions
provide shadows for flesh.

![Michelangelo's Sistine Chapel, Rome, Italy. Photo by Alex Proimos, 2011.](image)

Figure 53: Michelangelo's Sistine Chapel, Rome, Italy. Photo by Alex Proimos, 2011.

Similar decorative techniques seem to have been common in western Europe during this boom in
rock art production. Altamira Cave in Spain, discovered more than forty years before Lascaux
but less widely publicized, also dates from the Paleolithic period and features a similar use of the
natural architectural setting to help enhance the three-dimensionality of the animal paintings
[Figure 54], despite the difference in the overall architectural form of the main galleries. This not
only shows the widespread nature of the art form in western Europe at the time, but also the adaptability of the decoration to different types of natural architectural space with the same intention of rendering.

Figure 54: Altamira cave reconstruction showing the use of natural rock forms to crate three-dimensional paintings. Photo by author, 2012.

But even with the evident influence of Lascaux and other rock art sites as part of the early art historical community, the medium in general has only with difficulty been accepted as world art worth further interpretation. The paintings were often referred to as “primitive art” (Laming 1959; Sieveking 1979), by researchers in the mid-19th and 20th centuries, but soon afterward these early paintings began to be established by some as the beginning of the art historical narrative, and were even referred to as “The Birth of Art” by Georges Bataille (1955).\textsuperscript{114} As

\textsuperscript{114} Paul Bahn offers several anecdotal histories of early reactions, which vary from descriptions of “remarkable paintings,” to reports of “rude attempts of uncivilized artists.” Some of the contrast can be attributed to both the
European modernism was a developing trend around the time of the discovery of Lascaux, these types of paintings served to connect modern artists with their ancient ancestors and were used by many as inspiration in a new style as part of the avant-garde known as “primitivism.” For a short time, there was even a School of Altamira, where the cave paintings served as explicit inspiration for emerging artists such as Joan Miró and Haydn Stubbing (Cardinal 2004: 179) [Figure 55]. By the 1940s there was an established list of similar archaeological discoveries of which modern European artists would have been aware, giving a substantial media base from which to draw inspiration and aesthetic. Despite those, or possibly because of those who sought the style as a hallmark of primitive peoples, some bias has always remained in the art community, even though Lascaux has been proven to be extremely important to our understanding of ancient cultures, and the tradition of art within the context of society.

discoverers and where the art was found. Europeans working in Africa and influenced by the culture in which they were surrounded tended toward a more racist view of the art production, not giving the credit to artists that other populations did. Europeans working in Europe, however, mostly saw the images as an early communication system, maintaining its relevance to the greater art history and archaeological communities (1998: 31-57). Oscar Moro-Abadia and Manuel R. González-Morales relate this difference in impression to the delineation as any human production as “art” form the beginning, therefore necessitating the use of art historical terminology when discussing it. They are, however, careful to acknowledge that in the last twenty years, there have been other suggested terms, including “prehistoric imagery,” and “material presentations,” that seek to negate the trivial impression that comes with dividing Paleolithic representations into art mobilier and parietal art (rock art). (2008: 532-7). By dividing ancient production into any categories, it deemphasizes the anthropological connection between all cultural artifacts produced around the same time. This fragmentation of culture, though based on objective characteristics instead of stylistic/subjective, creates a discrepancy in interpretation, seemingly giving parietal art priority over portable art, which is generally identified as artifact.
As part of this art historical narrative, the paintings at Lascaux become even more interesting through a close examination of the space from the perspective of architectural aesthetic decoration, something that is rarely discussed when looking at prehistoric art. When looking at Windels’ comparison to the Sistine Chapel, architecture here exists with art to create a total artistic sensory environment, where the art is influenced by and inserted into an architectural space, and in turn influences the way that an audience perceives space. Although the Sistine Chapel’s decorated ceiling inspires awe in its creation, the Lascaux space is able to create more of an aesthetic experience when viewed from the perspective that its original inhabitants would have, without the use of an interpretive environment or electric light. Viewing the cave with fire\(^{115}\) as the sole source of light reflecting off the calcified walls,\(^{116}\) the animals seemingly come

\(^{115}\) Art historian-etiologist Amy Dyson has conducted multiple studies on the aesthetic effect of firelight on the understanding of the paintings. For additional information, please see Dyson 2014.
to life, enhancing the sensory visual experience showcasing the architectural space as integral to the perception of the paintings. Several researchers have claimed that this phenomenon was purposefully created to achieve an intentional mental state, to facilitate trance and would give additional meaning to the rendering of such images. Lewis-Williams addresses fire as part of the ancient experience, particularly associated with caves, because of the moving shadows created by the flame. In reference to one example at Niaux he writes:

“The distinctly humped dorsal line is clear when a light source is held to the left of and slightly below the image...This technique of using shadows to complete a depiction is more common than is usually supposed: people used the insubstantial interplay of moving shadows to seek power and create images of that power” (2002: 220-21).

The light becomes part of the aesthetic depiction, and therefore integral to the interpretation as related to the architectural space.

It seems to be the specific addition of ‘art’ to the walls and ceiling of the Paleolithic caves and shelters that initiated an architectural revolution—the creation of total aesthetic space—even for ancient peoples. It allowed the caves to move from natural occurrence to human achievement. Despite all the anthropological evidence suggesting that sole aestheticism was not the primary purpose behind the decoration, we cannot help but acknowledge the importance of the paintings in creating a the total sensory experience that clearly still resonates with a modern international population traveling to experience cave art.

The use of the existing architectural framework as part of the painted and incised space adds to the inherent aestheticism of the historic site, but presents a conservation problem for professionals attempting to introduce cave art to a modern public. As a medium, rock art is one

116 Replicating this practice is part of the interactive tour experience through Lascaux II, where light is used to help establish original context.
of the most difficult to conserve and also interpret, in part because of the nature of the materials used, but also due to the art’s dependence on a natural architectural setting and the surrounding climate. A cave’s humidity or a shelter’s exposure to weather complicate preservation, suggesting the need for an alternative solution in order to both preserve ancient rock art, and introduce it to the traveling public in a sustainable way.\(^\text{117}\)

### 4.5 Designing Context for Interpretations

It was the increase in tourism and interest in experience the cave at Lascaux that ultimately led to the modern deterioration of the cave, expediting its closure to the public in 1963 and highlighting tourism iatrogenesis for similar sensitive sites. The popularity of the site encouraged officials to create another way for visitors to experience the ancient art and continue to encourage local tourism. The Lascaux II solution was suggested in 1966 and proposed an architectural reconstruction that would act as a full replica of the most decorated spaces of original cave, providing something for visitors to see while protecting the original cave. The architectural intervention eventually opened to the public in 1988 and is still a major tourist attraction today.

The Lascaux II solution allowed for the preservation of the original art, but initiated a discussion in the cultural heritage community focused on interpreting and presenting complicated theoretical frameworks around historic sites. Rock art has proven to be a medium created and used with a variety of purposes, some of which may be difficult for the average visitor to fully understand or relate to. Yet, to provide a context for an educational site to be in line with modern

---

\(^{117}\) Fabiola Bastian and Claude Alabouvette of the Université de Bourgogne, in *Microbiologie du Sol et de l'Environnement* produced an extensive study of factors leading to the deterioration of Lascaux and how to mitigate them. Particular concerns addressed related to tourism and human-caused problems, as well as various types of mold and other biofilms or algae (2009: 55-60).
practice, this type of material must be part of the interpretation. The research of Lewis-Williams, Parkinson, Lloyd, Bleek, and others provides a wealth of information to present to the public, but European interpretations in particular have varied in what type of information is presented, often along the established biases of the original Spanish and French research traditions.

Lascaux II initiated a growing trend in rock art tourism solutions, which has resulted in several recent experiments putting different types of rock art into an understandable context. Sites such Thot/Thonac (the companion site to Lascaux II, France), the Museo de Altamira (Spain), Kamberg Rock Art Shelter and the Origins Centre (South Africa), and several sites in the United States, have each used design to create an interpretation for rock art sites intended to present remains for a wide and unspecialized audience. The diversity of interventions and their varying invasiveness have been the subject of an extensive debate within the cultural heritage community that has attempted to resolve how to include rock art as part of a number of cultural communities and value systems. Some interpretations have focused on the art historical or utilitarian approach or value system, while others have focused on the rock paintings and engravings as part of the greater natural environment. In all cases, the art itself is used as the catalyst for decisions in the interpretation, but with significantly different results in presentation.

Lascaux II can be considered the first on-site immersive intervention, and the beginning of the modern interpretation of rock art, and as such is an ideal site on which to focus because many other later interpretations have used it as a reference point for design. As it features the most extensive design intervention, it also serves to provide a study in how naturally and stylistically invasive interpretations can be, and how dependent the architectural setting may or may not be to
the conservation and interpretation of rock sites. Each subsequent experiment, however, also provides an example of the influence of varying degrees of architectural setting on the media, as each places rock art within a different type of cultural heritage narrative, also suggesting different values and influences on the presentation.

4.6 Cultural Heritage, Monument Values, and Interpretation

The Lascaux II reconstruction presents a unique opportunity to examine presented value systems for historic and cultural sites and how design in particular influences them. Although the creation of architectural space can be seen as integral to the presentation of Lascaux, the actual design possibly betrays an unintentional value system presented through the focus of the reconstruction. Visitors and even site administrators understand history from the perspective in which they themselves have been educated, and this preference is especially present in architectural reconstruction, where history must be redesigned or recreated. In an examination of archaeological research and the ability to describe the past for a modern audience, Michael Shanks and Christopher Tilley write:

Reliving the past without copying would be an entirely different experience. History doesn’t repeat itself because it has already happened before. Recreating the past necessarily involves the present – the conditions and context of the act of creation. Recreating the past is a practice which reveals the author, the subject in the present. To copy the past ‘as it was’, as exactly as possible, is to reflect the past; it is an illusion, a tautology. To reproduce the past ‘as it was’, to relive the past as a reflection is to produce an image which hides the observing present (1987: 16).

Essentially, there is no way of perfectly replicating the past for a modern audience, because the audience has only lived in the modern world, and therefore can only view history with a modern understanding and system of values in place. It is not possible to replicate completely the
mentality of ancient peoples in creating art or architecture, so professionals must attempt to create a context for the interpretation that will facilitate the best understanding possible.\textsuperscript{118}

In looking at reconstruction as an architectural practice, although materiality and method can be replicated, the social and cultural context of production is more difficult, because researchers will never have all the information necessary to determine exactly why something was created. Therefore, the reconstruction must make the best attempt possible to physically reconstruct something of cultural significance and theoretically reconstruct the context in which it was initially created. As Shanks and Tilley continue: “The aim is not to construct a coherent continuity, a complete story of the past. The past is forever reinterpreted, recycled, ruptured (1987: 19). Therefore, methods of interpretation must be as fluid and changing and the original history was.

In order to design Lascaux II in a way that would physically reference the original natural space as much as possible, the new cave was constructed about 200 meters away from the original cave, and utilized an existing quarry as the new entrance to the underground interpretation. Only two of the original cave’s seven galleries, the Axial Gallery and the Hall of the Bulls, were reconstructed, because these had the most paintings and were considered to be most representative of the entire cave. The interior space was constructed using a 10 centimeter thick

\textsuperscript{118} The act of copying or creating copies has a long tradition in art history, where the Romans used marble to routinely copy Greek bronze sculptures. In using a different material, changes had to be made to the structure of many of the sculptures, through the addition of “stumps” or other supporting pieces, thus changing their initial appearance with each copy. Additionally, the original aesthetic quality of the bronze was lost in the marble copies, but different qualities, particularly preservation, were gained in the change in texture. Similarly, the idea of creating prints of paintings introduces the same concept: copies bring art to the masses, but in creating them, some of the original aesthetic, particularly tactile quality, is lost. Like copying any other media, reproducing rock art requires picking and choosing which elements are most important to replicate, and how, meaning that some qualities are going to be lost in the reproduction by default.
reinforced concrete shell [Figure 56] that was eventually covered in soil to which the paintings would adhere. The paintings were then applied by Monique Pétral using ancient tools [Figure 57], techniques, and pigments, where they could be reproduced.\(^{119}\) Prior to the opening of Lascaux II, Thot [Figure 58] was planned in nearby Thonac to replicate important scenes for several other galleries, particularly the Swimming Stags (Aujoulat 2005: 269).

---

\(^{119}\) The architectural reconstruction is a metal skeletal frame, with a layer of concrete on either side, hung from steel girders for extra support. A specialized mortar was then applied to the walls to give the illusion of the original stone texture. To make sure that the paintings were as accurate as possible, the original structure was meticulously measured with a special machine built by Renaud Sanson and photographs were referenced for the actual imagery. The materials used for painting were natural and local, and as accurate as possible to the original pigments created by ancient people, and were applied using the same ancient methods by a team of artists (Delluc & Delluc 1984: 194-6).
The reconstruction was designed to replicate the original cave specifically for tourism, meaning that the reproduction was created to express the most important qualities of the original cave that people would want to experience. In order to relate to the audience that interpretation are intended for, value systems are often identified, because these help to produce a picture of the past that is as complete as possible. People travel to see historical and cultural sites for many different purposes: to learn about local or national history, to learn about themselves, or even for
entertainment (Holtorf 2010: 44-5). Documenting why people travel to the sites that they do helps to construct a visitor value system that can then be examined by heritage sites in order to understand what tourism are looking for and how the site can accommodate these wishes and even move beyond them. According to Shanks and Tilley, the idea of ‘value’ first “refers to a relationship; it is a meaning, a significance for an other [sic], for someone…” and it “unites…an object and a person or two people” (1987: 47). Heritage values help visitors to relate to cultural sites all over the world, which they then associate as part of their personal heritage story. For replicas or reconstructions where there is a very specific image presented, examining these values systems is applicable to understanding how certain things are presented and others not in this type of interpretation.

When heritage values are introduced into an interpretation, however, designers and researchers must determine “which values” or “whose value” to protect or cater to. The heritage sites discussed in this study are all designated by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization as having world heritage/cultural value, and therefore their protection and interpretation are considered significant by this world organization. Traditionally, heritage value systems are related specifically to historical events/people/places, aesthetic, artistic, scientific or technical achievements, although systems can be determined by any evaluating group seeking

---

120 One of the most common ways for historic and cultural sites to interact with visitors for the benefit of the site is through popular travel websites such as Tripadvisor.com, which not only allows visitors to review particular places, but also allows the management of those places to comment on the reviews. In one review from November or 2012, a visitor writes: “For many years, I had been longing to visit the caves at Lascaux. When I finally got there I was thrilled and not at all disappointed that what you actually see is a reproduction. These prehistoric cave paintings are so spectacular, they will take your breath away” (November 7, 2012, Tripadvisor.com). The review suggests that preconception that the facility would actually house the prehistoric paintings instead of the reconstruction, and that the personal value in seeing the paintings may reside in the age of the art and their artistic quality. With reviews such as these available, site managers can then extrapolate the review, establishing key points for better information about the reconstruction or pre-education of visitors. It is important to note, however, that not all visitors leave reviews so the information provided by sites like Tripadvisor represents only a cross-section of patrons, particularly those willing to put some additional effort forward.
important connections to ancient or cultural material (Clark 2010: 89-91). Value systems based on group or individual experiences can then be seen as being translated into the interpretation of historic material. As Graeme Aplin writes, “…no presentation of material is objective or value-free” (2002: 30). This is a clear statement of one of the most primary problems related to interpreting anything for the public; there is always a person or group doing the interpreting, and because of this, there will always be an inherent value system, conscious or not.

Acknowledging tourism and cultural values systems dates back to Riegl’s *Der moderne Denkmalkultus, sein Wesen und seine Entstehung*, and is perhaps an even more valuable resource to the discussion of Lascaux II as to the war monuments of Ancient Troy. As an early art historian interested in the social qualities of art and its relationship to the development of monuments, Riegl suggests that there are different types of values that can be associated with monuments, a theory that later becomes associated with the practice of cultural heritage.

Particularly important to the modern understanding of artistic monuments and reconstruction are Riegl’s “artistic-value,” “historical-value,” and “age-value,” each of which is still used as an identifier in cultural heritage preservation. According to Riegl, artistic value was originally reserved for monuments that held *Kunstwollen* or “artistic volition/importance,” – monuments of fine art for example – but this is a broad and subjective definition and can change depending on who the interpreter is. Historical-value required that the monument be related in some way to a historic event or person, and the creation of the monument in itself did not seem to qualify as a historic event (Riegl 1928). This suggests, however, that historical monuments were not historically valued for their artistic design, or that art production did not necessarily hold historical significance, complicating the modern definition, especially for ancient monuments.

---

121 Translation from the original 1903 essay by Karin Bruckner and Karen Williams.
that seem to possess both. There is also age-value to consider, where the appreciation of a monument comes from the amount of time that has passed since its creation, especially if the monument has started to deteriorate. Although this appears to be one of the more objective principles, the qualifier of deterioration is based in aestheticism, which was considered very important at the time when Riegl was writing. Age-value accommodated the Romantics who saw crumbling monuments and architectural follies as the ideal aesthetic, creating a difficult situation for modern historic preservation or reconstruction to accommodate.

Riegl was defining values specifically related to monuments nearly a century ago, but his identified value systems closely align with those outlined in modern cultural heritage practice, where researchers and interpreters must also determine how to interpret values in archaeological presentations. Though many similarities exist between modern practice and Riegl’s writing, cultural heritage development in the last 30 years has stressed the importance of education at archaeological and historical sites, introducing yet another necessary factor into any interpretation. The 1990 ICOMOS International Committee on Archaeological Heritage Management (ICAHM) Charter for the Protection and Management of the Archaeological Heritage addresses education under its Integrated Protection Policies, specifying that:

> The presentation of the archaeological heritage to the general public is an essential method of promoting an understanding of the origins and development of modern societies. At the same time it is the most important means of promoting an understanding of the need for its protection. Presentation and information should be conceived as a popular interpretation of the current state of knowledge, and it must therefore be revised frequently. It should take account of the multifaceted approaches to an understanding of the past. (ICAHM 1990: Article 7).

---

122 Several recent edited volumes specifically address values as related to modern practice include Henry Cleere’s Archaeological Heritage Management in the Modern World (1989), which is a collection of case studies on Stakeholders and Resource Management that weigh different values systems as part of the greater theory and Smith et al., Heritage Values in Contemporary Society (2010), another series of contributions that put values systems into the context of themes such as “popular culture,” “archaeological management,” and “heritage.” Although neither addresses Riegl’s value systems specifically, the focus on the age of material and societal influences mirror’s Riegl’s early interpretation, and continues the tradition of identifying specific factors that individuals identify and associate with.
According to the charter, the purpose of a physical interpretation is to provide an educational context for the remains, and that this must be revised as information changes. The idea of education, however, also ties into the principles of preservation, suggesting that an educational program needs to include information to assist visitors in understanding not only the context of the monument or site, but also why it is necessary to be preserved for a wide audience.

In modern practice, values can also be associated with practitioners and visitors. Sites that are managed as part of a collective memory or heritage must mediate different backgrounds in the presentation, since many individuals will be involved in interpreting the material. The concepts of travel and tourism can also bring new value systems, because people tour places for different reasons, sometimes outside of education, and therefore administrators must decide which of these values to accommodate (Holtorf 2010: 44-52). It can be particularly difficult to mediate these different value systems in interpretation, especially with complicated subject matter such as rock art, because different groups of people may view these sites from different perspectives and influences, just as researchers have in the past. In examining historical monuments of art that also hold age-value, for which Lascaux would certainly qualify, architectural historians and preservationists are forced to choose how these monuments are interpreted, and what values on which to focus. Lascaux as a site represents an anthropological study by providing important information related to human development and hunting practice, but there is something inherently aesthetic about the art as painted into the architectural space, something that is not lost on visitors or researchers. Therefore, the cave seems to possess Riegl’s artistic, historical, and age values together, suggesting these as integral when interpreting the space for the public through a modern intervention with a focus toward education and context. This dilemma is often
what forces researchers to choose which values to focus on so as not to overwhelm the visitor with information.

4.7 Reading Values in Lascaux II

Lascaux provides an ideal case study for observing interpretation and value systems because it provides a built example, which can be compared to the interpretation of the same media at other sites. With both Riegl’s and modern values in mind, the Lascaux II reconstruction can be viewed as attempting to recreate a total sensory space, replicating all visual and aesthetic aspects of the original, but in a synthesized way. Added to the replica were features to help provide necessary accessibility for the average patron that the original cave could not, smoothing the floor and streamlining the entrance [Figure 59]. The reconstructed space also allowed for an interpretive area, named the ‘Museophgraphic Entry Tunnel (sas muséographique)’ to be added before patrons enter the site. This additional interpretive space allows for a permanent exhibit that demonstrates the artistic techniques used by Paleolithic people to achieve the three-dimensionality of the images about to be seen. The experience is intended to be as authentic as possible, while meeting interpretive and accessibility requirements; essentially an “underground” museum.
The construction was revolutionary for the time, helping to creating an archaeological park, where the focus of design was on the cave [Figure 60]. Nevertheless, has been criticized for a betrayed value system when compared with similar interpretation, as some say it emphasizes entertainment and art above archaeological knowledge or utilitarian value of rock art. When examining Riegl’s and modern value systems, Lascaux II follows in the tradition of the French rock art historiography, by placing more emphasis on the paintings as “art” and less as “artifact.” While this is not uncommon, other more recent interpretations have taken a different approach, where different value systems are also very clear.
The architecture and paintings of Lascaux II are less than 30 years old, eliminating the presence of Riegl’s identified age-value that the original Lascaux possessed. Additionally, the tour and interpretive facilities are specifically related to the art, and include a demonstration of how the images would have been originally viewed by firelight, again weighting artistic value above historical.\textsuperscript{123} There is little emphasis placed on the anthropological remains found with the cave, or on the people associated with it beyond a few artifacts in the antechamber and a short

\textsuperscript{123} It is interesting to note, however, that many reviews of the Lascaux II reconstruction both acknowledge the fact that it is a reconstruction, while at the same time specifically mentioning the age of the original paintings. In a review from January of 2013, one visitor writes: “…the cave which is an exact replica of 90% of the paintings discovered in the original caves which were closed to the public in 1963…It is difficult to believe that these paintings were created over 17,000 yuears [sic] ago!” (“Worth a Visit” 2013). Another writes: “We, like, many others appreciated the need for the replica of the original caves and paintings. Realising that they were a replica did not spoil our enjoyment of the visit. It was just fascinating to see what had been so marvellously painted all these many thousands of years ago” (“Very Illuminating – very good experience” 2012).
discussion of historical chronology. When examining the reconstruction as part of an architectural history narrative, the space that visitors are actually experiencing was recently created, and all aesthetics, even those reproductions of ancient material, can be considered a modern construction in the timeline of architectural history, more closely related temporally with movement such as Deconstructivism, but lacking in similar aesthetic. This places these types of reconstructions at odds with architectural heritages, because they do not work with the normal timeline presented. The original Lascaux Cave is a monument clearly demonstrative of age-value and authentic cultural significance as arguably one of the oldest decorated architectural spaces in the world, but Lascaux II loses these characteristics in its new construction. It looks old, but is not old; it is “modern,” but does not resemble other contemporary design. In a sense, Lascaux II and other similar types of interpretive architecture are design anomalies, modern architectural creations for the purpose of displaying replicas of ancient artwork from a specific place, time, and culture, and authentic only in method of reproduction.

Although much of the scholarship on Lascaux II focused on the method of reproduction, there is some concern over the idea of opening up so-called “archaeological parks” that do not necessarily address archaeology, especially as part of the greater museum trend in moving toward education. In a 2005 article for Culture & Musées, Jean-Bernard Roy addresses the issue, comparing archaeological experiences to theme parks, with the same types of values needed to accommodate public expectations. He writes:

Parcs de loisirs à thèmes archéologiques, ils n'échappent pas à la logique de gestion des parcs récréatifs en termes de concept iond'i nvestissement et de promotion. Dès l'origine, leurs

---

124 Although there is little outright emphasis on the anthropological history by the Lascaux II design, some visitors made the connection themselves, one specifically writing: “Fantastic to see a replica of the Lascaux cave and an insight into the more human side of our predecessors” (“Insightful” 2012).

For people traveling to archaeological parks for leisure experiences, particularly Lascaux II, the experiential emphasis on the presentation is more in line with entertainment facilities, but with an educational twist of attempting to create original architectural context. Roy goes on to specifically address Lascaux and references the over-tourism that caused its closure, but does concede that the creation of reproductions could be necessary to bring the information to a larger audience, and that to be against it for the principles of reconstruction is to in a way oppose extending culture to the public (2005: 41). The argument can be made for many types of reconstruction, or replication, include that of Senemoglu’s Trojan Horse. The purpose of interventions for archaeological tourism is to benefit the public in some way, and therefore creating a space that the public enjoys and learns from can be thought of as serving that purpose, despite presenting the value of art over anthropology.

Therefore, when viewing Lascaux II from the perspective of cultural history, the question becomes, “Can the Lascaux II reconstruction become part of a human narrative through utilitarian value?” The answer may lie in this combination of artistic-value and the introduction of entertainment-value. Visitors may value Lascaux II more from the perspective of an entertainment experience, rather than an educational one, where viewing the replicated art in a reconstructed natural context provides more of an experience than viewing independent paintings in a museum context. If this is indeed the case, the reconstruction can be considered as “for the sake of art” as part of a total synthesized architectural environment—purposefully aesthetic and selective, meant for people to experience the artistic space, not necessarily because it is old, but for the artistic achievement. According to Shanks and Tilley, “Material culture can be considered
to be a mode of non-verbal communication, at one and the same time both simpler and more complex than written or spoken language” (1987:133). It could be that for some visitors, the expression of the reproduced art provides more cultural “information” than an interpretation focusing on anthropological history would, while at the same time providing an entertaining experience, thus making it something to see in experiencing an ancient culture despite the fact that it is a modern construct.

What is most interesting about the public’s perception of Lascaux II, especially given the frequent scholarly controversy over reconstructions and authenticity is that visitors really seem to identify with reconstructions, as much as they would with the original and authentic architectural space. The replica is so popular with visitors that there is currently an international traveling reconstruction of five scenes from the Nave and Well depiction (named Lascaux III) that work as part of an exhibition on the paintings, and an additional facility, Centre International d’Art Pariétal Montignac Lascaux (also referred to as Lascaux IV or Lascaux Caves Museum), is planned for a 2015 opening. This new replica will reconstruct the entirety of the

---

125 Marion Blockley summarizes the types of architectural reconstructions and their place in cultural heritage practice, as well as the historical debate surrounding their use, particularly reconstructions that assume substantial knowledge of the past. She attributes the reason for reconstructions largely to mass tourism and helping visitors understand and interact with space, where little ancient material remains (1999: 15-34). Clottes and Chippindale agree, but suggest the justification for a replica should come from giving visitors a “fuller sense of what a given place was like than do the actual remains” (1999: 197), meaning that the reconstruction should replicate environmental conditions for the ancient inhabitants for modern viewers. They do, however, acknowledge that Lascaux II is a unique situation, and may not be able to be replicated as a concept at other sites, and therefore places like Niaux, which Clottes and Chippindale are working on, should focus on the truth that the past can never be completely replicated, so instead should be interpreted for what it is (1999: 198). In both cases, Lascaux II is a case study that works for itself, but not necessarily similar rock art situations.

126 The exhibit began in Bordeaux at the CAP Sciences Museum and eventually traveled to the Field Museum in Chicago, the Houston Museum of Natural Science, and Le Centre de Sciences in Montréal in September 2014. Its final stop in North American will be San Francisco, after which it will head to Asia. In total, it is scheduled to tour the world until at least 2020 (Dowson 2014: 1).

127 Like many previous large archaeological museum projects, the Conseil Général de la Dordogne held a competition for the design of the new complex. The budget was €50 million, and contestants were asked to regard the project as a way to turn the Montignac region into an “internationally culturally and scientifically significant attraction in terms of access to, understanding and conservation of parietal art” (Furuto 2013:1). The winning
cave, and provide space for more interpretive materials, introducing more of the utilitarian evidence associated with Parietal art and Paleolithic cultures. Through this new installation, it seems as though organizers for Lascaux are adopting the more recent approach of interpreting rock art from multiple perspectives, including utilitarian or anthropological history, something that is seen in other competing interpretations.

4.8 Comparative Values Represented in Rock Art Interpretations

Like Lascaux II, value systems are used in other rock art interpretations to present the material the public in an accessible way. These values are often associated with historical traditions for individual countries, and can differ significantly when examining how the medium is presented. One of the more common ways of displaying rock art in an architectural setting is to remove it from its natural context—if it has not already been removed for preservation or by looting—and place it in a museum. This often happens with freestanding exposed stones and panels that have essentially become *art mobilier* by their removal from natural context. Although the provenance is not known for some pieces, museums such as the Origins Centre in South Africa use a constructed architectural setting [Figure 61] to protect the pieces and place them back into an understandable context with other related art or artifacts. In some ways, the panel and individual pieces are displayed like art: free-standing and as part of a gallery setting. The Origins Centre, however, focuses more on contextualizing the pieces with other cultural artifacts, including modern and diversified African art [Figure 62], reproduced skeletal remains of human development stages [Figure 63], documentary videos of trance group practices, and reimagined proposal was submitted by Snohetta, a Norwegian architecture, landscape architecture, interiors, and planning studio and Casson Mann, an exhibition, museum, and interior design studio based out of London.
animations of traditional southern African stories, such as those documented by Bleek and Lloyd.

Figure 61: Origins Centre gallery showing rock art alongside other cultural artifacts. Photo by author, 2012.

Figure 62: Gallery at Origins Centre displaying contemporary African art inspired by rock art shown in bottom right corner. Photo by author, 2012.
As a museum intended to do more than display art, the Origins Centre is a different type of design intervention for rock art that was born out of the necessity to preserve the art as part of a greater regional tradition, and as a solution for visitors coming to South Africa who are unable to venture out to remote rock art sites. It provides specific cultural context, highlighting this as an interpretive value that is important by presenting both artistic and utilitarian values of rock art. At the same time, the Centre acts as a research hub and an accessory interpretation to many rock art installations that are still interpreted as part of national parks. The Origins Centre seems to follow in the tradition of the rock art research that originated from the country: the ethnoarchaeological analysis of the art, and its place within a greater world context. The Centre is able to highlight the diversity of views on rock art by providing designed spaces to interpret in different ways. There has been substantial discourse in the past on how museums interpret
through installation, particularly with African art, but the Origins Centre is unique in its cultural and anthropological approach to rock art presented as part of human development, and in many ways mirrors the country’s focus on the modern humans evolving from the area.

Museum projects with installations, reconstructions, or cultural context have become much more popular since Lascaux II was initially constructed and serve to provide additional information for the art, suggesting additional values as part of cultural heritage practice. In a similar project that builds on the innovation of Lascaux II, but seeks to provide cultural context similar to the Origins Centre is the Museo de Altamira in Spain. The project partially reconstructs a publically inaccessible prehistoric cave as part of a larger cultural museum. In contrast to Lascaux II, however, the Museo de Altamira stresses the importance of an anthropologic history together with the reconstructed authenticity that provides the spatial experience. At Altamira, the partial cave reconstruction [Figure 64] is part of an anthropological museum [Figure 65], illustrating the cave paintings as part of a continuing human narrative in the area together with other artifacts.

The overarching value system of the Altamira is evident in the way that it is described by researchers. José Antonio Lasheras Corruchaga and Pilar Fatás Monforte describe the project as:

…a large three-dimensional ‘open book,’ scientifically sound and original in its museological concept. The reproduction is part of a huge permanent exhibition about the Paleolithic period that is intellectually accessible to all; it fosters intelligent interaction and pleasure in learning through its analogy to present-day life (2006: 177).

Even the specific wording used in the description helps to show the value focus of the facility—to encourage education through engagement, with a concentration on Paleolithic life, not solely

---

129 Another tourism facility close to the Origins Centre is the Cradle of Humankind World Heritage site, which features fossilized remains of some of the oldest humans ever found, as well as a museum dedicated to the archaeological discoveries.
art. The Museo de Altamira architecturally reconstructs important aesthetic qualities of the cave, but not the entirety of the space, making it also more universally accessible to a wider audience. This also suggests that the focus of the interpretation is on presenting the material remains in a way that allows for circulation and understanding, not strict spatial reconstruction. At the beginning of the cave interpretation, visitors watch a video that puts Altamira within the greater cultural context, before entering the “cave” through a series of ramps with anthropological displays along them.

![Figure 64: Altamira cave reconstruction. Photo by Graeme Churchard, 2013.](image)

---

130 The Museo de Altamira interpretive space and museum is completely wheelchair accessible, whereas Lascaux II is not. The Altamira space is also able to accommodate large groups that can move through the space at intervals and remain at certain locations to view the reconstruction, whereas Lascaux II is more restricted in space, also having groups move through in intervals, but as part of a timed tour with no space to stop and gather.

131 The display cases hold tools that date to a period of occupation at Altamira, and other artifacts related to the settlement.
This creates a different type of journey from Lascaux II, where the entrance into the cave is part of the experience [please refer back to Figure 59], drawing the visitor down into the simulated underground space in the hills surrounding the original cave. In contrast, the journey through the Altamira reconstruction focuses on the excavation of the remains and the chronological and anthropological history of the cave before arriving at the art, educating visitors on the significance of what they are about to see before it is seen. Another way that Museum de Altamira extends the context is through reconstructing the cave as it existed during ancient occupation, not as it was when it was discovered. Archaeological and anthropological research, permits probable reconstruction of the cave’s occupants, which is also suggestive of the role of the cave art. This, along with encouraging patrons to view artifacts found in the surrounding region before viewing the art, helps the visitor understand the paintings as part of a greater
historical context.\textsuperscript{132} At Altamira, the architectural intervention is used to reconstruct important aspects of the cave, but not the entire space, while also providing an anthropological museum. The Altamira interpretation is an extension of the gallery concept, where the visitor is aware of the museum around them at all times, whereas the Lascaux II interpretation is intent on recreating the immersive experience.\textsuperscript{133}

In shifting the focus to a greater cultural narrative and making the space universally accessible, Museo de Altamira inherently lacks the aestheticism of Lascaux II, trading much of the experiential qualities for the expansive interpretive space. Despite its value system, Lascaux II demonstrates the importance of a total aesthetic experience for the purpose of cultural heritage understanding, by placing the art back into an architectural context as much as possible. Much of what was learned through the Ancient Troy study is that many tourists relate to things that they can universally recognize, and are therefore much more likely to understand complete architecture than fragmented, or partially-interpreted space. Lascaux II places particular emphasis on the importance of architectural space as part of the synthesized experience, creating a place that allows the visitor to be completely immersed in the cultural environment, old, authentic or not. The Altamira reconstruction is more aligned with modern cultural heritage practice from the perspective of authenticity and placing remains into an understandable context.

\textsuperscript{132} Visitors to the Museo de Altamira refer to it as a “Museum covering all of human prehistory, but concentrating on the period of the cave,” and “modern… does an excellent job presenting the development of mankind and its artifacts, including cave-dwellers' artistic expressions” (“An Outstanding Reconstructionb [sic]” 2014; “Excellent Museum” 2013). Although patrons are viewing the art, they clearly are aware of the context that surrounds it, particularly as related to Paleolithic life and development. When compared with Lascaux II, there is much more of a sense of cultural development imparted.

\textsuperscript{133} The paintings in Altamira cave were actually reproduced at full scale in the early 1960s, before there was a need to reproduce Lascaux. The cave was modeled using stereophotogrammetry by the Archaeological Museum of Madrid and Deutches Museum of Munich, the same technology later used by the Institut Géographique National to map Lascaux for its reconstruction (Delluc & Delluc 1984: 195). Each really focused on the design of the paintings within the natural architecture of the cave as being important to document and attempt to reproduce for visitors, but the way that the reproductions were later used in interpretation is more closely related to each country’s history of Paleolithic archaeological research.
Lascaux II is better able to create the particular sensory or atmospheric experience of the original cave, although as Gregory Curtis aptly states, “[architecturally] Lascaux II is not a cave” (2006: 107). As a modern construction it lacks the atmospheric or living environmental qualities of a cave, consequently creating a cool, but static space. Nevertheless it does attempt to emphasize the concept of the journey through the art, much more than is possible in a modern constructed museum.

Building on the Lascaux and Altamira models, designers are currently building a replica of Chauvet Pont-d’Arc, another decorated cave in the greater Lascaux region, which will open to the public in late 2014 after almost three years of work. Chauvet was discovered in 1994, relatively late in the history of such discoveries, which has allowed designers to learn from the previous models in creating a new interpretive space. The Chauvet replica involves new techniques of 3D scanning to create a digital reproduction, but will still use artists to create the paintings by hand. The French government claims that “All five of the visitor’s senses will be stimulated during this amazing journey back through time: the coolness, humidity, silence, darkness as well as the subtle mineral aroma will help fully immerse the public in the cave” (“Espace de restitution de la grotte Chauvet,” 2014: 1). It seems as though designers are looking to recreate a similar environment to Lascaux, but that it will be much more focused on the entirety of the physical context of Chauvet, hoping that visitors will engage with the experiential qualities of the cave, even though it will be a replica. But, in addition to the reconstruction, the intervention will include extensive interpretive facilities, both permanent and temporary.134

Although a large focus will be on the art, it seems as though interpretive facilities have evolved

134 The French government outlines a “discovery centre and permanent exhibition dedicated to the Aurignacians and wall art, as well as five sheltered interpretation stations, a temporary exhibition space, and education area for young people, an events center, etc.” (“Espace de restitution de la grotte Chauvet,” 2014: 1).
since the Lascaux II facility was built and now seek to highlight the art as part of the greater cultural context, helping visitors to engage with the people themselves, and not necessarily just the art.

At each of the sites discussed, the combination of the atmospheric qualities of the caves and substantial tourism has had a significant impact on the deterioration of the sites, causing officials to close the original spaces to the public and create interpretation space. But rock art is not always confined to caves; art on free-standing rocks and as part of open spaces or shelters may provide more insight into creating cultural context. These are ‘signals’ or proof of human presence or passage, and acknowledging the natural architectural setting in which they exist is integral to interpretation and public understanding. At Kamberg Rock Art Centre, one of the many locations of rock art in the Drakensburg Mountains of South Africa, paintings produced by the San people in antiquity under a natural rock shelter can still be seen and experienced in its original ancient context. The location under a naturally occurring shelter [Figure 66] provides some protection from inclement weather, and the remote location discourages heavy tourism traffic. The site is protected as part of uKhahlamba Drakensburg Park World Heritage Site [Figure 67],\(^\text{135}\) which helps to preserve cultural material alongside natural environments. Experiencing original rock art in this form not only enables the viewer to experience the age- and authenticity-values of the art, but also to experience the natural environment that partly inspired the art.

\(^{135}\) This is a common trend in Africa, Australia, and the United States, where rock art sites are relatively remote, and often chosen in antiquity for their natural or symbolic location.
Figure 66: Kamberg Rock Art Shelter, South Africa. Photo by author, 2012.

Figure 67: uKhahlamba Drakensburg Park World Heritage Site, South Africa. View from Kamberg Rock Art Shelter. Photo by author, 2012.
Ethnoarchaeology and research into southern African rock art is what provides much of the cultural interpretation of world rock art and emphasizes the connection of the hunter-gatherer artists to the landscape and animals around them. In the Drakensburg National Park where Kamberg is located, it is common to see eland, one of the most frequently depicted animals in the rock art [Figure 68], and integral to ancient and modern San cultural practices. This allows for visitors to make connections between cultural influences, the landscape, and the art, all within a single experience. It enhances the overall visitor experience and is able to show the geographic and geological importance of how and where the art is created.

Figure 68: Painting of an eland at Kamberg Rock Art Shelter. Photo by author, 2012.

Eland are integral to San spiritual beliefs and some hunting practices. Researchers attribute different roles to them through different theories, but in general eland are one of the more important animals to hunter-gatherer cultural traditions. Parkinson cites different stories in which people and eland are metaphorically connected, and also suggests that eland provided practical purposes, such as clothing and meat, making the animal an important resource (2002:44). Lewis-Williams refers to the hunting magic theory, comparing the physical trance experience of a shaman during the //ke:n dance with the experience that an eland has after being shot. Each experiences similar physical phenomena, including the individual’s hair standing on end, and each bleeding from the nose (2011: 74-81).

The Origins Centre similarly focuses on the connection between rock art, hunting, and the eland in South Africa, but is unable to provide the natural surrounding for the art. The museum instead displays a stuffed eland in one the galleries that displays panels depicting eland, enabling visitors to see the animal alongside rock art representations.
At the same time, it can be difficult for large groups to experience many of the southern African rock art sites because of the remote locations. The location allows for more authenticity than the European replicas, but fewer people are able to engage with the rock art, preserving it, but making it less well-known or recognized than the big tourism sites.\footnote{These types of sites have recently become a greater part of the rock art interpretation discourse because of conflicts over whose responsibility it is to both interpret and preserve them, especially in rural or less wealthy communities. According to George Abungu, African rock art is “contested heritage,” because of disputes over who created it, and the relative unimportance within the archaeological community until the 1960s (2006: 331-2). The art has also been used politically, meaning that there are additional influences on the imagery (Abungu 2006: 332; Smith 2006: 322). The new South African coats of arms even includes a depiction of a human from the Linton panel, along with a saying by the /Xam, which translates to “People who are different come together” (Lewis-Williams 2011: 16-7). The inclusion of this culturally significant image shows how rock art can be representative of a shared heritage, especially alongside such a profound statement. Where these types of images are not culturally defined, however, or are being used by multiple groups for different purposes, interpreting them for the wider public can be more difficult because the meaning extends beyond the ancient context and becomes influential in a different way.} With African rock art gaining popularity in the travel community, there is the possibility that these shelters could end up with the same tourism issues faced by Lascaux and Altamira. Already, the number of the visitors to some of them has caused concern with conservationists, because of damage to the historic landscapes, and also to the art (Abungu 2006: 332-3). This has created a debate not only over “how” to conserve the sites, but also “why.” Rock art in Africa specifically is seen as evidence of cultural evolution, since some of the rock art sites are twice as old as Chauvet, the oldest cave site in Europe (Smith 2006: 322). These sites also help to represent indigenous African arts and heritage for living ancestors, making them integral to the understanding of current cultural traditions. Since many groups in Africa continue to practice rituals similar to those used during the creation of the art and sometimes even depicted in the paintings, preserving and interpreting African rock art creates an opportunity to better contextualize rock art as a world medium warranting further study.\footnote{Putting African art, particularly cultural artifacts, into an understandable context a part of exhibits and museums for foreign populations has been the subject of significant discourse. For additional information, please see Karp et al 1992, and Karp & Lavine 1991. For additional information about rock art context in Africa, please see Ouzman 2006.}
For some African countries seeking to benefit from tourism, like Zimbabwe and Botswana, rock art has become a way to increase national revenue, especially since the art can be enjoyed alongside national park excursions. According to Benjamin Smith, this tourism increase has meant that preservation facilities have had to be quickly designed and implemented at otherwise open public sites, resulting in “cages” surrounding the panels. These protect the art against vandalism, but at the same time restrict access and engagement for the touring community.\textsuperscript{140} “Protecting” the site in this way removes the experience for visitors, and lacks interpretive qualities to create sustainable tourism, thus negating the purpose of encouraging tourism in the first place. Introducing interpretive facilities in places such as Southern Africa will help not only physically protect the art, but educate visitors on the need for the protection of cultural and historical resources.

Despite tourism concerns, interpreting African rock art as part of the natural environment has proved to be successful in presenting the cultural context of its production. Where these types of zoological landscapes no longer exist alongside the art, whether for urbanization or animal extinction, it is more difficult to provide this type of context. The region around Lascaux II, however, has attempted to create a natural context for the cave paintings by partnering with Thot, a small “prehistoric theme park” in order to accommodate some of the geographical authenticity lost in the architectural replica. Thot provides visitors with a zoological experience, compete with animals similar to those depicted in the cave paintings, thus allowing visitors to see the types of animals that inspired the art of Lascaux Cave. Where some of these animals were no

\textsuperscript{140} He specifically writes, “…the sites were not presented; they were only protected. In cases such as Schaapplaats, the ugly fence guaranteed a poor visitor experience. The rock art was scarcely visible between the wires and photography was impossible” (2006: 323).
longer available in the region, Thot provides genetic approximations, complete with “reconstituted Aurochs” [Figure 69]. The site also provides a visitor center with additional cave reconstructions [Figure 70] similar to Altamira and displays that illustrate daily activities of regional prehistoric peoples. This helps to provide additional context for the Lascaux II reconstruction, but at the same time borders on an “archaeological Disneyland” with the exterior zoo experience. In the case of Thot, the architecture of the interior cave simulation allows for the visitor to see reproductions of the Lascaux cave more closely and within a cultural context that can be compared with Lascaux II, but it also removes the cave from its natural environment, which Lascaux II in a way provides. Together, they give a better understanding of the context in which the art was created, with the architecture used in different ways for interpretation.

Figure 69: "Reconstituted" aurochs as part of the zoological interpretation at Thot. Photos by author, 2012.
As digital simulation has recently progressed, design has been extended further to interpret rock art for the international public. For those wishing to interact with the original Lascaux cave, an extensive digital replica is available online as another less-invasive form of architectural reconstruction. Although it is difficult to reconstruct a tactile experience in digital media, it does allow the viewer to experience the entire cave—not possible in any of the other partial reconstructions—and see the complete progression of spaces and art, while showcasing simulated surfaces and lighting. This is an additional way for the public to understand the cave as an entire body of art, but eliminates the concepts of authenticity- and age-value, as well as any indication of scale and a minimal representation of materiality. It remains, however, one of the...
more effective ways of making site-dependent art available to a wide audience at limited expense, and many more sites are beginning to invest in digital reconstructions where physical ones are impossible.\textsuperscript{141} Similarly, Werner Herzog’s 3D film, \textit{Cave of the Forgotten Dreams} (2010) features the Chauvet Cave, and is the only way for the public experience the cave space beyond photos, until the new museum opens.

\subsection*{4.9 Conclusions}

Rock art has provided researchers with a way to understand human development across the globe and over millennia. As a commonly used medium in the Paleolithic period, rock art helps to illustrate early hunting rituals, and significant cultural practices that provide ideas about the development of civilizations. While the medium and widely-used, however, the interpretation of the art for the public represents a variety of trends, often based in the initial biases of the countries in which the art was uncovered. In examining these trends, different value systems can be identified to understand if the art is viewed mainly as artistic expression or with a greater utilitarian or cultural purpose.

As researchers, it is important to examine how the public understands these unintentionally presented values, specifically how interpretations are read by a modern audience. The purpose of any value examination is not to establish a “right” or “wrong” way to interpret, but to heighten awareness of the effect of certain decisions on the understanding of a non-specialized population, and subsequently to attempt to create the as much context as possible at any historical site. Rock art in particular is difficult to accommodate when compared with mobile art or artifacts because

\textsuperscript{141} The Nottingham Caves Survey project has also taken on an extensive digital reconstruction project to help interpret over 450 human-made caves beneath the city of Nottingham in Britain. The team uses laserscanning technology and posts the reconstructions to a website as they are completed (Nottingham Caves Survey 2014).
of its contextual and physical dependence on a natural architectural environment. Sometimes reconstruction is required to facilitate accessibility. Nevertheless, through design, there have been many advances in the production of a reconstructed aesthetic, paving the way for developments that could help preserve sensitive sites for future generations, and helping to highlight the intentional phenomenology of ancient decorated spaces.

At each of the sites examined, the interpretation of the remains was partially dependent on the cultural background of the interpreting country, which result different ways of explaining the importance of the art as part of the display. Lascaux II’s total aesthetic experience interpreted the cave mainly “for art’s sake” by seemingly placing more value on the artistic representation and less on the age and authenticity of the material. Altamira places less emphasis on the age- and authenticity-values, but at the same time acknowledges these values through a cultural interpretation of the material as part of a greater human context. Both use architectural reconstruction particularly to reproduce an almost-exact—although synthetic—architectural space with the intention of allowing people to experience the art in as natural of a context as possible.

Since much of the need for reconstruction is a result of over tourism at a sensitive site, this is another area to be carefully examined, and something that has played a significant role in archaeological site interpretation outside of the rock art discourse. Lascaux, Altamira, Chauvet, and the Southern Africa sites allow for an extreme study of human tourism iatrogenesis, but the ideas of mass tourism, and as a result, commercialization, will be examined more intensively at sites that remain open to the public in the next two chapters.
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CHAPTER 5
Archaeology & Urbanism: The Impact of Egyptian Cultural Heritage ‘Spaces’ on Archaeological Remains and Urban Populations

5.1 Introduction

Increased tourism to cultural heritage or historic sites has caused managers and government officials to rethink the way that sensitive and popular sites are experienced by the public. Egypt has seen a substantial increase in tourism since opening many of its cultural heritage sites to the public, and has experienced problems comparable to those at Lascaux and Ancient Troy. This mass tourism has necessitated a rethinking of tourism spaces, particularly those in an urban environment, to accommodate the traveling public, and make the remains safe and accessible. The consistent increase in this infrastructure, however, has led to overdevelopment in urban areas associated with archaeological sites, and the increase in tourism has expedited deterioration of the remains as a result of human contact with the ancient material. Egypt has been at the forefront of this major trend to promote and accommodate tourism development, particularly with the creation of new outdoor cultural heritage “spaces;” hard-surface urban constructions intended to facilitate circulation of visitors. The spaces have been the subject of international controversy because of their unintended impact on local populations and archaeological remains. Although they allow for facilitated access to the archaeological sites, the designs have been seen as unsympathetic to the Egyptian people and cultural heritage by some researchers, because they have increased surface area devoted to the ancient sites instead of for public use. In Luxor, Egypt the creation of the archaeological facilities has resulted in demolition of residences and forced

---

142 Most of the spaces can be considered plazas, where hardscaping is the main feature and intended to be used for large crowd gathering, or to provide movement circulation through multiple types of spaces, i.e. shopping, cafes, or other associated functions. In most cases, these spaces are associated with archaeological or historical site, and at the entrance/exit to accommodate tour buses.
relocation of families and businesses neighboring the ancient sites for the purpose of increasing international revenue from additional tourism.

Luxor specifically has seen extensive new construction of tourism areas intended to facilitate access to the Temples of Luxor and Karnak by larger groups of visitors. Large-scale plazas in front of each temple permit shopping in the entry area that precedes the archaeological sites but erased neighborhoods that had long benefitted from tourism to the temples. Increasing commercialization of cultural heritage in Egypt favors archaeological complexes to expand into urban environments, where space is limited and therefore very expensive.

Although a discussion of this new architectural trend as related to history is necessary, also important is an examination of the cultural patrimony movement in Egypt, as these projects were begun as part of a nationalistic movement to reclaim cultural property and encourage international tourism. While the new designs show an Egyptian interest in encouraging international visitors and taking an active role in protecting heritage, the additional space to excavate and establish ancient avenues such as that of the sphinxes in urban Luxor has aided the purposeful deterioration Luxor’s tree-lined Nile corniche that once cooled the city, and instead caused vast open and oppressive hardscaped spaces.

The designs created a diplomatic problem, as they were considered progress by the government under Hosni Mubarak because the displaced people were moved into newer housing and

---

143 Modern Luxor is the location of ancient Thebes, which, along with the Valley of the Kings necropolis, was inscribed to the UNESCO World Heritage List in 1979.
144 Suzanne Mubarak sponsored the Luxor development project and oversaw the entirety of the project as the head of the Project Management and Implementation division. She gave her administrative priority over the manager for
promised better access to plumbing and other basic needs. Even with the proposal of better infrastructure for the local population, however, additional problems have been caused by the construction of these new spaces. The designs have been criticized for their impact on the local environment and visitor experience due to expedited planning and execution. The vast areas of hardscape act like heat islands, creating uncomfortable temperatures without the relief of shade or other cooling strategies. Additionally, the extensive hardscape can increase groundwater pollution, as oil and other chemicals are washed from the plazas into the soil below without plant filtration. In a related problem, this polluted groundwater, which already suffers from significant salinity, can be brought back to the surface and into the ancient buildings through a capillary effect, distributing salt and other pollutants into the ancient material. The ancient sites remain in danger of increased development alongside substantial conservation neglect, as these have been exacerbated by constant unstable political climate in Egypt. As the subject of an extensive international debate on whether these types of architectural mediations really improve the cultural heritage site, or whether the negative impacts on the ancient architecture, environment, and local populations are really worth the perceived improvement of the tourism facilities, the Egyptian interventions provide a case study for how the creation of particular environments through architecture can affect the physical tourism experience.

5.2 Egypt as Experienced Through Spatial Definition and Environmental Planning

In both ancient and modern Egypt, there appears to be an inherent need for defined space, or similarly, control over environmental conditions, as created through architectural intervention. Examples such as the Pyramids at Giza, the temples of Karnark and Luxor, the funerary complex tourism and promotion, the antiquities staff, the physical works staff and the environmental unit (Abraham et al. 2000: 103).
at Dier-el-Bahari, provide a basis for comparison when looking into modern architectural aesthetic trends. In each of the ancient examples, space is designed to help move people through certain areas and between individual buildings in a complex.\textsuperscript{145} The ancient Egyptians experienced in how to control their surroundings through total spatial design, and were experts at organizing the labor to accomplish substantial planning projects. These ancient examples provide visual and theoretical context for the modern archaeological planning and speak to the cultural environment that dictates these interventions as necessary.

The establishment of most ancient Egyptian cities along the Nile River alone speaks to the understanding that the population had of environmental influences on their daily lives. With much of the surrounding land occupied by harsh desert, the Egyptians found areas that would not only be good for building, but that would provide a sustainable way of life, close to natural resources. Over the course of several thousand years, the Egyptians were able to use the conditions of the environment, particularly the Nile, to produce food through flood-irrigation and establish stable cities,\textsuperscript{146} based largely on careful land use that would last for thousands of years.

The design of some of the most well-known temples demonstrates the influence of the carefully controlled environment on aesthetic decisions. The architecture particularly focused on adhering to different subsets of the greater cosmology, which helped to establish Egypt religiously and

\textsuperscript{145} Each of these examples is designed to create a sequence of spaces, where certain individuals were allowed to experience certain areas, which controls movement through the complex as a whole. Many temples were also designed and constructed using celestial and cardinal associations (Trachtenbeg & Hyman 2002: 71).

\textsuperscript{146} Michael Smith identifies two main characteristics to define a “pre-industrial/ancient” city—(1) coordination among buildings, which Egyptian urban environments impose, and (2) standardization among cities, with certain types of buildings being repeated and clustered at different geographic locations (2007: 7). Smith uses this definition to examine the history of cities and urban spaces in the ancient world, particularly the idea of planned cities, where intention design is applied to layout. The Egyptians were not only highly aware of spatial organization, but standardization of form and imagery was part of their religious structure, ensuring that consistency of design was applied to new projects.
historically. According to tradition, the temples themselves represented the mound of creation (the primordial or primaeval mound), a consistent theme even across the varying cosmologies of regions and believed by ancient Egyptians to be where civilization began. The construction of spaces at Karnak and similar temples followed the movement of the symbolic earth, with each outer space rising slightly to the peak, which would have been the innermost sanctuary (Blyth 2006: 219; Parker Pearson & Richards 2005: 34-5). The ability to design and construct the spaces in such a way as to increase the elevation at the innermost shrine shows remarkable awareness of the environmental conditions of the temple locations, and an ability to use the natural landscape to the advantage of the construction.

Also important to understanding many of the surviving Egyptians temples is the progression of spaces, as defined by architectural transitions. Temple complexes were often surrounded by a wall, intended to differentiate the sacred space from the profane. At many, pylons [Figure 71] at the entrance created the gateway to the consecrated interior and also allowed for large expanses of wall for carving with hieroglyphs and accomplishments or the installation of monumental sculptures of the pharaoh(s) who funded the project. After the pylons is usually an open courtyard, followed by the entrance to the roofed temple and columned hall (referred to as a hypostyle hall) whose number and size of columned vary. Each additional space becomes smaller and more sacred when approached from the columned hall. The innermost sanctuary

---

147 Patricia Spencer gives a more in-depth description in her lexicographical study of Egyptian temples. She suggests that the shrine to the god was the “focal point of any Egyptian temple” and that most of these architectural spaces fall under two main aesthetic categories: (1) a closed naos with double doors, and (2) an open-ended area with a sacred barque. In each case, these shrines were located “on the temple-axis,” making them part of the architectural progression (1984: 99). This builds on Petrie’s earlier denotation of different types of temples for different types of worship (1938). It must be noted, however, that any formulaic approach to temple analysis is determined by surviving examples, and there are many Egyptian temples that have only survived in description.

148 It must be noted that there are examples of Egyptian temples, particularly at Abydos and Dendera, which do not have the pylons at the entrance, suggesting a different purpose for the temples.
itself, sometimes referred to as *djeser djeseru*\textsuperscript{149} by the Egyptians, would have been surrounded by additional rooms to house statues of visiting or associated gods, with the innermost area accessible only to a select few priests (Strudwick & Strudwick 1999: 26).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure71.jpg}
\caption{Pylons at entrance to Temple of Horus at Edfu, Egypt. Photo by author, 2011.}
\end{figure}

In the temple arrangement that Karnak, Luxor, and Edfu follow, constructed architecture defines space and the same types of spaces are repeated in a sequence as a standard of practice, making an ancient Egyptian temple easily recognizable architecturally to ancient peoples. Having the spaces progress in a sequence where rooms feel more and more confined is way of aesthetically identifying sacred space from public space, while at the same time protecting the most important rooms from the harsh environmental elements, and using the availability or rejection of sunlight to define the space even further. Once a priest entered the temple, the rooms would have gotten progressively darker as the size and location of the windows moved higher on the wall. This

\textsuperscript{149} Spencer is again more specific in this, suggesting that there are several names given to shrines and chapels. Please see Spencer (1984: 99-146) for a more in-depth analysis.
enhanced the illusion of the sacred environment if accompanied by torches and smoke, and the priest would experience the mystique of the god’s house through this aesthetic. The dark rooms helped to keep the inner sanctum cool in the desert climate and assisted in the preservation of the decorated walls.

In addition to providing a particular aesthetic, the rooms are also designed functionally primarily using a rectilinear layout. This would have provided structural efficiency in design and allowed ample space for wall decoration. It also creates a facilitated the progression of spaces, as they could be easily aligned and structured. The Temple for Horus at Edfu is particularly demonstrative of each of these concepts, with a traditional arrangement of spaces, all of which are rectilinear and rising in elevation to the dark sanctum [Figure 72]. This preference for rectilinear spaces may reference the importance of cardinal alignment, something that is also comparable in several temples. Since many environmental elements such as the pattern of the sun and the Nile River are important to the Egyptian way of life, these may be referenced in the layout of certain temples. Luxor Temple [Figure 73] features a progression of spaces along an axis similar to that of the Temple of Horus at Edfu, but, atypically, the axis runs in the North-South direction to situate the temple alongside the all-important Nile River. This suggests not only an awareness of the importance of the Nile, but also acuity of design to seemingly reference the river in the design of the complex.
Figure 72: Rectilinear barque room, Temple of Horus, Edfu. Photo by author, 2011.

Figure 73: Luxor Temple with axis running parallel to the Nile. The temple, which originally sat along the bank of the Nile is now separated from the river by city infrastructure, but still retains some foliage. Photo by author, 2011.
How these ancient spaces interact with each other and the environment provides a cultural context to a discussion of the modern site, especially with regard to the environmental design. Strict comparisons can be made between the design and execution of the modern and ancient spaces when looking from a purely theoretical standpoint. Many of the monumental structures planned by the Egyptians stood for thousands of years, offering not only a historical precedent for continued development at each of the sites, but also an aesthetic model for new construction. The ancient Egyptians were able to construct the complexes successfully using the technology and environmental conditions available, offering current planners the opportunity to learn from the past in the design of the new spaces.

5.3 The Development of Egyptian Cultural Heritage Sites

For Egypt and many other countries dependent on tourism, the architectural planning of certain sites gives a clear indication of the intention of the cultural heritage managers, and in the case of the Egypt, the government, in establishing high value heritage sites to produce additional income. Unfortunately, the pressure to accommodate tourism often results in expedited construction and design, and in some cases, increasing deterioration of archaeological monuments and the human environment as a result. As one of the main cultural heritage centers of the world, Egypt has struggled over the years with its identity and ability to accommodate mass tourism. Plagued with political issues, including terrorism, radicalism and anti-tourism dissidents, the development of Luxor as a sustainable tourism destination has been a long process for the Egyptian government (Abraham 2002: 387-96). Certainly in the two decades

---

150 Upper Egypt in particular has been the fairly recent target of terrorism associated with tourism sites, creating a difficult precedent for expanding currently tourism facilities. The 1997 massacre of 58 tourists at Deir-el-Bahari, just outside of the city of Luxor is a prime example of how political or outside disputes can permanently affect tourism. Jakkie Cilliers (2003), and Peter Bergen and Alec Reynolds (2005) suggest that this event, carried out by imprisoned Jamaat al-Islamiyya in retribution, alone helped to cripple Egypt’s significant tourism industry (2003: 94; 2005: 3).
before the political unrest of 2011, Egypt saw a significant increase in tourism numbers, requiring a redesign and masterplanning of the cultural heritage and architectural infrastructure in order to accommodate the additional visitors\(^\text{151}\) (Gamblin 2004: 269-71). The sustainable expansion of tourism is a topic of extensive theoretical discourse,\(^\text{152}\) and thought by many to be extremely important to the survival of Egypt as a nation, as the economy and ability to fund cultural heritage research relies heavily on tourism revenue (Helmy & Cooper 2002: 514-21).\(^\text{153}\)

Luxor and other commonly visited sites represent major international tourism destinations, helping to financially sustain the whole country, but struggling with how to architecturally accommodate the ever-expanding requirements of the international visitor.

Over the last several years, Egypt has attempted to modernize archaeological sites with the help of the international community, to keep up with the increase in visitors, and to develop sites in a way that will encourage international tourism. With the need to develop sites quickly and efficiently, however, many architectural solutions have proven to be more problematic than effective\(^\text{154}\). Development plans such as the Comprehensive Development Plan for the City of

\(^{151}\) Gabriel Abraham, an associate at ABT Associates Inc. USA, and consultant for the Comprehensive Development Plan for the City of Luxor (CDCL) outlines six individual investment projects, including: (1) Restoration of the Avenue of the Sphinxes, (2) Development of the Destination Resort of El-Toad, (3) Development of the New Community of New Luxor, (4) Infrastructure services for New Luxor and El-Toad, (5) Establishment of High-Value Agriculture, and (6) Development of the Open Museum and Heritage District in Luxor City (2002: 387-8). These projects cover a variety of values based in community development and heritage, specifically to encourage a substantial tourism increase. But, the development plan is a set of recommendations, not rules, and many of the proposed projects have not been accomplished due to facts of cost and availability. This has left Luxor city in a situation that has begun tourism projects, but without the infrastructure to support the increase in visitors.\(^\text{152}\)

The expanding tourism in Egypt has been featured in many heritage news stories and case studies in recent years, with commentators on both sides of the argument. Many of the reports are written by native Egyptians, who have a stakeholder claim in the heritage discourse (see El-Aref 2009), but others are from outside heritage experts (or projects partnered between Egyptians and other experts) seeking to put Egypt into the broader context of the tourism practice (see Helmy & Cooper 2002, Ross 1988, and Weeks 1993).\(^\text{153}\)

Helmy and Cooper cite tourism as integral to providing jobs for Egyptians, whose local and national economies alone do not provide enough employment outside the tourism industry to remain sustainable. Therefore, tourism is not only integral to revenue, but also to individual livelihood and employment percentages for citizens (2002: 519).\(^\text{154}\) As Waleed Hazbun, a scholar associated with the Department of Political Science at Johns Hopkins University cites increased focus on land around archaeological sites and beach resorts being set aside for architectural
Luxor (multiple versions, including 2000 & 2002), and the Valley of the Kings, Luxor, Egypt Site Management Masterplan (2006), and Zahi Hawass’s essay “The Egyptian Monuments: Problems and Solutions” (1995), were created to introduce current issues associated with the archaeological sites in Upper Egypt and to move forward with the development of the sites for tourism in a sustainable way, while identifying the impact that these would have on the ancient remains. In the plans for the sites, recommendations for improvements to the city of Luxor include the expansion of tourism sites, as well as the protection of all monuments and the creation of economic opportunities for the local population. Citing the deterioration of monuments from continuously increasing tourism,\(^{155}\) the plan included developing the Temples of Karnak and Luxor to create better architectural infrastructure for visitors to the sites with the intention of preserving the monuments (Abraham 2002).\(^ {156}\) Hawass, former Minister of State for Antiquities Affairs, cited a similar situation regarding the expansion of the cities of Edfu and Giza resulting in the deterioration of their respective monuments, where conservation is

\(^{155}\) Following multiple monitoring missions by UNESCO and ICOMOS, researches cited multiple factors requiring attention for Ancient Thebes (Luxor) to remain inscribed to the World Heritage List. These included the rising groundwater level, risk of flooding, uncontrolled urban development, and absence of a defined protection perimeter for the property and buffer zone. These factors were identified as part of a larger conservation concern that also included the demolition of houses at Gurnah to accommodate new infrastructure and concerns regarding the sustainability of the development plan (UNESCO 2007: 1). The UNESCO committee’s concerns in 2007 were focused on the human impact of further development, particularly the excavation of the Avenue of Sphinxes that would demolish residential structures. Other researchers have focused specifically on the conservation and destruction of monuments as a direct result of tourism. Main conservation issues in this way include the rise in temperature and humidity, leading to deterioration of decorated wall surfaces, caused by an increase of visitors, as well as the deterioration of stone walls and other surfaces from direct human contact (Wendrich 2006: 184).

\(^{156}\) In a July 2011 issue of IMPACT, an Egyptian newsletter produced by the Ministry of Planning and International Co-operation, Senior Research and Evaluation Officer Sally A. El Tanani outlined the current plans for enhancing Luxor, which included following the new comprehensive development plan which “aimed at turning Luxor into an open-air museum by 2030” at a cost of 2.2 billion Egyptian pounds (2011: 2). This suggests that the architectural involvement would go beyond just developing the excavated archaeological sites and opening the Avenue of Sphinxes, but also continue to interpret other Egyptian cultural heritage, such as Hassan Fathy’s village and a number of the historic mosques.
necessary for the survival of the architecture, even though this development would certainly impact communities that have grown around the sites (1995: 105-112). Although each project presents awareness of the impact of tourism on ancient Egyptian monuments, this expedited development, while attempting to fix the current situation, which created additional problems for the ancient architecture and local communities.

What is most interesting to the continuing development of these cultural heritage spaces is that the ancient aesthetic was purposefully influential on the modern design of the associated sites in Luxor. At the Temple of Karnak specifically, the newly constructed plaza extends the rectilinear forms and progressive space developed in the colonnaded courtyards of the temple. The project was designed by Hala Nasser\(^{157}\) who was named one of the most influential Landscape Architects in the Middle East, and teaches at Clemson University. According to Senior Research and Evaluation Officer for the Ministry of Planning and International Co-operation, Sally A. El Tanani:

\[\text{The creation of the Plaza removed all the slums in the surrounding area of the temple and created an open space to allow visitors standing in the middle of the temple gates, to see the Temple of Hatshepsut on the opposite bank of the Nile - the West Bank of Luxor - exactly as the ancient Egyptians did (2011: 2).}\]

The new plazas at Karnak are intended to be monumental, not only to accommodate crowds but also to control the space and lead tourists to the temple. Her statement, however, is very dismissive of the surrounding area, referring to the low income housing as “slums,” and simple in the view of what the eventual design would accomplish. This creates an interesting theoretical and spatial juxtaposition when examining the historical precedent for interpretation and the environmental and human impact of the newly designed plaza spaces.

\(^{157}\) The project was completed by HewittNasser studio.
5.4 The Impact of Spaces on the Cultural Heritage Environment

The Egyptian cultural heritage interventions were intended to help accommodate increased tourism in the area by providing much-needed tourism infrastructure, something particularly lacking in Egypt in the 20th century. The design of the newly planned urban archaeological spaces, however, has been problematic for both visitors and the monuments. Large-scale plazas [Figures 74 & 75] featuring the extensive use of limestone paving have created unintentional but oppressive “heat islands”\(^{158}\) around the archaeological sites, reducing air quality and increasing the deterioration risk for the local historic monuments. The original design of the plazas, referred to as Luxor Temple Square and Karnak Temple Square, intended to provide shaded and sustainable space for visitors and the community, but the planted trees and grass require significant growth to serve their original purpose. Additionally, increased urbanization around the sites and the salinity of groundwater have also created problems that are difficult to mitigate.

\(^{158}\) The Urban Heat Island Effect theory suggests that urban spaces tend to have higher ambient temperatures than rural regions because the use of hardscape and engineered materials as well as the concentration of buildings. For additional information, please see Golden 2010.
Figure 74: Karnak Temple Square, Egypt. Plaza extends the rectilinear form of the temple to the interpretive center and plaza design. Photo by author, 2011.

Figure 75: Luxor Temple Square. Plaza extends the linear form of the temple and spaces into the plaza design. Photo by Marc Ryckaert, 2013.
The “heat island effect” is a heavily researched concept in the architectural community, although it may not be often addressed in heritage planning. Based on the theory that certain materials absorb and reflect sunlight as radiation, this phenomenon has been the subject of extensive discourse, specifically for its relationship to the planning of urban spaces and its subsequent effect on urban populations. Excessive hard surface landscapes combined with substantial environmental sunlight can together force ground temperatures to rise, making the impact of the sunlight on pedestrians much more intense. As cities and other urban spaces develop and increase their total percentage of hard surfaces, air quality is thought to decrease, causing an uncomfortable and sometimes dangerous environment for both local populations and travelers (Sanford 2004: 318-9). In Egypt, where sunlight and temperatures are already elevated, this effect can not only make certain spaces uncomfortable, but also the reduction of air quality can exacerbate existing health problems for travelers who do not know to take certain precautions. Death or significant illness is rarely caused solely by the heat island effect, but in an area where high temperatures are already present, it could contribute to heat stroke or similar illnesses affecting tourists.

Another concern for the planning of the spaces is the sociological impact that the heat islands may have on tourists. People tend to interact with the plazas differently when the environment is uncomfortably hot, avoiding gathering or traveling through the plaza, which would negate the intended purpose (Shah & Kesan 2007: 353). When faced with an expansive open space,
individuals will move toward the outer edges of the paving during the heat of the day, where air quality is better and temperatures are generally cooler. Even in the coolest months of the Egyptian winter, sunlight is so intense that even hard surface materials, like limestone, not intended to absorb the sun can cause heat to be reflected onto unsuspecting visitors. Many of Egyptian spaces, including those in Luxor, also provide very little shade from which to escape the heat and reflection of the sun [Figure 76], and the only solution for travelers is to attempt to avoid the plaza altogether.\footnote{In reviewing the Temple of Karnak archaeological site, many tourists mention the plazas as detrimental to the overall experience. Once writes, “We didn't linger in the Visitor Center, however, and totally ignored (i.e. no eye contact, no speaking, no looking at the goods, no stopping) the gauntlet of shops and salesmen selling souvenirs, drinks, and snacks as we headed out across the hot paved stone plaza in 102 degree temperature to reach the entrance of Karnak Temple” (“Photos can’t capture Karnak Temple” 2013), while another one writes, “The huge open space in front of the temple, repaved around 2009, is in very poor condition now with uneven slabs and many broken pavers - hardly an improvement on the former open area where a few sheep were grazed in among the small trees and bushes. I found it a long, hard walk to get to the entry scanners” (“Signs of the Times” 2014).} In one of its status reports on Ancient Thebes, UNESCO writes:

…the overall aim of an open air plaza in front of the temple of Karnak was to correct the haphazard development of secondary facilities that have sprung up over time and to upgrade these through a harmonized design. It highlighted the need for the State Party to organize an international design competition for the entrance to Karnak Temple to encourage high-quality design alternatives which support and promote a new vision on heritage management, and to respect existing archaeological and surviving evidence (2010: 1).

The report does not address the pollution or air quality issues associated with the plaza, but does discuss the purpose, which seems to be mitigating previous architectural strategies through “harmonized design.” Important to note here, however, is that UNESCO does not often remark on the design of facilities, just if they accomplish their intended purpose. In the report following this one, UNESCO does not explain whether the plaza continued to serve its purpose, but the 2013 report outlines additional infrastructure being added (UNESCO 2013: 1).
The heat island effect and air pollution from other sources are common in Egypt due to increased urbanization combined with the natural climate. Urban sprawl around Luxor city is continuously addressed in the UNESCO reports, yet not physically addressed through design. Constant construction and expansion of the city around Cairo and Giza [Figure 77] has led to significant pollution that is visible on ancient monuments\textsuperscript{162} in these locations. As Luxor and other Egyptian cities continue to expand, monuments could see similar results from common air pollution exacerbated by the heat island effect. As there is already significant weathering and deterioration

\textsuperscript{162} There are various types of urban pollution that can affect monuments beyond the heat island effect. In Esna and Edfu, lack of proper sewage disposal has caused some sewage to flow into the heritage sites, and in Cairo and Giza, increased urbanization has brought pollution from vehicles and fires closer to the monuments, leaving them stained (Hawass 1995: 105-109).
of several monuments at Luxor,\textsuperscript{163} continuous exposure to air pollution and carbon dioxide created by large tourism groups could lead to the eventual destruction of the monuments (Doyle 2009: 47-9).

The hard surface development can also create problems with pollution being carried into monuments from the groundwater. Any spill or waste that is deposited onto the plaza, even bird or animal waste, will remain there until washed from the surface as opposed to a permeable landscape, which will allow pollutants to flow through plants or soil and be filtered. Although rainfall in the area is rare, washing the plazas as part of the upkeep of the site produces the same effect, moving any materials sitting on the plaza down into the soil. Without plants to help clean

\textsuperscript{163} Along with the UNESCO studies listing concerns for Ancient Thebes, several outside researchers have addressed the issue of weathering and conservation at Karnak Temple specifically. Major concerns that stemmed from the studies include general loss of material, staining, spalling, and fissures (Fitzner et al. 2003), as well as the salinization of the stone through capillary action (Saleh et al. 1992).
toxins from the soil, pollutants can be absorbed into the groundwater table, and eventually be wicked back up into the ancient monuments through a capillary effect. Due to extensive purposeful irrigation of the Nile, the water table in Egypt has risen to a significantly elevated height compared to where it would have been when the ancient monuments were constructed, and this has led to increased wicking into ancient monuments (Doyle 2009; Walton 1981: 30-6). Along with the elevation increase, there has been a significant increase in the salinity of the groundwater, a particular problem in Upper Egypt, which has significantly affected farming as well as the preservation of local monuments (Walton 1981). The elevated water table has resulted in facilitated wicking of salts and other toxins into the ancient monuments through porous stones, often also drawing out the natural salt found in the material makeup of the buildings (Doyle 2009; Hawass 1995; Saleh, et al. 1992). This can increase spalling of the stones, which cosmetically damages ancient buildings, but also often requires extensive conservation to fix, if the problem is bad enough to cause structural damage. Although salt and water damage existed before the plazas were constructed, the expanse of hard surface space allows for an easier transfer of polluted materials into the groundwater, thus exacerbating the pre-existing problem.

164 This is a natural process, referred to as Phytoremediation, where plants are used to filter and clean pollutants from water as it is absorbed down into the soil layers (Hinchman et al. 1996: 1). It will be discussed in-depth later in the study.
165 Susan Walton and others credit the construction of the Aswan Dam for farming irrigation as particularly affecting the salinization of the rising elevation groundwater table, proving that the intervention may be almost as harmful as effective, since this salinity of the soil will not allow for the farming that the dam was built to create (1981: 31-32). Ahmed Madani (2005), as well as Ali Kerem Saysel and Yaman Barlas (2001), also identify soil salinity as one of the major problems with currently farming and sustainability in Egypt, and have been able to model its impact using formulas to calculate how to control salinity.
166 The spalling problem with Egypt is more complicated than in some other countries, because many ancient monuments in Egypt were constructed using local limestone or sandstone, both of which are very porous and prone to wicking, and also that they inherently through material make-up have a high salinity level. This means that some damage is caused through the wicking of pollution and material into the stone, and additional damage is caused when the salts found naturally in the stone are released.
Urbanization is also a major issue affecting cultural heritage in areas where city expansion is associated with economic development. Egypt has been attentive to the idea of major city expansion for over a century, studying the design of British and French cities, and hoping to emulate the urban environment that they provide. Initiated by Muhammad ‘Alî in the early 19th century, an imperial project to modernize cities was undertaken by the Ottoman authority with the intention of creating an industrialized economy in many of its nation states. Mercedes Volait credits this action as a catalyst for Egypt’s own modernization project for developing Alexandria and eventually Cairo, which were to be modeled after Hausmann’s Paris, complete with large garden spaces and promenades (2003: 17-28). During this same period, Egyptian cultural heritage in the urban fabric was also impacted, with the establishment of the Comité de Conservation des Monuments de l’Art Arabe, which oversaw the preservation of “Arab Art” in Egypt, albeit through the lens of a largely European committee. Although there was often discord between Egyptian and European members of the committee, the movement did ensure the preservation of many urban monuments in Egypt, particularly mosques (El-Habashi 2003: 155-175).

The urban structure that exists in Cairo, Luxor, and other Egyptian cities today, however, is a shadow of these early attempts to create a European city in the Middle East. The cost of space in metropolitan areas in the last century eliminated the idea of many public parks. Since urban space is at a premium, many developing cities choose to sell the important land instead of using it for public works, thus allowing the hard surface area to expand and the heat-mitigating parks to shrink. There is also the concern of dwindling natural water supplies in the Middle East,

167 Volait goes on to say that while the project was begun during the reign of khedive Ismâîl, British occupation in the late 19th century furthered the design process and formed a large part of the modern city (2003: 29-31).
making public works projects that require water to care for them extravagant when compared with providing water for people. As microcosms of these urban environments, cultural heritage urban spaces in Egypt have tended to follow the same principles of development and organization as the large cities. As the space needing to be controlled is allocated as part of a greater financial picture, hard surfaces have become much more common and have expanded the heat island effect around cultural heritage sites, without including the initial proposed parks that would have broken up the paved space. Because many cultural heritage and archaeological sites are funded by national governments and not private money, the emphasis of the intervention is often placed on securing the safety of the archaeological remains, and leftover funds are allocated to the visitor spaces. This can mean that at sites all over the world, inexpensive materials, including easily managed gravel and tile, are used for the interpretation spaces. Adding facilities that require upkeep, such as green spaces, is often a long-term commitment by the entity funding the site, and therefore difficult and uncommon to come by.

Also important to note is that with the expansion of cultural heritage spaces often comes the increase in tourism numbers to archaeological sites, which can result in the eventual destruction of architectural features. As examined before, the sheer number of people visiting a site can lead to additional problems [Figure 78], with the result that many other archaeological sites around the world have had to control access because of expedited wear on cultural heritage remains. Large numbers of people can be difficult to control in a crowd format, which could result in more people touching architectural features either on purpose or by accident, causing features to

---

168 There is a slight exception to this specifically for monuments as part of the Ancient Thebes complex, because private entities or other national governments, such as UNESCO, and the Japanese Funds-In-Trust, have contributed funding to specific projects related to the archaeological development, but not for new interpretive facilities (UNESCO 2013).

169 This will be discussed further in Chapter 6 in relation to Machu Picchu, Peru.
wear more quickly. Large crowds can also mean more carbon dioxide being released into the air, which in volumes can lead to the deterioration of painted spaces. A less-researched, but similarly important problem with crowding at archaeological sites is the affect that large groups have on the quality of the tourism experience. Larger groups mean that some monuments are more difficult to see or photograph and can result in some tourists being unhappy with visiting sites that are too crowded.\textsuperscript{170} With some of the oldest painted and sculpted spaces in the world, Egypt must carefully weigh the impact of these large groups on cultural heritage sites in order to ensure that monuments can be preserved while allowing people to experience them in an enjoyable way.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure78.jpg}
\caption{Crowds entering the Karnak Temple complex from the interpretive center. Photo by author, 2011.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{170} For the Temple of Karnak, there is even a discussion topic on Tripadvisor.com that asks how to avoid crowds at the Temple of Karnak (“What a difference a day makes (or not..?)” 2010).
5.5 The Human Impact of Expanding Archaeological Development

The construction of these archaeological spaces was intended to benefit local populations, but the development has in fact caused entire populations of people to be forcibly relocated in order to accommodate the expanding cultural heritage sites in Luxor, something that was identified as concerning in early UNESCO studies of the site. Over time, as modern cities have encroached on the sites, the Egyptian government has pushed communities back, claiming the protection of the monuments as a priority, but has experienced backlash by those who feel that this has been done primarily for the commercialization of the cultural heritage site and with tourism revenue in mind. The removal of several blocks of housing to accommodate the excavation of the Avenue of Sphinxes connecting the Temples of Luxor and Karnak [Figure 79] has been particularly criticized for the displacement of poorer residents to newly created settlements. UNESCO identified this removal early in conservation reports writing:

The mission also described reported projects in Luxor such as the excavation of the Alley of the Sphinxes in its totality, designed to make evident the past physical connection of the Luxor and Karnak Temples…The report commented that while work in these areas has already demonstrated the good physical survival of the avenue, a part of this avenue is covered by the contemporary town and will require demolition of at least 300 residential houses… The demolition of some of the structures near Karnak, the later urban settlements between the two temples and of substantial parts of Gurnah are neither acceptable approaches within contemporary conservation theory (which demands that changes be limited to only those essential to meet critical functional needs, and here, only where this can be done without loss to heritage values), nor respectful of the property’s outstanding universal value. Even if some of these places are not what would be described as “antiquities”, they should be protected as being indissociably connected to the development of the site, and therefore worthy of the strongest protection efforts (2007: 1).

The report specifically highlights modern cultural heritage principles, suggesting that the entirety of a site’s history should be part of the interpretation. This includes comparatively modern history, which would include the cultural practices of modern Egyptians living in the area. Not only did the demolition separate local populations from their familial homes and trivialize current cultural and living practices, but some researchers suggest that separating tourists from

\[171\] For additional information, see Egypt Then and Now 2011; Van der Spek 2011; Meskell 2005; Gamblin 2004.
the local populations creates an inauthentic dialogue between culture, tourism, and place, where international visitors are seeing only what the government and cultural heritage managers want them to see, not a true representation of a particular city. This creates a more “tourism friendly” environment, but at the expense of those who are intended to benefit from the economic development (Russo & van der Borg 2002: 631-37).

In her 2011 blog, Reflections in the Nile: A journal of my travels in Egypt, Su Bayfield writes:

I’m still not sure if I like the re-design – it all feels sort of ‘sanitized’ now, an archaeological theme park with the sole purpose of getting the dozens of coach-loads of tourists in and out as quickly as possible. While I understand how vital tourism is to the Egyptian economy, on this trip and especially around Luxor, I’ve been forming the impression that Egypt no longer has a place for, or an interest in, the serious student of Egyptology. This saddens me (1).
She introduces an interesting aesthetic result of the new spaces: the seeming sanitation of Luxor to accommodate tourism. The spaces are not just tourism-friendly, they are tourism centric, resembling parking lots and waiting areas at theme parks, but not focused on Egyptian culture, ancient or modern. Removing the local population removes the modern culture of Egypt from the archaeological center, sanitizing the experience by creating an environment in which a wide variety of international tourists will feel safe with the comforts of home. This degrades the experiential quality of traveling in a foreign country for those specifically looking to feel a part of another culture, but helps to control the onslaught of people and move them toward the temples.

The displacement of local peoples is reminiscent of a neo-colonial approach to tourism planning, where the impact of the tourism on the host nation can really be positive or negative depending on who stands to gain from the revenue that the cultural heritage site will produce. Tourism can mean big business and has been proven to be a successful tool in the Middle East for countries looking to further develop their economies. However, this often then becomes an economy controlled largely by outside influence and can leave nations overly dependent on tourist revenue, resulting in decisions that benefit the outside sources and not local populations (Hazbun 2004: 313-15). To combat the future issue, Egypt and similar nations have been encouraged to think about Sustainable Tourism as a way to fund the preservation of archaeological heritage sites with the additional revenue and have minimal negative impact on local populations. Helmy

---

172 As part of the Luxor IMPACT bulletin, Hanan M. Abbas, another Senior Research and Evaluation Officer writes: “As major attractions for international tourists, the sites support significant employment in tourism-related industries and generate substantial revenue for local enterprises. As a matter of fact, there has been an increase in the national income as a result of the growing tourism rate. This was also reflected in the increase of employment in the tourism sector (2011: 4). There is certainly an awareness of how additional tourism will impact Egypt in a positive way, but there does not seem to be an acknowledgement of the negative impacts, such as over-tourism or increased urbanization.
& Cooper examined the development of sustainable tourism in Egypt, through a case study involving stakeholders, current tourism policies, and future plans, coming to the conclusion that although sustainable tourism would be the best practice in Egypt, it has yet to be effectively executed (2000: 528-30). Therefore, in order for Luxor to continue as a successful tourism destination, it will need to carefully implement suggestions from both the government and outside strategists.

In theory new settlement area would provide much-needed infrastructure, but in practice, managers failed to see the broader cultural impact of separating people from their familial homes. Consequently, the move was met with extreme resistance by those being relocated, even though the new development claimed to have “basic necessities of living that were missing from the old village” (*Egypt Then and Now* 2011:1). This is even acknowledged in the IMPACT issue administered by the government. Research and Evaluation officers Sherihan Habib and Hourhane Ghorab wrote:

Relocation schemes to protect archaeological sites and promote tourism must be adopted, based on an open dialogue with local communities. A relocation strategy is incorporated in the development plan of Luxor. It aims at demolishing homes, removing encroachments on the city’s archaeological sites and relocating residents to newly-planned communities. The goal is to create the world’s largest open-air museum by 2030. Such initiatives have been met with dissent by the local communities, as portrayed by the media. Thus, the communities of Luxor need to be engaged through participatory efforts (2011: 5).

As many researchers suggest, local populations in developing countries usually do not see benefits of continued cultural heritage development and in some cases are not even aware of the revenue that they could receive, making the displacement at Karnak even more problematic (*Yunis 2006*). Habib and Ghorab go on to suggest that the local public should work with the

---

173 Yunis addresses tourism in both developed and developing countries, and suggests that underserved populations in developing countries may not be as well informed on government practices, particularly as related to
government to find a successful solution to problems, and that national efforts should address local concerns such as poverty (2011: 5). With concerns from UNESCO still in place years after the IMPACT publication, it seems as though these suggestions have still not been implemented successfully.

Although the Luxor development has been one of the most publicized and expensive Egyptian projects, even winning an award in 2010 from the Organisation of Islamic Capitals and Cities (OICC) for the development of the Temple of Karnak plaza, it is certainly not the only one. The forced removal of settlers in other ancient sites in Egypt such as Luxor’s west bank, was also the result of the expanding commercial opportunities for tourism infrastructure, i.e. cafes, shops, circulation, and not solely resulting in the protection of the monuments (El-Aref 2009: 1; Ross 1988: 1). Without a known monetary benefit from this removal, the projects can certainly be considered problematic to the local population, who lose everything, and gain nothing from the development of the site.

Included in the political debate is the removal of vendors from archaeological sites in favor of the new designed shopping areas. With a long history of unlicensed souvenir vendors at the sites, the new Egyptian spaces control local access to the more popular archaeological areas and keep former souvenir vendors away from tourists. This was seen at Giza as early as the 1980s, and

archaeological sites, and therefore are “also unaware of their potential economic value” (2006: 151). This essentially allows national governments to receive revenue from archaeological sites and completely bypass serving the local populations surrounding it, since locals may not know any better.

According to an IMPACT article, Luxor was “shortlisted” for the competition and the plaza was completed for a total cost of 80 million Egyptian pounds (Tanani 2011: 2).

Both the Giza and Nile West Bank projects suggest that conservation was part of the decision to remove people from the archaeological sites, major funding was put into place on both projects for enhanced tourism facilities. According to El-Aref, the Deir Al-Bahari project, which included a new café, bookstore, and bazaar was completed for 9.850 million Egyptian pounds (2009: 1).
outraged local people who were dependent on selling gifts to tourists as their main source of income. The government maintained the position that the move was intended to protect the monuments from further damage (Ross 1988: 1). As a result, many sites now feature security walls around the archaeological remains, providing specific locations where licensed vendors are allowed to sell goods. The planning of this type of infrastructure is common in other areas of the world, placing Egypt within the confines of modern cultural heritage practices. Cultural heritage spaces associated with the temples of Karnak and Luxor include planned retail areas for shoppers within the confines of the archaeological site. Deir-el-Bahari, a part of the Luxor West Bank archaeological development, features a similar restriction of access designed to be a shopping corridor, or “gauntlet,” which forces visitors to leave through the shopping area [Figure 80]. As opposed to the previous open accessibility of vending at the sites, the newly defined architectural space restricts the number of vendors able to sell goods in a certain area, an initiative that most likely brings in additional government funding through licenses and permits, and could also direct tourism income to specific vendors, a perceived preference. The intervention was intended to provide a more pleasant experience for visitors, many of whom were tired of being accosted at archaeological sites, but has added to the general dissent in the local communities, again seeming to place the needs of tourists over those of the Egyptian citizens.\footnote{The further tourism-friendly development at Deir-el-Bahari is also most likely politically influenced, as this was the site of the Luxor tourist massacre in 1997. Since then, the site has been revolutionized to control access and encourage tourism through new and modern facilities, but has not necessarily been made more secure.}
The design of these designated shopping spaces, particularly those following the gauntlet approach, also have been criticized because, although they remove some souvenir vendors from the archaeological site, it forces visitors through the shopping complex to the exit the site. The concept of “exit through the gift shop” is not new in museum theory, and there are many examples where this is the norm, but it does seem to be an emerging development in open air tourism sites, where visitors are forced to pass through a makeshift bazaar in order to leave. Unlike a museum shop where visitors can choose to enter or not, the gauntlet intervention fully embraces the concept of the Middle Eastern bazaar, where at times, it is difficult to pass through when vendors are intent on making a sale. By planning the exit in this way, it eliminates the visitor’s choice in shopping, and instead creates a major inconvenience for many. But,

---

177 The practice is, in fact, common in many European and American art museums, where galleries or public space end in the gift shop.
178 In one review of the Deir-el-Bahari site, a visitor writes: “Have never previously encountered such aggressive and rude touting of tat - some members of our group were tearful from the treatment. Gangs of touts would close in
compared with the Pyramids at Giza site, where souvenir and camel ride vendors are still allowed to approach people at will as they are visiting the archaeology, the gauntlet approach does organize these vendors into a certain place through design.

Souvenir vending in Egypt has been a highly debated topic in recent years, with the government attempting to make tourism much more enjoyable after fielding complaints of aggressive vending. Although Deir-el-Bahari and Giza have not been able to perfect the practice, the new installation of open tourism plazas, despite their environmental impacts, seem to embody a more progressive approach to vending by utilizing adjacent and not forced shopping areas. Both the Temples of Karnak and Luxor are accompanied by developments that feature specific shopping spaces intended to create purposeful vending space and eliminate unauthorized vending from the sites, but visitors are not forced to walk through them to enter or exit the site [Figures 81 & 82]. The solutions are moderately effective in preventing goods from being sold inside the monuments themselves, but the design still embraces a corridor approach, making it difficult for tourists to completely pass without being approached. The architectural intervention at Edfu [Figure 83] seems to be the most effective solution, by designating a space for vending on the exterior of the site in a bazaar with plenty of circulation space around it. In contrast to the gauntlet approach and corridor examples, the Edfu bazaar allows for people to bypass the shopping area completely if not interested. These different examples represent how simple variations on a particular design theme can actually influence the way that people both view and travel through a site. The architecture acts as a controlling agent, guiding people to what they

on tourists, ESPECIALLY SINGLE WOMEN. AVOID” (“AVOID - Hyper-aggressive [sic] locals selling tat - AVOID” 2014) Because this vending area is part of the circulation strategy, it is impossible for tourists to avoid, and therefore the solution for this visitor is to avoid the site altogether to avoid the harassment.
wish to see and allowing them to avoid what they do not, while still serving its other functions.

Figure 81: Temple of Karnak shopping area off of parking lot. Photo by author, 2011.

Figure 82: Temple of Luxor shopping and cafe area. Photo by author, 2011.
Important to note in this discussion is that many of the recommendations to relocate local populations and develop the sites were encouraged by international consultants, such as the World Bank, Abt Associates (an international research and policy firm), the US Agency for International Development, SWECO International, and the French-Egyptian Center for the Study of the Temples of Karnak, who worked alongside Egyptian authorities to redesign the tourist facilities and work with conservation programs.\footnote{Recommendations can be seen in Mitchell (2001), Abraham et al. (1999), and CFEETK (2010).} Because many Egyptian cultural heritage sites were traditionally excavated by foreign archaeologists working toward the preservation of the
sites,\textsuperscript{180} utilizing the knowledge of those archaeologists seems to be a natural progression when looking to develop cultural heritage sites, particularly because the assisting countries have had substantial experience with cultural heritage development in their home nations. Enlisting outside resources to help with masterplanning and design can be a way to proceed in an endeavor where a developing country might have little experience, but an international design and research committee also could be seen as less sensitive to the inhabitants of the home country, creating another problematic political situation. If the focus of the redesign is seen as serving the international tourism community and commercial potential of the site and not local citizens, populations will be less supportive of the endeavor than in situations where they take an active role in the development.\textsuperscript{181}

\textit{5.6 Benefits of Further Landscaping and Architectural Development}

With the significant heat island plaza and other problems associated with the Temple of Karnak, an examination of the ancient architectural solutions could help to mitigate the negative effects and be in line with the cultural heritage practice of interpreting history through architectural intervention. First and foremost, the large modern plaza spaces emulate the inner courtyards of the traditional temple complex, but without the relief of the cooling strategies that the ancient temples would have had. Each would have featured one or more sacred lakes and been planted

\textsuperscript{180}Researchers such as Willeke Wendrich are careful to point out that although foreign archaeologists in the 21\textsuperscript{st} century can provide important preservation and conservation insight into the archaeological development of sites in Egypt, many of the foreign countries continuing to excavate played a large role in the early removal and destruction of Egyptian artifacts during the Ottoman empire and even into the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century (2006: 186). This is part of the post-colonial discourse that archaeology falls under, because original problematic practices by outside nations could create mistrust among the local inhabitants, despite the fact that these have since been rectified.

\textsuperscript{181}In a project at Quseir, Egypt, researchers found that when archaeologists (both foreign and Egyptian) collaborated with the community on excavation and interpretation projects, the local community was able to benefit from merchandising income, and became more involved in the practice of archaeology, suggesting that they considered it part of their heritage and therefore worth protecting (Moser et al. 2002: 242-3). Although this is just one example, many studies focused on active stakeholder involvement have found that engaging the community in a project ultimately leads to its success or survival (for additional information, please see Johnson et al. 2006, and Aas et al. 2005).
with greenery, which would have helped to mitigate the effect for the ancient priests, and such strategies would still work today at a relatively minor cost if they were properly cared for.

The simplest and often most cost-effective solution to environmental problems associated with heat from hard surfaces is the introduction of urban vegetation where the heat island effect and water seepage are most extreme. In a study of multiple urban spaces, Akbari and Rose found that urban plantings significantly improve air quality and are able to cool spaces better, mitigating the heat island effect (2008). As the land along the Nile was once a lush environment, redeveloping Luxor to include more palm trees and other native plants would be historically appropriate and help make the archaeological sites more pleasant for both tourists and locals. Since the Nile corniche was blocked in the most recent development of the sites, reopening this as a cultural connection to the temples would help to provide not only context for the archaeological remains, but also relief from the oppressive heat. Some urban plantings were suggested as part of the larger Luxor development plans, but the focus of these was initially aimed at cosmetically enhancing the environment, not mitigating the negative impact of development. Rodayna Omar, however, still sees this development as historically appropriate writing:

The project aimed at beautifying this unique monumental area by decorating the road with flowers and trees that are in tune with the Paranoiac nature of the road, thereby raising its aesthetic value. Another objective of the project was the restoration of the road to its previous condition during the era of the Pharaohs (2011: 4).

Reintroducing florae into the Egyptian city would not only help to cool hardscape, but also introduce visitors to the greater context of how the Egyptians used greenery in their cities, serving both an aesthetic and functional purpose. Although the exact plants that the Ancient

---

182 In her blog about travels in Egypt, Su Bayfield writes: “Luxor has been ‘prettified’ in recent years, all in the name of tourism and as we began our trail at the new entrance to the temple in the big empty paved plaza, I wasn’t
Egyptians used are currently unknown, the local temples feature wall reliefs [Figure 84] that could provide important visual information for what the ancient cities may have looked like. Additionally, the reduction in air pollution would help the sustainability of the city as a whole and hopefully encourage similar projects around the community to help combat the overall negative effects of urbanization. Currently, the Temple of Karnak plaza features some planting, but trees and grass are sparse when compared to paving, showing some attempt by designers to mitigate the heat island, but with little success due to the minimal amount of green space [Figure 85]. Interestingly, photographs of Luxor before the interventions show a substantially more lush urban environment, suggesting that the projects originally intended to improve the area have actually worked against the local environment [Figure 86].

Figure 84: Relief carving of the so-called Botanical Garden at Karnak depicting plants that Thutmose III brought back to Egypt from his military campaigns.

---

sure that I like the so-called improvements. Nectanebo I of Dynasty XXX constructed his processional avenue of sphinxes on top of an older route which was used at certain periods to carry the sacred barque of Amun from the Karnak Temples to Luxor Temple at festival times. An inscription of Nectanebo reads “I have built a beautiful road for my father Amun-Re surrounded by walls and decorated with flowers for the journey to the temple of Luxor”... (2011: 1). Plants in part represented life to the Egyptians, so reintroducing these would not only be affective in mitigating the heat island effect, but also ideologically appropriate to a cultural context.
Figure 85: (Top) Karnak plaza as designed with royal palms by HewittNassar Studio. Image source: http://www.hewittnassar.com/en/portfolio/project/default/0/13.html. (Bottom) Google Earth screen capture showing plaza and green space as constructed.
Another strategy to help mitigate the negative effect of the hardscape is Phytoremediation, the process of cleaning groundwater through plants, which can be used to remove hazardous materials deposited into groundwater from the plazas. Studies conducted by the Argonne National Laboratory and Applied Natural Sciences, Inc. suggest that particular plants are able to significantly reduce soil toxins, such as oil (Hinchman et al. 1996), one of the main runoff chemicals associated with paved surfaces. Introducing more extensive native Egyptian plants as part of the architectural intervention should reduce some of the toxins seeping into the monuments through the groundwater, as well as improve air quality through the production of oxygen. Egypt has also been working with SWECO international, an engineering and consulting firm based in Sweden, to lower the groundwater table caused by over irrigation [Figure 87] by
installing pumps and wells\textsuperscript{183} around the temples (ECHO 2011: 1). This should also help prevent salt and other toxins from being wicked into the foundations of the monuments and deposited on the exterior.

![Luxor Temple showing damp soil due to rising groundwater. Photo by author, 2011.](image)

Additional architectural development, although likely more expensive, could also help to combat the heat island effect, through the inclusion of constructed shades as part of the design of the plazas. Many archaeological development projects, specifically those in the Middle East faced with intense sun conditions, have utilized shades to give visitors a more pleasant space to rest out of the heat of the day, and prevent sunlight from reflecting off of hard surfaces [Figure 88]. This

\textsuperscript{183} The pumps and wells were dug by hand to avoid vibrations further damaging the monuments (ECHO 2011: 1).
can encourage tourists to visit sites at all hours of the day, even during the oppressive afternoon heat, helping to increase revenue and help pay for the development project.

Figure 88: Shades at Tel Akko, Israel. Photo by author, 2011.

Like shading, water features can help to cool an environment and make an exposed space more pleasant in which to gather. Traditional community fountains have been used for thousands of years as gathering areas, and as part of temple complexes, and following in the ancient trend, many sites have started to use community water features as ideal places for seating. However, with the substantial water crisis in the Middle East and concerns already with Nile distribution in Egypt, any planning to include such a feature at Karnak must be carefully considered for its impact on the resources of the Egyptian people. From a sociological standpoint, improving the plazas can represent a positive move on behalf of the Egyptian government to engage the local and international communities in the Temple of Karnak, and in other significant historical sites. Throughout history, plazas have been used as community gathering spaces, and recently well-
planned plazas around archaeological sites have provided ideal gathering spaces for local people, allowing them to feel engaged in the history of a certain area, but with a modern benefit. If areas around historical sites are uncomfortable, people will avoid them, creating a situation where the site is seen as a negative aspect of the city, instead of a place of national historical importance and something to be protected.

In a publication for the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), Bernard Feilden and Jukka Jokilehto identify international standards for restoring and interpreting urban archaeological spaces. As part of the consideration for interpretation, they particularly highlight the evidence of changing culture over time as necessary for visitors to understand a place:

> The value of an historic town is embodied in the material testimony of its stones and its structures, and often lies beneath their visible surface. This historical stratigraphy—the evidence and marks brought by changes in use over time, as well as the connections and continuity that make an individual building part of the urban context—constitutes the basis for establishing the criteria for its conservation (1998: 78).

Luxor’s temples provide a center around which the cultural landscape has changed over time. As such, an interpretation of the temples as part of the greater modern culture would help to show value for both the ancient and modern heritage. The current design represents a preference for the ancient architecture, but could be modified to incorporate all areas of Egyptian cultural heritage.

One of the recent successful projects to improve public archaeological plazas and incorporate multiple heritages is the development at the Temple of Augustus and Rome in Ankara, Turkey. The site includes a 1st century BCE Roman temple dedicated to the emperor Augustus [Figure
around which the city of Ankara eventually developed. The temple was converted at one point to accommodate functions of the Hacı Bayram mosque, which subsequently built a large plaza for local worshippers [Figure 90]; the immediate area also includes several preserved Ottoman houses [Figure 91]. Although the area had since seen significant decline since the installation of much of the historic architecture, the Turkish government adopted the project of revitalizing the urban environment of Ulus, where the site is located, naming it an urban conservation area in 1980s. The redevelopment of the Augustus Temple and plaza followed in the 1990s with new architectural spaces connecting the mosque, temple, and houses (Ercan & Akkach 2009: 92-93) [Figure 92]. This not only allowed for the preservation of the monuments, but also created a designated area for the public interpretation of Turkish architectural heritage, showcasing examples of design from various periods in Turkish history. The project included the design of additional modern spaces to connect all of the structures, as well as several shallow decorative pools with plantings, seats, and bridges for people to gather and keep cool in the hot weather.
Figure 89: Temple of August, Ankara, Turkey. Photo by author, 2011.

Figure 90: Hacı Bayram mosque attached to Temple of Augustus with plaza. Photo by author, 2011.
Figure 91: Restored Ottoman houses near Temple of Augustus. Photo by author, 2011.

Figure 92: Development project connecting Temple of Augustus, Hacı Bayram mosque, and Ottoman houses. Photo by author, 2011.
This new urban landscape project was completed alongside a larger study of the archaeology of the Augusteum, whose objective was to examine and document the monument, as well as stabilize the architecture, which had fallen into disrepair by the 1990s (Botteri & Fangi: 85). Similarly to the Temple of Karnak in Egypt, the new plaza spaces were intended to enhance this historical focus, by “defin[ing] independent but integrated spaces to religious and daily activities” (Ercan & Akkach 2009: 92-93). These public spaces then allow for spatial control and circulation as a part of the experience with historic remains, and are in line with cultural heritage practice, as they also provide space for the public outdoor functions of the nearby mosque.

The Ankara project was successful in creating an area where people can gather or rest when visiting one or all of the identified cultural heritage sites. Although the location in the city does not environmentally allow for trees to be planted for shade, the pools and other low plants help to cool the surrounding hard surface landscape, as well as providing an additional visual aesthetic. By connecting the ancient history to the modern mosque and historic houses – since converted to shops – the project allows locals and visitors to engage with different periods of Turkish history. The architectural and theoretical connections bring together populations with different associated value systems into one place, encouraging a sense of community ownership both of the history, and the modern intervention. Since the space is part of each of the sites, it encourages those with a stake in one of the properties to protect the community space, allowing three different cultural institutions to feel a personal claim over the area, thus helping to sustain the upkeep of the site as a whole. The plaza spaces can then be used by each institution for events or religious gatherings and becomes part of the functional fabric of the city.
Introducing such spaces into otherwise fledgling urban communities can help bring individual stakeholders together and add to the developed urban living space. Architecturally, creating shared public parks and plazas allows local individuals to feel a sense of community ownership essentially through their ability to expand their living space into the public environment. This seems to be the most effective idea toward developing a sustainable community, because residents who feel a sense of ownership over shared public spaces will take care of those spaces better than individuals who feel isolated from them. This model is particularly important in the Middle East where temperatures are cooler in the evenings and people come out to community spaces or plazas to socialize or gather outside. Mark Francis refers to these types of community spaces as “participatory landscapes,” where visitors are expected to interact both with each other and the architecture, therefore making this engagement part of the design intention (1989: 148). This certainly ties into cultural heritage practice, which also stipulates the success of interventions through public engagement.

As a relevant precedent for the cultural heritage spaces in Egypt, the intervention in Ankara has also shown how a local religious population can respond to the ancient remains. During the construction of the Hacı Bayram mosque in the 15th century, parts of the ancient Augustus temple were utilized as rooms, but the ancient building itself was not dismantled, despite the importance of the site to Turkish Muslims. Instead, the mosque was built to be connected to the temple, to utilize the space inside while preserving the architecture (Botteri & Fangi 2003: 84). This could have been because the temple wall was still structurally sound and, therefore, facilitated construction of that part of the mosque, but whatever the intention was initially in
leaving the Roman building there, keeping it over the centuries shows a sensitivity to and the integration of history that came before modern Turkey or the mosque.\footnote{Interesting to note—the design of the new spaces to connect different pieces of Turkish history was assigned to Middle East Technical University and University of Adelaide students. The purpose of the design project was to “raise students’ sensitivity to spatial and social difference in their experience and design of constructed environments” (Akkar Ercan 2008). This introduces the theoretical design problem as part of a larger social history, helping to further enhance the cultural heritage objectives and educate students at the same time.}

This combination of histories that the Ulus area represents has become part of the wider interpretations of several proposed architectural interventions. In 2009 when the project was reexamined, several groups sought to use the histories as organizing theories for its continuing development, including titles such as “Integration, Connectivity, and Transition,” and “Hacı Bayram – Layers of the City,” and proposed projects such as an underground museum that would highlight Ankara’s variety of historic pasts (Akkar Ercan & Akkach 2009: 95). This shows not only the continuing effort to preserve and develop urban space, but also to look to historical precedents and cultural importance when designing new interpretations. In an area with different types of social and historical pasts, integrating them into a modern interpretation can be difficult, especially trying to relate different types of religious architecture to one another, but by highlighting the architectural space itself as a modern and constantly developing social and cultural environment, the individual buildings become part of a larger idea, and allow residents to engage in and feel a part of different histories.

Improving the Egyptian facilities in a way similar to Ankara would not only allow people to engage in history in a comfortable setting, but the plazas could then continue their function of controlling movement between monuments and facilities in a less obtrusive way and at the same time provide important community space. An intention of the new plazas was to create necessary
architecture for circulation, but to also provide “open spaces” for the local residents, something that would ultimately help protect the monuments through community involvement (Abraham 2002: 390).\footnote{Abraham lists several “site specific” interventions alongside the plaza development, which include defining spaces at different points in the city through architecture, as well as improving greater circulation and enhancing the living environment (2002: 390-91). As well as engaging the local community in the historical significance of the area, the plan also calls for the creation of thousands of jobs, something that may be more tangible to local inhabitants than an appreciation for ancient heritage, but at the same time creating additional awareness and involvement.} Despite the environmental issues created by the plazas during the day, they do provide a pleasant public space for the local population in the evening. The hard surfaces continue to reflect warm air into the atmosphere, even when the temperature in the city drops as the sun sets. This provides a comfortable environment in the evening for the community where children can play and people can gather outdoors, as intended in the Luxor Development Plan.

5.7 Art Historical Implications and Benefits to Interpretation

The plaza at the temple at Karnak specifically helps to continue a tradition of new construction started thousands of years ago at the site, and this connection could be used as part of the interpretation of the remains. In constructing spaces that align with ancient Egyptian building principles, site designers could then explain why the temples are constructed in a particular way with regard to environmental conditions, and cite the need to work intelligently with these concerns in the future. Both the ancient and modern examples have the same intention: to control an environment through architecture and guide people through spaces using design. The architecture itself creates the aesthetic, focusing on rectilinear spaces situated as part of an otherwise organic city and environmental plan.
From a historical perspective, the development of Luxor could also be considered as continuing an ancient tradition of investing a modern interest in ancient remains that spans for thousands of years. The Temple at Karnak was modified over multiple dynasties, suggesting the continued importance of both the complex and the site over millenia. The Temple at Luxor, although much smaller, features the same emphasis on adding new spaces to the architectural layout over multiple dynasties and even includes the Abu el-Haggag mosque [Figure 93], which was built inside the complex during the Ottoman occupation of Egypt. The addition of modern plazas to the archaeological parks represents a continued interest in the conservation and development of the complexes, an interest that nearly dwarfs that of the Egyptian pharaohs’ expansion of the sacred sites. The additional modern intervention could represent a new chapter in the continuously changing purpose and design of the temple complexes, which over time included the worship of several major religions and now serve as part of a city-wide open-air museum. In a related parallel, however, the new architectural spaces restrict access to the temples through walls and with guards, eliminating previous green community space, and instead closing the temples off from the local population in the evening.

The oldest part of the Temple of Amun-Re at Karnak dates to the Middle Kingdom (specifically 1971-1926 BCE), where the White Chapel of Senusret I (Dynasty XII) was designed as part of a courtyard. Subsequent projects by multiple Dynasty XVIII Pharaohs vastly extended the temple complex to include massive courtyards separated by pylons, and eventually the hypostyle hall was added by Sety I (Dynasty XIX). Additional small projects from Dynasties XX-XXV followed this and added many other smaller defined spaces and shrines. Eventually, in the Late Period, a wall was added around the entire precinct, and the Avenue of Sphinxes connecting the Karnak and Luxor Temples was built (Blyth 2006). In the Greco-Roman Period, the temple was also slightly modified by the introduction of relief carvings to justify the Macedonian invasion of Egypt, and building maintenance was completed (Sullivan 2010: 12). For additional and more specific information on the history of the Luxor and Karnak Temples, please see Bell 1985, and Helck at al 1975.
Although the current architectural projects can be criticized as tailored only for tourism, there might be significant economic benefits to redesigning the spaces as better and more sustainable urban environments. According to a 2007 study by Müge Akkar Ercan:

…public spaces can influence the economic value of urban land which surrounds them, as long as they are kept in good condition. Particularly nowadays, with their economic value generator role, public spaces are increasingly seen as a crucial means to add value to speculative developments, both in terms of amenity and commerce (Thompson, 1998), and to market and regenerate localities (Madanipour, 2000) (2007: 118).

In many ways, Luxor and Karnak can be compared with other post-industrial cities, which often feature crumbling infrastructure, poor aesthetic quality, population removal or abandonment, and weak independent economy. Allowing for both the association of ownership that residents would feel and the economic benefit of increasing tourism in a sustainable and publically safe way,
enhancing the current interpretations would more likely than not prove to be economically beneficial to the local area long term, despite the initial cost to the government.

5.8 Conclusions

The paving and visitor center at Karnak and similar projects are a recent development in Egypt that centers on increased security, exclusiveness, and community separation, often at the expensive of the local culture and environment. The 2011 Egyptian Revolution represents the beginning of a new historical period in Egypt that has seen the dissolution of many of the previous voices in Egyptian cultural heritage management. This provides the new and often-fluctuating government with a chance to improve site development where the previous regime left off, with many projects including those in Luxor incomplete, and offers the opportunity to improve Egyptian cultural spaces for much-needed future tourism and the local communities. Before the revolution, Zahi Hawass transformed the way that the world experienced Ancient Egypt and inspired modern Egyptians to view archaeological remains as their cultural heritage and therefore preserve it. However, with Hawass no longer in his position as part of the Supreme Council of Antiquities following the revolution, the new government must now focus its attention to improving the existing problematic archaeological interpretations and once again make the country a viable tourism destination.

Architecturally, Egypt represents the constant struggle between tourism development, the environment, and the local community, but also provides an ideal case study for other countries looking to develop their own cultural heritage spaces. Expedited planning and architectural design can result in less careful consideration of the full impact of these “state of the art” spaces
on the surrounding human and natural environment. Developing sites from an *interdisciplinary* perspective will make sure that modern tourism facilities do not negatively impact local populations or ancient architecture. Architects, archaeologists, conservationists, art historians, politicians, and other stakeholders working together create the most effective interventions through the careful consideration of all elements. With the substantial loss of tourism revenue during the revolution, the new government must be careful not to fall into old practices of expediting changes to make up for the money that was lost in the uprising, but instead must begin a new tradition of careful and well thought out renovation with sustainability in mind.

With several currently ineffective cultural heritage spaces, Egypt represents just one example of how architecture can impact both the natural and human environments when projects are expedited or the local environment is not taken into consideration in the design. Nevertheless, although Luxor is problematic at the moment, it can be easily modified through additional intervention to make the spaces more pleasant for both foreigners and locals. This will take substantial effort on the part of the new government to engage the local community and seek the advice of architectural planners to work with the current situation, but an ideal solution could certainly be found.
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CHAPTER 6
Cultural Imposition and the Maya: Chichén Itzá as part of the Cultural Heritage Narrative

6.1 Introduction

Interventions that are economically driven, such as the Luxor plaza renovations and other recent Egyptian developments, commercialize ancient remains to increase national revenue from foreign tourism. Many sites have struggled with the balance between marketing history for the benefit of public education, and marketing monuments specifically for revenue. Drawing from discourses related to archaeological image production, specifically the Trojan Horse and other inauthentic monuments, as well as architectural reconstruction, and revenue-based construction, the dialogue can now turn to how marketing archaeological architecture can impact cultural heritage and potentially impose specific imagery onto living cultures.

Commercialism and architecture have never been mutually exclusive in cultural heritage tourism, but for Chichén Itzá, Mexico, the issue of continuous development has become central to the understanding of the architectural complex as the site of modern Yucatán Maya identity and shared world heritage. Since the inception of modern mass tourism to the area in the 1970s and promoted by the cruise tourism industry, the site has seen visitors from all over the world, who are eager to experience the archaeological remains for religious, spiritual, educational, and leisure purposes. However, despite its fame, Chichén Itzá has been widely criticized as historically inauthentic\(^\text{187}\) for its expansive tourism spaces, with a focus toward the commercialization of the archaeology at the expense of the local Maya heritage.

---

\(^{187}\) Authenticity is the subject of substantial debate in archaeological tourism literature itself, since “authentic” is a subjective concept, though based on research and fact. Erik Cohen describes “authenticity” as “an eminently modern value…whose emergence is closely related to the impact of modernity upon the unity of social existence” and therefore related to the idea of what is real and not (1988: 373). This further complicates the idea of interpretation, since the act of interpreting is also subjective, but a built interpretation generally creates a set or objective image.
The commodification of both Meso- and South American archaeological sites has been a highly debated topic and one that this chapter will discuss at length, but, it can be argued that the current architectural interpretation at Chichén Itzá can be considered authentically representative of both the ancient and modern Maya populations, despite commercialism concerns. The active participation of Maya residents in the archaeological management of the site and the theological connection between ancient Maya religious beliefs and the physical interpretation provide a basis for understanding how the archaeological complex is currently presented, and how it can continue to be developed further in an authentic way. Community involvement is particularly stressed in cultural heritage literature (McManamon & Hatton 2000: 10) but rarely practiced, suggesting the importance of this dialogue to the universal understanding of Maya tradition. With parallels to ancient politics and history seen in the modern site presentation, the interpretation can be thought of as inherently “Maya” in its emphasis on the past and the evolution of the architectural complex over time to accommodate changing needs.

From the perspective of the design narrative, the substantial restoration projects at Chichén Itzá emphasize some of the well-defined elements of modern interpretation, including presenting remains in a contextual way. But with the site presentation continuing to be influenced by multiple outside forces dependent on increasing revenue, the interpretation is more consistent with an “imposed” heritage, rather than with historical honesty. Chichén Itzá’s large-scale restoration projects allow visitors to understand the architectural complex, since the structures are now “whole” again, but the constant promotion of the some of the buildings as totally
representative of “Maya” creates an inauthentic dialogue about the historical and cultural significance of individual structures due to their use as part of modern media campaigns.

6.2 Chichén Itzá within the Narrative

The discourse thus far on archaeological interpretations has included the competing theories of entertainment and education, either of which can be the focus of a particular project, depending on who is the interpreting agent. These competing theories are particularly important with the presentation of ancient architecture, since restorations and reconstructions are intended to allow a visitor to experience a total architectural complex, but are based on sometimes-limited evidence found at the site. Many sites face the problem of how much to restore a building/sculpture/etc. to ensure that the public understands the material. “Over-interpreting” the remains through extensive reconstruction projects can create questions in the authenticity of the intervention, and encourage an inauthentic history. Architects and archaeologists must weigh the information excavated at the site to provide a basis for restoration, but when little information exists, a portion of the intervention becomes educated guesswork, with theories constantly evolving, and architecture being forced to adapt. This is particularly significant when names or purposes are given to architectural constructions and spaces by archaeologists at the beginning of excavation and further investigation proves that the building was used for another purpose. These names are passed down by tradition and can influence the way that the building is physically

---

188 A good example of this at Chichén Itzá is the so-called “Observatory,” which was named for the roof of its circular tower. As early as 1875, researchers assumed that the structure was used for tracking celestial patterns, particularly because the Maya were known for making “astrological observations,” and the tower and other buildings were aligned to cardinal directions (Aveni et al. 1975: 977; Ricketson 1928: 218-19). This led researchers to specifically focus on the building as an observatory in excavations, and the discourse has since followed this research. The building is discussed further later in the chapter.
reconstructed or interpreted, causing concern for the presentation of an honest historical narrative.

Another issue with restorations is the archaeological colonization that has been part of the previous discourse on Egypt, as areas of world cultural significance are excavated largely by outside entities, often forever changing the cultural fabric of a particular area through new construction or interpretation. Although archaeologists feverishly research the people and sites that they investigate, it can be said that culturally they may have less sensitivity for surviving populations when making interpretive decisions. Despite the knowledge they possess, archaeologists who are not descendants of particular cultures may understand the culture differently, especially when examining surviving architecture. Further, they may make choices for reconstruction that can be seen as imposing cultural heritage on an existing cultural group. This is particularly pertinent for areas with modern populations living in a similar cultural situation as their ancient ancestors. This brings to the forefront a discussion of how to create archaeological context in an interpretation when living populations and interpreters are participating in two different cultural narratives, even unintentionally.

With these concerns to negotiate, design in various forms has become one of the most influential concepts in the presenting history, place, and identity, whether through historic preservation/restoration practices or through the iconographic representation of ancient peoples and cultures. New interventions can be used to illustrate local building traditions, house artifacts regionally, or even become a cultural symbol. Through these and other methods, aesthetic
choices at archaeological sites can influence the way that the outside world views a particular place of heritage, and is therefore integral in the interpretation.

By the beginning of the Terminal Classic period,\textsuperscript{189} Chichén Itzá had established itself as a significant power in the Maya civilization, with some of the most extensive architectural construction and planning in the Maya world and covering as much as 5 square kilometers with just the city core. The main civic precinct [Figure 94] consisted of several imposing structures, which have survived architecturally in some state, reflecting the distinct architectural styles of the various parts of the Maya region, particularly those of the Puuc and Chenes traditions. It has been suggested by John Henderson that the cultural production of architecture in the city and goods and crafts coming out are particularly reflective of the individual heritages of the city’s inhabitants, at a time when Chichén Itzá was prosperous (1997: 213).\textsuperscript{190} Like the ancient city, current cultural heritage production relies on individual or regional crafts, as well as the presentation of the site for tourism purposes.

\textsuperscript{189} Mary Ellen Miller identifies the beginning of the Terminal Classic Period as around 900 CE. This is relatively late in the Maya occupational history of the area, which dates back to 1200 BCE in some areas. Maya occupation of Mexico and Central America became more prolific at the beginning of the Common Era, with a substantial increase in population around 300 CE beginning the Early Classic Period (Miller 2012: 6).

\textsuperscript{190} Henderson specifically cites the collaboration between multiple cultures—Itzá aristocrats, Mexico, and Yucatecans—as producing types of hybrìds crafts that reflect individual and combined traditions (1997: 213). Much later, it is this influence of multiple traditions and ethnic groups that partially led to the designation of the Pre-Hispanic City of Chichén Itzá as part of the World Heritage List (ICOMOS 1987: 1-2).
Although the site is said to have lost much of its power in the 12th century CE,\footnote{Morley (1925) extends the date of collapse to the final abandonment of the site in the 15th century. He suggests that the actual collapse took several hundred years and began with the battle between Mayapan leader Hunnac Ceel and the Itzán ruler Chac Xib Chac, where Chac Xib Chac was killed and the site began to be discovered and ended with what he calls the “final abandonment” of the site by the Itzá, when the area was ruled by foreign leaders (70-73).} there was never complete population abandonment as evidenced by later discoveries, allowing it to continue to exist in living memory in the mind of the locals (Henderson 1997: 225). By the 16th century, the area around the site was occupied by cattle haciendas and is referenced at least in geographic location by a number of Spanish sources dating to the 18th and 19th centuries (Bregalia 2006: 67).

As one of the first modern travelers to Chichén Itzá, American John Lloyd Stephens described the approach to the site and its condition writing:

At four o’clock we left Pisté, and very soon we saw rising high above the plain the Castillo of Chichen. In half an hour we were among the ruins of this ancient city, with all the great buildings in full view… From the door of our hut some of the principal buildings were in sight. We went first to those on the opposite side of the camino real. The path led through the cattle-yard of the hacienda, from which we passed out at one end by a range of bars into the field of ruins, partially wooded, but the greater part open and intersected by cattle-paths (1848).
Stephens’s description provides one of the earliest western accounts of the site, adding insight into its preservation by the 19th century. Like many abandoned historical sites, eventually the landscape, in this case jungle, and the modern population begin to encroach on the site and use the buildings for different purposes. He also describes seeing some architecture appear above the foliage, suggesting that the site was covered by the landscape, but not necessarily erased.

Along with his anecdotal documentation, Stephens’ journey provides some of the earliest artistic documentation at the site. Frederick Catherwood, an English 18th and early 19th century artist and friend of Stephens, travelled with him through Central America, painting many of the more iconic sites. At Chichén Itzá, Catherwood painted the Castillo [Figure 95], the first building that the explorers saw rising above the jungle, and one that would continue to be a popular subject in subsequent centuries.

Figure 95: Frederick Catherwood’s watercolor of the Castillo at Chichén Itzá. Image source: Archive of Lithographs at the Frederick Catherwood House, Plate 22, Merida, Mexico.
Stephens’ descriptions alongside Catherwood’s romantic illustrations Central America to the modern world, providing a relatable account of exploration in a new world. In the late 19th century and into the 20th century, a handful of other explorers traveled to the site as popular interest in it began to grow. Excavations began in the early 20th century, first under Edward Herbert Thompson, who was unaffiliated with an institution and inspired by Stephens’ reports, and then eventually as a joint effort between the Carnegie Institution and Mexican government. In 1952, Karl Ruppert published an architectural monograph that reconstructed and illustrated all of the structures found as the site. The book included a foldout site plan that illustrated the architecture [Figure 96] in juxtaposition to the surrounding topography, particularly highlighting the creation of architectural plaza spaces to establish site lines and space. Since then, the site has been widely published, but Ruppert’s architectural plan remains the most comprehensive of the early archaeological documentation.

Figure 96: Portion of Ruppert's architectural map illustrating archaeological remains found under the Carnegie Institution excavations, 1952. Drawing shows spaces cleared by Maya to flatten topography in the main precincts and public spaces.
Even by the 1920s, the site had been widely publicized, and was featured in two particular *National Geographic* articles, both of which were written by Sylvanus Griswold Morley. His contributions from February 1922 (“The Foremost Intellectual Achievement of Ancient America”) and January 1925 (“Chichen Itzá, An Ancient American Mecca”) presented the site to the world with photos of the excavation [Figure 97] alongside images of reconstruction and restoration projects [Figure 98] that were already taking place. Following the subsequent publication of the archaeological finds and installation of the Cenote Sagrada artifacts at the Harvard University Peabody Museum, Chichén Itzá was introduced to a modern audience and popularized as a tourism destination for the western elite, who were intent on seeing the cultural remains of what Morley described as a “magnificent civilization” (1925: 62).

![Figure 97: Photograph of the “Court of the Thousand Columns” prior to full excavation by S. Badia in Morley, 1925, p.76. This was eventually completely cleared of trees and restored as a plaza space.](image)

---

192 The National Geographic Society has a history of funding research in Mesoamerica and sponsored excavations at Chichén Itzá in the mid-19th century.
193 Morley was an American archaeologist who worked on the Chichén Itzá excavation and wrote other travel pieces on Meso- and South American archaeological sites for National Geographic. It is clear by his descriptions of the site and its contents that Morley understood the archaeological significance during excavation, but also the importance of the site to the local population. The photos often include portraits of modern Maya descendants posing near various features. For full articles, please see Morley 1922, 1925.
Public travel to the site was facilitated by a group of Yucatecans and Governor Felipe Carrillo Puerto, who created new civic infrastructure in the area, including much-needed roads, for the sole purpose of drawing more tourism to Chichén Itzá and other regional archaeological sites.¹⁹⁴

As part of the planned growth, the local population and specifically the town of Pisté, the neighboring community to the archaeological site, grew from five hundred to four thousand

---

¹⁹⁴ At the opening of the new route to and infrastructure at Chichén Itzá, Puerto spoke in Maya, congratulating the workers on the wonderful job that they did, reiterating the modern population as connected to the ancient Maya Indians, and also confirming that the infrastructure is deserved by people in small town, and not just the larger cities [paraphrased by author]. Exact speech: “Compañeros, así como los antiguos mayas hicieron un pueblo, igualmente ustedes han hecho una carretera que dicen que es una gran obra...Este día nos enseña dos cosas: nos enseña las grandes obras de los antepasados y nos enseña el camino que, ahora, han hecho sus descendientes con su corazón y su sangre, en un momento...Por eso se hizo este camino en que está el corazón de los indios mayas...Todos ustedes saben cuántos años han tenido Gobiernos que les engañaba. Ahora, nada tienen que pensar a este respecto, pues tienen trabajo retribuido y dinero, y si siguen ustedes con todo empeño y con todo corazón, no sólo llegarán a edificar pequeñas ciudades sino también de las más grandes y populosas (Horcastidas 2008: 179-180). By drawing all these comparisons, Puerto makes a politicized statement, but also one that references the early idea of heritage at the site, by emphasizing the modern connection to the ancient site, as well as the need for people to see it. Hocastidas takes this further by suggesting that his political statement is a precursor to his eventual socialist leanings that emphasize the “la organización y la movilización de los trabajadores” [mobilization and organization of workers] as part of the project, which reflects similarities to ancient Maya labor practices (2008: 180).
inhabitants during the main decades of tourism expansion, because of the increased opportunity for income related to the industry (Casteñeda 1996: 75). In instituting the infrastructure, Puerto and the government created a commercial entity in the site, intending to benefit the local community,\(^{195}\) as well as the greater Mexican/Yucatecan population. As most of the local population worked as part of the archaeological site, however, it can be debated whether this was really a long-term solution to an initial struggling economy, or whether it created an economic boom and later depression.\(^{196}\)

Since the site was in significant disrepair and being overtaken by the natural environment of the jungle upon rediscovery [see Figures 96 & 97], archaeologists and organizers over the last century have restored a number of the buildings and plaza spaces in order to both preserve and interpret them, a concept that is a direct reflection of what the Maya themselves did to preserve the structures in antiquity. The 1924 excavations revealed that a number of existing buildings in the Chichén Itzá complex had been repaired in antiquity to accommodate additional building phases both horizontal and vertical to some of the most prominent structures. Toward the end of occupation, Maya masons constructed extra walls between columns and used monumental sculpture and other pieces of spolia to create buttressing [Figure 99], which prevented roofs from falling in as the buildings deteriorated. Interestingly, this intervention was seen by modern archaeologists as a violation of the integrity of the religious site, since many of the stones used were gathered from nearby religious structures. Morley describes the expedited construction as

---

\(^{195}\) Important to note is that Paul K. Eiss claims that in developing this type of infrastructure in Yucatán form the 1870s on, the local and national governments were following a trend originally established by Mexican president Porfirio Diaz to rebrand the area as “modern” and “civilized” as part of a greater nation-building practice. Although Puerto would later identify with the local Maya, infrastructure development continued as a way to introduce additional cultures to the world as part of the greater nation (2008: 525-52).

\(^{196}\) This will be discussed in detail later in the document.
being the work of “impious hands, forced, perchance, by dire necessity,” and a “violation of the Rattlesnake and Warrior Throne” (1925: 94). The Maya themselves appear to have viewed the practice as an acceptable form of renovation.

![Photograph from the Carnegie Institution](image)

**SECONDARY WALL BUILT BETWEEN COLUMNS TO PREVENT THE ROOF FROM FALLING**

The Northeast Colonnade began to fall to pieces in ancient times, even before it was abandoned. Particularly the roof beams began to give way beneath the tremendous mass of solid masonry built on top of them. In a frantic effort to save the roof, the last inhabitants of the city built hastily constructed walls of the crudest sort, from the floor to the roof beams, between the columns. The search for stone to put in these supporting walls seems to have been so hasty, indeed, that they did not scruple from laying vandalistic hands upon the Rattlesnake and Warrior Throne and tearing from the cornice some of its sculptured blocks (see illustration, page 91).

Figure 99: Photograph of a restoration project that occurred in antiquity. Note Moreley’s description, which mirrors his sentiments stated in the article. Image in Morley, 1925, p. 94.

Despite Morley’s dramatic account of the ancient reconstruction process, it was not uncommon in any ancient society, particularly in Mesoamerica, to protect and reconstruct religious buildings

---

197 Morley is very critical of early and late Maya construction, at one point suggesting both that “the Mayan architects built poor roofs,” and that “Mayan masons were courting disaster” (1925: 93). He is very complimentary, however, to the archaeologists who stabilized the structures in a similar manner, writing “…every stone was carefully removed and numbered…next came the more delicate job of repair” (90).
that remained important over generations. What he saw as a violation of cultural heritage practice initiates an interesting twist to the narrative of architecture and culture heritage – the role of reconstruction or restoration in interpretation. Many researchers have their own opinions on both the constraints and purposes of these practices, but for many, reconstruction is seen as creating an understandable architectural narrative for visitors who may not recognize archaeological remains but will most likely understand a whole building (UNESCO 1972).\textsuperscript{198}

Despite the increase in understanding for some, reconstruction in the archaeological world can be seen as a negative addition, specifically where stabilization or restoration will suffice to protect the building for future generations.

In line with practices at the time that Chichén Itzá was discovered, there are a number of structures at the site that have seen extensive reconstruction or restoration, specifically for the purpose of tourism. One of the best known is the so-called Observatory or El Caracol, which was initially named for its circular tower and spiral staircase, reminiscent of the modern building type and based on the knowledge that the Maya were exceptional astronomers. When found, the structure was largely collapsed with a mound of dirt covering the majority of the tower [Figure 100]. Today, it is one of the most-visited monuments on the site, having been substantially restored through surface cleaning and stone replacement [Figure 101].

\textsuperscript{198} As part of the UNESCO 1972 publication on restoration, Piero Gazzola writes “Some theorists think it beneath their dignity to explain the qualities of monuments in language which the man in the street can understand…often, even the most educated are reluctant to give more than a cursory glance at the work of the historian, who should be their interpreter and guide. Most people imagine that they need only look in order to see…” (15). Gazzola’s and others’ prevailing theory is that reconstruction or restoration will allow for a greater understanding of heritage where material remains are fragmented in some way. The idea is that providing visual information outweighs potentially inauthenticity.
Figure 100: El Caracol before excavation and restoration. Photo by Gomez Rul in Morley, 1925, p.74.

Figure 101: El Caracol or "Observatory" at Chichén Itzá. Photo by author, 2007.
Ideologically connected to the Observatory through its patron deity, the pyramid of Kukulcán [Figure 102] was a focal point of the civic precinct for the last several centuries of occupation, and served as inspiration for Stephens and Catherwood as an iconic structure rising out from the wilderness. When it was rediscovered, the pyramid was covered in foliage [Figures 103 & 104], but still visible above the plaza that surrounds it. It was excavated and restored in the 1920s and 1930s, using the original blocks that had fallen after the site fell into disrepair. Around the same time, researchers discovered that the standing temple was not the first on the site, and that a previous pyramid and temple had occupied the same position (Henderson 1997: 214).

Figure 102: The pyramid of Kukulcán restored, Chichén Itzá. Photo by author, 2007.

Thompson suggests that the pyramid consists of an inner temple with questionable dating, but is currently attributed to the “nōh emal” period, which is characterized by Seibal and Ucanal invaders. The inner temple was then encased in an outer temple that he assigns to the “dz’emal” period, where Kukulcan (sometimes also referred to as Quetzalcoatl by other authors—see below), a priest or leader, and other people from Tula brought new traditions of architecture into the city (1970: 44). This would account for the difference in style between the inner and outer structures, and potentially the reason for encasing the older temple in a new one.
Figure 103: Photograph taken by Teobert Maler in 1892. The site had not yet been preliminarily cleared and the pyramid was still overtaken by the jungle.

Figure 104: The pyramid of Kukulcán as documented in Morely’s 1922 & 1925 National Geographic articles. Each shows the pyramid in a progressing state of clearing and excavation. Left photo by O. Gaylord Marsh in Morley 1922, p. 164; Right photo by Carnegie Institution in Morley 1925, p. 68.

The Maya practiced architecture through constant revision, reconstructing buildings where the location was considered religiously important, a concept that is not lost in a comparison with
modern cultural heritage practice (Abrams 1994).\footnote{Abrams cites the seemingly continuous progression of form, with constant improvement of typical buildings sought over time (1994: 25-27). This could be related to the shifting ethnic population, especially with regard to the pyramid of Kukulcán, since Kukulcán was a Maya deity derived from the Mexica deity Quetzalcoatl, shown in imagery as a plumed serpent (Jansen 2010: 89).} For the Maya, there was a significant interest in the past,\footnote{Nancy Farriss (1987) characterizes this interest as “bordering on obsession,” and suggests that it is illustrated in the Maya prolific tracking and recording time (569).} and how it was interpreted for a contemporary audience; this was illustrated through the continuous use and reuse of architecture and sculpture as part of public space.\footnote{There are several buildings at Chichén Itzá that may be emulating architecture at other, older sites, including the expansive Temple of the Warriors. Kowalski (1999) suggests that the architectural style used is characteristic of other Mesoamerican sites, specifically Tula and Xochicalco, which Chichén Itzá may have been referencing (102).} To many, the lifecycle of architecture is seen as linear: a building is created, a building is used, a building deteriorates and “dies” [Figure 105].

![Linear Lifespan of a Building](image)

Figure 105: In the Linear Lifespan of a Building, there is a clear beginning and end. The building is constructed, is used, and then eventually deteriorates until no longer usable. Diagram by author, 2014.

Weathering shows the lifetime of a structure’s existence through conflict, climate change, abandonment, and other events. But through intervention, in the case of the Maya, rebuilding and restoration, a building can essentially be “reborn,” [Figure 106] through the adaptive reuse of the structure or restoration. The rebuilding of a new pyramid of Kukulcán emphasizes the importance of the physical site to the ancient Chichén Itzá community, helping to demonstrate the need for continued preservation, and allows for acknowledging the past while moving toward the future. This notion of reuse and architectural significance can also be explained through the modern cultural heritage narrative, which further uses the pyramid as an educational tool in the modern interpretation of the site for tourism.\footnote{Important to note here is the policy on restoration or reconstruction of a pyramid as identified under the UNESCO Charter of Athens. Wolfgang Wurster cites the charter as determining that anastylosis “should not be used}
architectural evidence of the Maya civilization, but also to reinforce the context of the monument’s construction when this interpretation is acknowledged as part of the presentation. What is seen sometimes as a negative impact on archaeology at other sites becomes culturally and contextually appropriate as part of the Chichén Itzá individual narrative, strengthening the idea that archaeological sites be interpreted using these individual concepts and regulations, as opposed to blanket policies.

**Figure 106**: In the Cyclical Lifespan of a Building, there is no set beginning and end of the lifespan. The building is constructed, used, and then renovated to be reused, and essentially reborn as many times as necessary. Diagram by author, 2014.

The ancient Maya viewed time as a series of cycles, one following the last, and something that became culturally adapted into the modern world through the Maya *b’ak’ tun* 13 apocalypse.

---

in the conservation of Maya monuments; they are constructions made of solid core filling and exterior containing walls or mortar-masonry” meaning that reconstruction is not reversible (2006: 192). In the case of the Pyramid of Kukulcán, the monument being restored actually encases another monument, unlike most Maya pyramids. Therefore, the blanket rule does not necessarily apply to this particular pyramid even though it would be proper practice for similar monuments.
If the cyclical time theology is further adapted for heritage interpretation, reusing the architecture through archaeological tourism not only secures the building’s future, but also creates a new cycle of existence, breaking away from the assumed linear architectural progression. As Nancy Farriss writes in her article, *Remembering the Future, Anticipating the Past*, “…time is a perpetual repetition, corresponding to the diurnal and seasonal rhythms of the natural world, and the past therefore is infinitely repeatable” (1987: 566). The cyclical understanding of time employed in this case by the Maya, is not provocative to Mesamerican or non-western scholars, but is revolutionary when applied to the concept of architectural progression. Through adaptive reuse and historic preservation, architecture embodies the concept of a cyclical time, breaking away from a linear boundary, where it is left to crumble until it is completely destroyed.

This new life, however, as part of the greater interpretation of the tourist site comes with additional concerns, particularly with regard to the continued use of the pyramid of Kukulcán in particular. As at many Maya sites in Yucatán, visitors were originally allowed to climb the pyramid to view the surrounding site from a bird’s eye perspective, as well as visit the interior temple on the top. But, with stricter concerns regarding both the safety of visitors and more importantly to some, of the monument itself, the Mexican National Institute of Anthropology and History closed the pyramid and interior room to climbers in 2006.

---

204 The Maya used multiple calendars to chart time through a series of cycles. These included calendars to track a civic year (*Haab*) of 365 days, a religious year (*Tzolk’in*) of 260 days, and also the Long Count, which tracked time through a much longer series of cycles. The Long Count calendar consists of the *Tun* (360 days), the *Katun* (7200 days), and the *B’ak’tun* (144,000 days). One Long Count takes 13 *b’ak’tuns* and only occurs every 5,125.36 years. On December 21, 2012 the 13th *b’ak’tun* was scheduled to end, suggesting to some the end of the Maya calendar and therefore the world. The date inspired many apocalypse theories and stories that once again popularized the Maya culture in modern society as people became interested in conspiracy theories. However, under the Maya cyclical time theory, when the *B’ak’tun* ended on the equinox, the world did not end and the calendar restarted. For more information on the Maya cyclical time and calendar system, please see Milbrath 1999. For more on the 2012 apocalypse craze, please see Restall & Solari 2011.
Of similar concern to archaeological heritage planners is the grooming or restoration of the site, which was once partially covered by the jungle and used for cattle trails. The plaza spaces and imposing buildings have been restored and cleared of jungle debris in part to accommodate larger groups of tourists in the area. Chichén Itzá is one of the most popular tourism destinations in the Yucatán, regularly accommodating mass tourism from the local cruise and Cancun vacation industries, and the expansive green spaces on the site allow for thousands of visitors to access the archaeological remains daily. The site and others in Meso- and South America have been criticized for being “over groomed,” a term that refers to the presentation of an archaeological site as too perfect or restored, suggesting that visitors will not understand archaeological method or site deterioration.

What makes these sites vulnerable to the argument is their locations as part of a greater natural landscape or eco-system, in some areas referred to as the Maya Forest (Ford 2006: 105). Much of the region is used for ecotourism, a tourism subset that many suggest is a less impactful way

205 Castañeda claims that Chichén Itzá provided 50-55 percent of all tourism to archaeological sites or zones in Yucatán between 1977-87, and that it is responsible for a 91 percent in visits to archaeological zones. He further elaborates that CULTUR, the Patronato de las Unidades de Servicios Culturales y Turísticos del Estado de Yucatán, estimated income from the site at about $523,075 for 1988 (1996: 80-1). With Chichén Itzá’s continued development and new marketing campaigns, these numbers will have continued to increase exponentially as infrastructure and popularity have grown.

206 In her article “Rethinking Mass Tourism,” Vilhelmiina Vainikka defines mass tourism as tourism associated with “mass production, mass consumption and mass tourist destinations” in contrast to other authors, such as Castañeda, who suggest that mass tourism involves specific plans or packages (2013: 271). Castañeda suggests that planned time is crucial in the tourism industry, especially at Chichén Itzá, where tours are carefully arranged at specific times from other tourism destinations (1996: 226). It seems that both theories are practiced at the site, where visitors can participate both as part of planned packages mainly from the cruise and beach vacation industries, but also as individual travelers. The site is accessible to groups and individuals, and is visited en masse, suggesting it would qualify for both Vainikka’s and her opponents’ definitions.

207 The Maya Forest refers to the area around a collection of Maya sites at the border of Guatemala, Belize, and Mexico, where the Maya specifically used the forest as part of daily existence. At El Pilar, one of the larger Maya sites, the government has allowed for the identification of the El Pilar Archaeological Reserve for Maya Flora and Fauna, which allowed for the preservation of plant and animal life that was integral to Maya culture (Ford 2006: 105-112).
of providing an economy for remote villages, while protecting the natural environment (Hearne 
& Santos 2005: 303). When the landscape begins to encroach on archaeological sites, site 
management must make the decision of whether or not to clear the natural wildlife, which helps 
to protect monuments from destruction and also allows for viewers to see the spaces much better. 
But the removal of natural material from the monuments can also be seen as conserving in a way 
that unintentionally encourages inauthentic interpretation. When looking from the perspective of 
the building lifecycle, the reintroduction of a forest or jungle is part of the constant evolution of 
the site, suggesting that acknowledging this phenomenon should be part of the education strategy 
of the presentation, and that perhaps some of the material should be left so that visitors also 
understand the natural deterioration of architecture. The complete removal of these types of 
landscapes can be considered overgrooming, which insinuates that the site is stripped completely 
of its natural environmental or excavated state. This may give visitors the impression that the 
landscape naturally developed in this way or that excavation and restoration have not taken 
place, and that the monuments have not deteriorated.

What some may deem to be overgrooming at Chichén Itzá, however, can also be viewed as the 
authentic representation of Maya spatial practice, theoretically in line with ancient Maya cultural 
and religious practices. The preexisting plazas, now cleared and mainly covered with grass

[Figure 107], are part of the ancient architectural make-up of the site, purposefully constructed to 
accommodate large crowds. Their restoration, therefore, is in line with creating a contextual 
environment in which to view the monumental architectural remains. The plazas allow for full 
view of the architecture, while leaving the jungle foliage around the buildings would not only be

---

208 The original plazas and buildings designed by the Maya were covered with a type of plaster that was very durable 
and allowed for both sculpting and painted decoration.
detrimental to their preservation, but would also prevent visitors from seeing the monuments as originally intended. Similarly to the restoration of the pyramid, what is advocated as incorrect practice at other sites could be considered ideologically authentic and appropriate for Maya remains.

Figure 107: Extensive civic precinct plaza that would have once been plastered is now covered in grass to allow easy access for tour groups. Photo by author, 2007.

6.3 Marketing the Maya: Visual Culture and Identity

The discussion of authenticity in interpreting Chichén Itzá and other Maya sites can be extended beyond the surface treatment of the site to how the public views the architecture and art as part of a greater societal heritage. In ancient Mesoamerica, buildings were used as “public symbols” and expressed ideas to both the local and foreign populations (Kowalski 1999: 7). Architecture was
considered part of the identity of the local population, because intricacies of design varied by region and other formal qualities demonstrated particular important ideas of living and worshipping (Hutson 2010). While Chichén Itzá was at the height of its power, producing architecture so extensively would have demonstrated the ability of the ruling power to complete large-scale endeavors and also represent cultural/social/religious/political influences on the area at the time of construction. For example, including depictions of the feathered serpent on the pyramid of Kukulcán meant that by the time it was constructed, the Mexica cult of Quetzalcoatl—later revised as Maya deity Kukulcán—had been introduced to the site. The architecture is culturally readable, and part of the greater structure of Maya social and political society. In an examination of how art and architecture are used as part of a greater system of control in Maya society, Julia Sanchez writes:

As the one who commissioned the monuments, the ruler could use them to communicate his/her view of society. In the ruler’s view, the ruler was the dominant living member of society, whose image was placed on stelae in plazas to communicate this identity to all of Maya society. In the central area of each site is a large plaza with a gallery of ruler portraits. Plazas were used in a variety of ways: as the setting for public ritual, for processions, and for markets and other daily activities (Andrews 1975: 10-13, 37), so the images of the ruler in plazas were visible to the largest, broadest audience (2005: 262).

Sanchez argues that the monuments and plazas, as well as royal art placed in them, were used in cultural rituals in a way that the local population would understand, much in the same way that the architecture is reused as part of the interpreted archaeological site. As with the ancient

---

209 Hudson’s book addresses architecture and the practice of “dwelling,” as it can be visually read by local populations, and how the architecture, art, and culture interrelate. His study specifically examines Chunchucmil, an archaeological site in Yucatan.

210 Specific architectural typologies and decoration denoted different associations, and were part of a readable visual culture for the Maya. The Plumed Serpent was iconographically representative of Quetzalcoatl (Kukulcán), and the pyramid as a temple form had also been associated with the deity at Xochicalco in Central Mexico (Molina & Kowalski 1999: 141-51). Despite minor differences in depiction and style, these and other monuments form collection of visual culture creating a dialogue between the past and present for ancient Maya and other Mesoamerican cultures.
architectural planning, modern interventions at the site can also provide insight into how the modern local and international populations view the ancient and modern Maya cultures.

Any archaeological interpretation has an inherent emphasis on the past, often reconstructing the ancient daily use of the site through the display of art and architecture; this reexamination of the past was practiced by the Maya as part of their religious and cultural traditions, through the importance of documenting time. As Nancy Farriss suggests in relation to this Maya approach to time, “people construct their past to explain and justify their present” (1987: 577). People often view history as part of their own cultural identity, meaning that this detailed examination of history helps to justify current ideas or trends in tourism development for public consumption. In the case of Chichén Itzá’s development, the architectural interventions are justified by the Ancient Maya emphasis on the past and the architecture continues to act as cultural heritage. The problem that can arise from this, however, is that the population using or influencing the site design does not necessarily have the ethnic or cultural relationship to the ancient Maya population, meaning that the outsider’s interpretation of history could be seen as imposing a heritage on a surviving population through extensive marketing campaigns.

As an iconic piece of architectural heritage from the site, the pyramid of Kukulkán in particular has become one of the most recognizable structures in the world, and therefore one of the most marketed to the public as representative of modern Maya cultural identity. Although it reached its societal peak late in the history of the Maya civilization, Chichén Itzá has become central to the public understanding of Maya cultural identity as a result of the extensive marketing of the archaeological remains and particularly the pyramid. Like with Senemoglu’s Trojan Horse, the
The iconographic status of the pyramid of Kukulcán, created mainly through distribution of imagery, has been influential on the way that a modern outside population views and understands all of Maya culture.

Archaeological imagery practiced through photography and other forms of representation has become an organizing concept of tourism, helping to promote certain features at archaeological sites, while at the same time, increasing their iconographic status around the world. The pyramid of Kukulcán is one of the most reproduced images associated with the site, and is even featured on one rendition of the 1000 peso bill [Figure 108], a sign of its importance to the national government and heritage, but also a way of perpetuating the public recognition of the monument. As addressed in the study on Ancient Troy, tourists tend to photograph things that they visually understand, and whole monuments tend to be the focus of these images for that reason. The pyramid is a form that is both recognizable and, following reconstruction, whole, making it easy for the average visitor to understand and remember. Additionally, it sits as part of an extensive plaza [Figure 109], allowing for it to be photographed compositionally in its entirety, producing a quality, memorable image. As a site of mass tourism, the number of images produced and shared from Chichén Itzá is extensive, and of these images, the pyramid of Kukulcán is a favorite, as one of the main attractions at the site. The pyramid is acting in the same role as Senemoglu’s sculpture at Ancient Troy [please refer back to Figure 31 and Hall’s Cycle of Representation], becoming iconic through modern visualization, giving yet another dimension to its fame, and another life cycle of its existence. This iconographic status is further perpetuated by
the designation of the site as one of the “New Seven Wonders of the World” in 2007, which will continue to encourage tourism at the site, even more than previously.\footnote{The creation of this list itself is highly debated, because it was driven by an internet voting campaign, and UNESCO chose not to be affiliated. UNESCO called the campaign “mediatized” and wrote that “Acknowledging the sentimental or emblematic value of sites and inscribing them on a new list is not enough… “ and that the list reflects “only the opinions of those with access to the internet and not the entire world. This initiative cannot, in any significant and sustainable manner, contribute to the preservation of sites elected by this public” (UNESCO 2007).}

Figure 108: Back of the 1000 peso bill from 1977 featuring the pyramid of Kukulcán. Image source: Banknotes.com.

Figure 109: View of lower corner of pyramid as part of the main plaza of the civic precinct. Photo by author, 2007.
Through this commercialism, Chichén Itzá has become part of the modern visual identity of the widespread Maya culture. Identity is a difficult term to define, and according to Marie-François Lanfant, was so heavily used in the 1980s as part of tourism practice that it practically lost all meaning (1995: 30). But for the purpose of this study, the “visual identity” can be seen as specific associated imagery that has been imposed on a particular place or group of people, in this case by the outside world. Traditionally visual identity is created by marketing campaigns, national governments, tourism developers, or any number of people with a stake in the presentation of the site to a wide and public audience (Ascher 1984).212 As a visual association grows with specific elements of a site or building, the unspecialized international public can create a subconscious association with that type of visual culture and begin to identify the local population through it. In way, it continues the development of the heritage of a place through outside association, but could create a dishonest connection to the actual history or the cultural identity of the local population.

The widespread use of specific Chichén Itzá iconography, particularly the pyramid of Kukulcán, in promotional materials [Figures 110 & 111], has helped increase awareness of the site and even some knowledge of what exists there. Through these image associations, however, the publicity begins to create a visual identity for the place, and potentially imposes a new heritage on its population. The pyramid’s popularity overstates its historical significance, suggesting an inflated current importance over other structures. Although we know through archaeological

---

212 In her introduction, Ascher cites international tourism as “un phénomène économique,” and suggests that it is the monetary benefit that controls how and why sites use tourism the way that they do, and therefore why they are marketed and to whom, especially as related to international travel (1984: 11-26). Although the economic benefits of tourism in the Chichén Itzá region have been addressed, Ascher’s analysis helps to relate this back to the projection of images on an outside audience, and how marketing to these audiences may impact the site’s interpretation.
investigation that the pyramid of Kukulcán was of relative importance to the city, it has become the most identifiable structure associated with the site, thus creating its own historical discourse for better or for worse. Like Senemoglu’s sculpture, the pyramid has essentially developed a life and history of its own as part of the interpretation. Unlike the sculpture, however, the pyramid is an actual architectural artifact from a period of historical importance at Chichén Itzá.

Figure 110: Ca. 1950s travel poster for "Chichen-Itza" using the pyramid as a backdrop by artist Florex-Esp. Image source: http://www.dpvintageposters.com/.
Figure 111: Promotional image for the 2010 Elton John concert held at the site. Mexican archaeologists protested this and other concert series out of concerns for the ruins, but the government promoted the concert citing benefits for the economy (O’Conner 2012: 1). Image source: http://www.chichenitza.com/.

Particularly interesting about Chichén Itzá’s visual iconography is how early associations between the remains and the culture of the modern population began. As part of his 1925 article, Morley describes Maya descendants alongside the ruins, seeming to compare the modern population with the architecture, at times in a negative light. Under a photo of a modern Maya man in traditional dress standing as a scale figure next to a detailed architectural sculpture excavated from the site [Figure 112], Morley writes:

Two hundred thousand Maya toil for foreign masters to-day in the henequen fields of Yucatán, all memory of their former magnificence gone as completely as if it had never been. Their wants are few and easily filled…But, with such a glorious past, it would seem as though his future might be made of even greater promise than this. With rough places in the road, he must travel from his own simple past to the complicated world of to-day, and there is every reason to expect that he may again fashion for himself a destiny worth of his splendid ancestry (1925: 86).
Morley is writing from a 20th century nostalgic perspective, longing for the time when the ruins were created, as conceptualized through his description of hope for the local Maya. Through his lamenting description of the “former magnificence” at the site that has since gone, Morley reinforces his belief that the remains excavated at Chichén Itzá are evidence of a great civilization, one that modern descendants should strive to emulate. The evidence of this is visual—based on architectural structures still standing and artifacts uncovered. Morley uses this as reason enough to suggest that the modern heritage should rival the ancient buildings and in doing so, to essentially impose a heritage upon its own descendants, suggesting that the modern heritage that they are currently producing may be insufficient in comparison.

Figure 112: Maya worker standing with sculptural artifact. Photo from Carnegie Institution in Morley 1925, p. 86.
At the time when Morely was writing, this was a perfectly acceptable view of both the ancient and modern worlds, but it presents that idea that even then, architecture could influence the way that outsiders interpreted a particular place or a heritage. The small huts of the modern Maya in 1925, although more than likely very similar to the huts of the basic ancient Maya population at the height of Chichén Itzá, did not live up to what Morley established as an acceptable standard when compared to the ancient stone remains that he was experiencing. This is in line with the elitist practice of archaeology in the 19th and early 20th centuries, where large-scale building and “treasures” were proof of a civilization’s worth. Even modern interpretation can occasionally betray a similar bias, where the culture that outsiders deem as important is emphasized, and the heritage of the modern population is ignored.

As a professor of anthropology and director of the Stanford Archaeology Center, Lynn Meskell213 has examined the role archaeology can play in the understanding of identity and conversely how politics can impose or influence this determination. In seeking a scientific practice for examining identity that is “agenda-free” – she suggests that archaeology is not—she writes:

> What sets archaeology apart from other disciplines seeking to represent the nation or culture, such as history or anthropology, is its materiality. The residues of the past are often monumentalized and inescapable in daily life. Individually, the past is memory—collectively, it is history (2002: 293).

In interpreting remains for the international public, archaeologists use the materiality of the past, which therefore becomes identifiable as part of the heritage. The materiality gives weight to a collective and social historical narrative, as opposed to a single person’s experience, again

---

213 Meskell has been particularly involved in the discourse on modern ethnicity, heritage, and archaeology, particularly as related to how entire populations can be marginalized as emphasis is placed on more acceptable heritages. For additional information, please see “The Intersections of Identity and Politics in Archaeology,” Meskell 2002.
helping to define a heritage. Nancy Farriss’s (1987) analysis of Maya religion also plays into this concept, since the Maya themselves viewed the past as accessible and integral to an understanding of the present. Her suggestion that the past becomes essentially a collection of experiences that can be used to justify decisions in the present mirrors the concept of archaeological research. In either case, what is represented in the present must be based at least in part on the past, and what happened in the past is reflected in the present. This can lead to suggestions that descendant cultures must in some way imitate history in the present, which can cause confusion for interpreting both the ancient and modern populations, especially for broad tourism.

Beyond the archaeological interpretation, the idea of “Maya” in international popular culture has been perpetuated in much the same way as the Trojan Horse, Lascaux, or Luxor. Mel Gibson’s 2006 film, *Apocalypto*, popularized elements of Maya culture, while at the same time sparking controversy over the depiction. Some critics suggested that the film writers chose particular and “savage” cultural practices to highlight, while downplaying other views of the ancient Maya that were less dramatic. The film turned history into a commodity, and, as with Ancient Troy, creates a preconception for travelers to Yucatán archaeological sites, which can be difficult for any site presentation to overcome. The imagery provided by the film, shot in Veracruz, Mexico, mirrors some of the architectural scenery at Chichén Itzá, including the popular Maya pyramid, one of which can be seen on one of the production posters [Figure 113]. Like the pyramid of

---

214 In a 2006 *Washington Post* editorial, William Booth cites Maya scholars who would rather the film focus on the achievements of the civilization, and not on what Booth refers to as their “extreme hobbies” which include human sacrifice. Although there is some accuracy to the film, especially employing local Maya to speak Yucatec Maya, the language of the film, researchers in general were mainly concerned about how the Maya would view the representation of their culture (1). This can be seen as a direct parallel to the site, which is essentially a representation of Maya culture through art and architecture.
Kukulcán, the film provides one popular interpretation that is imposed on an entire ancient and modern population, stripping cultural intricacies for the purpose of revenue.

![Apocalypto promotional poster](image)

Figure 113: *Apocalypto* promotional poster released by Touchstone Pictures (2006). The poster specifically features the pyramid of Kukulcán and two other pyramids as a backdrop.

### 6.4 Local and National Government Influences

Although thus far the discussion has largely been about how art and architecture at Chichén Itzá and depictions of the Maya influence tourism and the understanding of culture, the local population and national government have also had a substantial impact on the presentation and commoditization of the site. Maya descendants still live in the area, and are in some ways involved in decisions made about the site through their contribution to the excavation. Ancient Chichén Itzá can still be considered within cultural memory of the modern Maya population,
who largely continue to live with an understanding of ancient beliefs and can therefore inform heritage management specialists with regard to authentic or inauthentic representations (Nygard & Wren 2008: 7-8).

This idea of local stakeholder input and evaluation is encouraged at all sites, but rarely practiced in a successful way, and Chichén Itzá has similarly struggled with balancing various influences. Tourism to the site has a substantial impact on surrounding population through local involvement as excavators and guards, but mainly through the promotion of crafts as an economic resource. Local artists, referred to as artesanos or vendedores sell their creations to tourists even within the boundaries of the architectural complex [Figure 114], and many of the artists are now well known for creating a new type of Yucatán art production\(^{215}\) that has evolved along with and because of archaeological tourism in the area (Castañeda 2005: 88).

Figure 114: Make-shift market along one of the main tourist paths. Photo by author, 2007.

\(^{215}\) Castañeda cites Mary Pratt’s (1992) “transculturation” as the process of creating new cultural traditions from contact between different cultures and specifically related to tourism arts created over time at Chichén Itzá. He claims that the arts currently sold were developed specifically for tourism after discovering what types of crafts tourists were looking for, particularly what are known as “Pisté carvings” (2004a: 22-23). This process of creating new art is not uncommon at other sites—for example small stone pyramids available at Giza and wooden horses at Troy—and has become not only an area of research in tourism studies, but also part of the art historical narrative, as many scholars are seeing the relevance of understanding this new form of visual branding.
As with the Egyptian markets, however, the markets in and around Chichén Itzá have caused some problems, despite any income that they provide to the local population. Castañeda and Laurie Kroshus Medina claim that this creation of an additional artistic movement, particularly those arts sold in relation to the archaeological site, can create discrepancies in the public understanding of history, and how these arts are related to different identities. Castañeda suggests that it is archaeologists, artists, and tourists who develop the totality of Maya culture through interaction and development. According to Castañeda:

Artesanos and vendedores read over the shoulder of the tourist, reading the tour guide, who is, in turn reading the archaeologist reading Maya culture. In this way, they get answers to the questions, What is Ancient Maya Culture? How do you sell it? What of it is bought by tourists? The artisans then provide their “answer” in the multiple forms of handicrafts…(1996: 129).

Each of these parties, therefore, contributes to the practice of selling Maya culture and identity through art economy. Conversely, Medina claims that “Maya culture,” as produced by all parties does not necessarily reflect the culture of the local populations around Maya sites, many of whom identify themselves as “Mestizo,” which suggests both European and indigenous influences. Tourists, however, tend to seek what they consider to be Maya culture, leading to the demand for goods that exhibit this trait [Figure 115], thus perpetuating the identity imposed by outside influence (2003: 353-61).

---

216 Traci Arden suggests that the overall monetary benefit coming back to local Maya communities from the government is “small” (2004: 104). This is discussed in further detail later in the chapter.

217 Pierre van den Berghe claims that the Mexican government’s past focus on developing nationhood on the culture of the mestizaje population in the early 20th century in part has caused a delayed focus on other ethnic-identifying groups. He claims that the idealization of indigenismo (indigenous populations) goes back to the 16th century, and that these eventually came together after the Mexican revolution, and have shifted back and forth in importance for tourism since. He is careful to reiterate that the differences are largely cultural and not racial, meaning that they can be interpreted through cultural production (1995: 569-70). These different cultural identities that the local and national population can claim as part of their heritage means that each will need to be interpreted as part of the greater Mexican narrative, but individual sites may only be associated with certain groups.
The market for local crafts has increased exponentially with the industrialization of the country, and the production of tourist arts is closely controlled and encouraged by the Mexican government under organizations such as The General Office for Popular Cultures and the National Fund for the Promotion of Arts and Crafts (FONART), further complicating an already contentious situation as related to identity. Néstor García Canclini best describes the historical exploitation of traditional Indian crafts by the government as a way of Hispanicizing the Indian population, while at the same time commercially benefitting from the sale of the newly created hybrid art (1993: 43-4). Since the revolution, the craft market has continued to gain importance
as part of the greater economic system, making it now integral to the continuation of both local and national economies. This has resulted, however, in traditional Indian crafts transforming into tourism crafts, much like those that Castañeda described at Chichén Itzá. These outside and sometimes governmental influences impose a commercial idea of art onto the population, who then change the crafts to appeal to foreigners and in doing so continue to inflate the economy.

In a later article, Castañeda furthers the discussion through an examination of how this imposed and universal Maya culture impacts the local population. He writes, “At work was an assumption of an essential unity of ethnic, cultural, and social identity between all Maya as construed by ‘Western imagination’,” and yet many people disidentify with the denotation of being “indigenous” Maya. Some even claim that the “Maya are long gone (they are the ones that built the pyramids)” (2004b: 37-9). This disassociation with the archaeological heritage can complicate the important process of stakeholder evaluation and participation at the site, which some have claimed is being successfully practiced at Chichén Itzá through the inclusion of the local Maya population in decision-making processes.

According to Lisa Breglia, local Maya workers have been hired by the National Institute of Anthropology and History and trained for generations to excavate the site, and these positions218 are inherited by family members upon their death (2005: 385-96). This helps to draw the local population into the practice of archaeology and conservation by suggesting that there is a shared benefit between local, national, and international entities. The public archaeology movement seeks to involve local communities in these types of practices to ensure that a site is well cared

---

218 Bregalia describes workers participating as *antiguos* (a term once referring to ancestors of the site and now the government guards), and in site excavation and maintenance (2005: 385-6).
for, but also must acknowledge that “archaeologists…must constantly remind themselves that a community, or even any definable segment of a community, may contain a great deal of diversity (Derry 2003: 22).\textsuperscript{219} Despite the attempts made to engage local populations at Chichén Itzá, there may still exist what Bregalia later refers to as “monumental ambivalence” to the successful operation of the site for locals (2006: 94-95). This could be the result of the majority population around Maya sites having relatively little control over the income generated, beyond developing their own local restaurants, stores, and other personal ways of benefiting from the influx of visitors. Traci Arden cites the initial government infrastructure development as providing little for local communities because of the “top down” approach to tourism economy, which provides roughly $6.4 billion per year for the government (2004: 103-4). In the case of Yucatán, and specifically Chichén Itzá, however, the continuation of a majority modern Maya population may help to rebuild ancient connection to the area, and thus continue to protect the archaeological remains, despite the 1972 Federal Law over Monuments and Archaeological, Artistic, and Historic Sites which places ownership of the ruins in the hands of the government.

While Yucatán is able to encourage some local participation in the upkeep of the monuments, the 1972 law is most representative of the existing exploitation of the local population and of the archaeological remains by the government. This connection between political power and architecture is ever present in the study of ancient cultures, and especially their tourism promotion. Often architectural planning and construction becomes the visual and aesthetic representation of political legitimacy, as economies are impacted by tourism. While often being

\textsuperscript{219} Derry here is referring to work within the United States, where people identifying as part of different ethnic groups are involved in interpretations. Although she is not specifically working with Maya culture, the diversity of personal identification in the modern Maya experience as previously addressed is applicable.
used to express power over a local population, these heritage spaces also suggest a cultural identity to international travelers, both ancient and modern.

At Chichén Itzá are significant parallels associated with the history of architectural identity; the political control of the local population stretches from the emergence of the city in the 8th century to its establishment as a modern tourism destination. With few local jobs not directly related to the site, and the associated jobs inherited, the only solution for many locals is to sell crafts at the site for little income, a profession that is largely unstable and relies heavily on tourism trends. As the makeshift bazaar along the tourist path has grown, and more tourists are being accommodated, both have started to encroach on the archaeological site. This could likely lead to its future destruction.

It is the similar commercialization of the site itself and specifically of the pyramid of Kukulcán by the government that also weighs heavily on the understanding of Chichén Itzá by a wider audience. The use of the pyramid as part of an interactive sound and light show in the evening [Figure 116] encourages visitors to stay longer in the day, but at the same time could be seen as a mockery of the religious tradition that the pyramid once represented. Similarly, using the ancient plazas as a concert venue, and exploiting images of the pyramid to sell tickets [please refer back to Figure 111] risks damage to the monument for the sake of income. Now, instead of standing as a beacon to religious belief,220 the pyramid represents how far the government has gone to commercialize the site for tourism. Often it is evident that cultural heritage becomes a way for

---

220 According to Lindsey Jones, even by the sixteenth century when the specific pyramid meaning had been lost to the local population, it was still considered to be a great monument as the “principle building” of Quetzalcoatl-Kukulcán (1995: 69). This was most likely based on its state of preservation, situation on the site, and recognition as a building type.
individuals or groups to identify with the past through a reexamination, as the ancient Maya themselves did. However, this commercialization of the cultural heritage fails to convey an accurate portrayal of the past, thus risking the interpretation of a shared heritage. The tourism industry in Yucatán is at risk of creating a power vacuum centered at Chichén Itzá through commercialization, with strict parallels to the collapse of the ancient city. As the power and influence of one particular site grows, other sites may see less funding and attention, and be left to deteriorate.

Figure 116: Pyramid of Kukulcán during the evening sound and light show. Photo by Elelicht, 2011.

Samuel Sweitz and other authors claim that the eventual collapse of the site was due to the power vacuum caused by the continued growth of the city and control that Chichén Itzá had over the surrounding region. The collapse came not long after the introduction of Kukulcán, who “represented the combined aspects of militarism and trade and was also imbued with religious importance” (2012: 181). This serves to represent the growing fear that as one monument becomes the embodiment of a culture, greater understanding and real meaning are eventually lost.
6.5 Lessons Learned from Machu Picchu

Chichén Itzá is by no means an isolated example of interpretation in Meso- and South America. Machu Picchu famously suffered from a number of the same issues with commercialization, overgrooming, and interpretation. As at Chichén Itzá, when Machu Picchu was “discovered” by Hiram Bingham, the architecture had been completely overtaken by the local flora and fauna, causing extensive damage to many of the 200 buildings. Excavations began shortly after Bingham’s initial expedition and have continued on and off since that time, under the funding from the Research Committee of the National Geographic Society and Yale University (Bingham 1913). The Peruvian Ministerio de Cultura currently oversees the site, though archaeologists for other countries are allowed to excavate if they have received the proper permitting. Design interventions at the site have included the reconstruction of many collapsed buildings and the general renovation of the site for tourism purposes, causing some to suggest that the substantial overgrooming represents an inauthentic interpretation due to its tidy appearance [Figure 117]. This has created a great deal of controversy in the archaeological community because of the concern that the site is being used more for profit by the modern Peruvian government and less for research and educational purposes, similar to the commercialization of Chichén Itzá. The preferential treatment of Machu Picchu by the government is difficult to question, because the site is considered one of Peru’s most accessible and well-known cultural heritage resources. Like Chichén Itzá, Machu Picchu was included on the 2007 New 7 Wonders of the World list, which created a boom in tourism surpassing 700,000 visitors per year (McDonnel 2006: 1).222

222 For the last twenty years, tourism numbers at Machu Picchu have been increasing exponentially, even before its inclusion on the Wonders of the World list. The Associated Press reported in 2005 that an average of 9,000 people visited the site in 1992, but by 2002 150,000 people were traveling to Machu Picchu (Instituto Nacional de Cultural del Cuzco 2005).
Like Chichén Itzá, Machu Picchu is very carefully maintained and generally restored and reconstructed, a vast difference from the complex that Hiram Bingham discovered and excavated [Figure 118]. Although modest funds maintain the site, nothing assures a safe and educational experience. Instead, there is a greater focus on getting tourists to, from, and through the archaeological site for as little cost as possible, while charging an exceptional amount for the experience. In particular, the construction of the Machu Picchu Ruins Hotel and other tourism facilities not far from the archaeological complex [Figure 119], and once-proposed plan for a cable car to transport more people to the site (see Higgins 2007), indicates a greater emphasis on

---

223 The site is situated on one of the peaks of the Andes Mountains, yet there are very few safety railings to prevent falling from the farming terraces or even any of the created tourist paths. The stairs used to gain access to many monuments on the site have been repointed, but have no hand rails, making the site comparatively dangerous to visit. Similarly, the educational tourism experience relies on a hired tour guide, as there are few signs as part of the site to explain the importance of monuments or features.
Machu Picchu as an opportunity for government income than as an educational experience for tourists.

Figure 118: Machu Picchu in 1912 after some clearing, but limited reconstruction. Photo by Hiram Bingham.

Figure 119: Machu Picchu hotel (far right) alongside entrance to the archaeological site. Photo taken looking back after entering the site by author, 2012.
With the constant increase in tourism infrastructure being added to Machu Picchu, and after many reports that it was being damaged by overcrowding, the Peruvian government eventually came under outside pressure to preserve the site. Consequently, the Dirección Regional de Cultura Cusco restricted entrances to 2,500 per day beginning in 2011. Despite the original intentions, however, some have argued that this system has been unsuccessful in mitigating tourism deterioration (Larson & Poudyal 2012: 917-20). Limiting admission to the extremely popular site also turned Machu Picchu into even more of a commodity, culminating in the admission charge rising to as much as $50 per person for entrance to the site and $17 per person to take the bus up the mountain to get there in 2012. This makes Machu Picchu one of the more expensive UNESCO World Heritage Sites to visit.

The cost is comparatively little for most international tourists who come specifically to see the archaeological sites and already spend thousands of dollars to do so. For much of the local Peruvian population who are principally descended from the Inca who created the site, however, the price is high enough to make visiting it difficult if not impossible. Although the 2005 site masterplan emphasizes the protection of the site in response to the previous 1991 masterplan, there remains significant emphasis on the expansive tourism facilities, rather than on providing educational or safety infrastructure (please see Instituto Nacional de Cultural del Cuzco 2005 for additional information). This suggests a continued discrepancy of values and perpetuates a dangerous situation at the site, where protective fencing should be considered a priority, not a luxury hotel.
Although Chichén Itzá has the advantage of significantly more space in which to house tourists and infrastructure, there is much to be learned from the progression of Machu Picchu over time, since significant similarities exist between the two situations. As infrastructure has expanded, potentially most dire is the impact of the archaeological presentation on the local population. In 1998, a cable car system proposed to transport visitors up to the site, but was met with criticism from both UNESCO and other research and educational agencies. The National Geographic Society has suggested that installing a cable car system to the site would “mar the natural vistas,” which are important to the cultural understanding of the site location, and facilitate overtourism, causing additional destruction of the site (Roach 2002: 1). Others have claimed that it would also eliminate the need for a road up to the site, potentially allowing the natural environment to remediate, but would force tourists to bypass Aguas Calientes, a community developed to serve tourism and the excavation which is not dependent on them (Flores Ochoa 2004: 125-217). If the infrastructure that the locals at Chichén Itzá are dependent upon were to be likewise eliminated, the impact on the community could be catastrophic—again suggesting the dilemma of economic pressures precluding possible enhanced, historically accurate site interpretation.

As for the continued commercialization of the site by the government, the politics of Machu Picchu have played out continuously in the media, specifically with regard to the importance of preserving archaeological sites for the sake of cultural patrimony. The descendants of indigenous

---

224 Part of the infrastructure growth concern with Machu Picchu is its location up in the Andes Mountains, which does not allow for safe expansion. Instead, much of the infrastructure has increased in Aguas Calientes, the once-small community at the base of the mountain that was established as part of the excavation many years ago. It now houses most of the hotels, hostels, and train station for visitors to Machu Picchu. In a monitoring report from 2005, UNESCO expressed continued concern over the unplanned expansion of Aguas Calientes to accommodate the site, but acknowledged that progress had been made in other areas through the proposed masterplan (1).
Inca populations are underrepresented in the cultural heritage sphere, and feel that the development of these areas and the selling off of artifacts is detrimental to their culture and their religious sites. In a 2007 *New York Times* article titled “The Possessed,” Arthur Lubow recounts the political atmosphere surrounding not only the artifacts mentioned earlier in the Peabody museum, but also the tourism at Machu Picchu, which is believed still to have sacred value to the people of Cuzco. He writes:

> In the minds of the [people of Cuzco] who inhabit the place that the Inca called “the navel of the world,” their compatriots in Lima, the imperial capital that the Spanish established on the coast, are greedily selling off the national patrimony…People in Cuzco would tell me that Machu Picchu is a sacred place that must be protected from commercialization and excessive tourism. When I said that to people in Lima, they would insist that there is no fault line between the two cities. Koechlin, for instance, told me that Peru is a Catholic country, both in the highlands and on the coast, and that the “elitist” criticisms of mass tourism in Machu Picchu originated with foreigners, not [the people of Cuzco] (2007: 1).

Lubow highlights the different in the personal or cultural values of Peruvians toward Machu Picchu, and equally important, the potential influence of the commercial entities in Lima promoting tourism in contrast to indigenous populations, who still adhere to ancient beliefs in Machu Picchu as a sacred place. It even seems to demonstrate a direct correlation both to the Imperial Incan regulation of religion in the outlying regions, and to the subsequent Spanish Imperial conversion of native populations to traditional Catholic beliefs. Suppression of the local population serves the commercial practices of politicians in Lima. If it is true that tourism management officials ignore the religious significance of the site, then this gross misinterpretation and misrepresentation of the material remains violates modern archaeological practices to define and present artifacts and architectural remains with historical context and voracity.

The problems faced at Machu Picchu and criticized by many cultural heritage professionals bear a striking resemblance to the future of Chichén Itzá if current issues are not mitigated in a
successful way. The commercialization of the local population, problems with overcrowding and overgrooming, and potential imposition of the government on local heritage traditions in Peru provide a cautionary precedent for further development at Chichén Itzá and other archaeological sites in Yucatán, where there is still a large population descended from indigenous Maya inhabitants who do not identify themselves as part of the larger government of Mexico. The continued use and manipulation of indigenous architectural and artistic traditions for commercialization or political gain can be seen as imposing heritage on a living population by promoting particular images to the outside world. Identifying particular artistic characteristics with a group of people, while at the same time not necessarily understanding or encouraging the tradition in which they were created, could be seen as a way of consuming someone else’s heritage and redistributing or repurposing it for financial gain.

6.6 Conclusions

It remains to be seen how Chichén Itzá will compare with Machu Picchu in the years to come, but some strides are being made to lessen the impact of outside influences on the presentation of the site. Nevertheless, beyond the closing of the pyramid to climbers and no longer allowing tourists to sit on the Chac Mool sculpture [Figure 120], the local and national governments have yet to limit tourism activities at Chichén Itzá, and people are still traveling to the site in record numbers, which will certainly continue under the current commercialization of the remains.
Figure 120: Chac Mool sculpture as part of the Temple of the Warriors was previously a popular tourism photography stop, where visitors could sit on the sculpture and take pictures. Photo by Bjørn Christian Tørrissen, 2010.

Although it has long been identified as significant to world cultural heritage, Chichén Itzá illustrates many of the issues that can affect the presentation of archaeology for the greater public. Commercially-focused practices, overcrowding, and imposed identity are just some of the factors influencing the way that the site is perceived and experienced. Despite these modern issues with interpretation, however, Chichén Itzá has a lot to offer when examining the influence of design interventions on context. Ancient Maya traditions can be interpreted through the presentation of the ancient architecture, but also the imposition of culture on the modern Maya population, who do not necessarily continue to identify with the architecture as their own heritage. The restoration of the pyramid of Kukulcán in particular is reflective of Maya tradition and the use of architectural monuments to demonstrate ideas of culture, politics, and control.

As one of the most popular tourism destinations in the world, largely perpetuated by the government’s commercialization of the site, Chichén Itzá has progressed into a new
metaphorical cycle of existence, as a symbol of Maya cultural heritage and identity, however controversial. New architecture intervention serves as a tool of building regeneration, allowing deteriorating structures to once again have a purpose in demonstrating political and social qualities to a widespread audience. With tourism numbers increasing and monuments still facing deterioration, however, the questions remains whether Chichén Itzá will survive to see the next cycle of its life or once again be overcome by the jungle.
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CHAPTER 7
Themes in Interpretation: Where do we go from here?

7.1 Interpretation through Design

Each of the previous studies represents a piece of the legacy born out of the interpretation of cultural heritage and archaeological sites for the benefit of the public. In a sense, concepts like reconstruction, restoration, planning, and installation sculpture take on new meanings as part of the cultural heritage narrative: the reconstruction and restoration of historic buildings at these ancient sites cannot simply replicate the context of the past, but it can be used as an interpretative tool to enhance comprehension of the historical narrative of a particular place by partially recreating ancient space for a modern audience. Adding interpretive elements does not mean that they will stand alone with their own identity, but instead the interpretation will become part of the visual iconography and artistic history of a place, whether authentic or inauthentic. Furthermore, how people understand and identify with these public spaces will sometimes determine the success of a project in representing history or culture.

Interpretive design encompasses and encourages new development, sparking constant revision and reassessment of techniques to continue to make sites understandable to a modern audience. This will continue as long as the public is particularly looking to the past to try to understand the present. Using design as a way to demonstrate or present history goes back millennia and can be broken down into common trends, despite the changing ways in which the design is administered. Although each interpretative situation has its own influences, complications, and priorities, examining them as a collection allows for a world analysis in how interpretation is viewed and understood not just by researchers, but by the public, of whom millions visit these historic sites every year.
7.2 Common Architectural Themes

In looking at the case studies together, several common themes can be drawn particularly with regard to the role(s) of interpretation as part of the cultural heritage narrative. None can apply to every site since each interpretive situation is unique in its political/cultural/historical/etc. condition, but together, they begin to form a basis for how interpretation is accomplished as a world practice. The themes highlight the potential impact that interventions can have on the public understanding of history, both now and in the future and can be broken down into the following broad categories:

*Design meant specifically to interpret often becomes part of the historical narrative*

As was the case with Ancient Troy and Chichén Itzá, what initially begins as a piece of architecture or a restoration can soon become the subject of its own discourse, as part of an assumed relationship to the site where it was constructed. Senemoglu’s sculpture at Troy was initially nothing more than an installation sculpture as part of a local festival. Through its existence, placement, and publicity at the supposed site of the Trojan War, however, it became *the* Trojan Horse, an integral part of the history of the site. As a recognized piece of history in itself as evidenced by the substantial renovation for the horse despite deteriorating archaeological evidence, the sculpture evolved from an interpretive element into the most popular piece of architecture to see. At Chichén Itzá, the pyramid of Kukulcán became iconic with the constant publicity and imagery surrounding it, helping it become one of the most famous pieces of architecture in the ancient Maya world, despite the fact that many other temples and sites were similarly or more important to the ancient Maya. The new narrative developed as part of the
restoration and publicity of the project can impose a new cultural history on a population of living descendants.

As a result of widespread publicity as “must see” features, these pieces of designed interpretation then become integral to the tourism site. Each influences the way that visitors understand history, by including the new construction in the presented timeline of existence at the site. The context in which they are presented suggests inflated importance to the historical narrative, especially as iconic objects within an otherwise less recognizable landscape.

The same can also be said for the total reconstruction of Lascaux II and similar reconstruction projects like Altamira. When the original material is inaccessible, whether for preservation, destruction, or any other scenario, the reconstructed interpretive facility becomes the sole narrative for understanding the ancient site. Interventions such as these then become the focus of the interpretation, and are subsequently conserved, just like ancient remains as they themselves begin to age. Since they are the facilities accessible to the public, they may also share a similar notoriety to the original site, and may confuse some visitors who believe that they are visiting the original heritage site.

*Design is often used to translate or illustrate complicated history*

Design is also used to help illustrate a story for visual-oriented audiences, where a complicated historical record must be boiled down to understandable media. In each of the studies, the intervention not only helped to relate the historical past of each of the sites, but also provided a timeline of construction from ancient to modern in the area, complete with cultural influences for
each epoch. This is particularly important at sites where the ancient remains are difficult to decipher and a modern intervention helps to reconstruct a narrative that is otherwise marred with gaps. In the case of Chichén Itzá and Machu Picchu, multiple restoration projects, although highly controversial, helped to reconstruct important ancient political centers almost in their entirety, allowing for visitors to experience the scale and detail of the ancient architecture that would otherwise have been lost to the overgrowth of the jungle. Projects like this display the relationship of architectural spaces within full sites and complexes, an important experiential element to a visitor’s understanding of “place.”

Lascaux II also created an avenue for visitors to understand the complete architectural context of the cave and paintings, which would not have been possible without the intervention. It provided the history, where history was previously inaccessible. Altamira took this one step further, providing additional cultural context through the museum, while still offering many of the experiential qualities of the Lascaux II reconstruction.

Where this concept becomes potentially problematic is in the case study of Ancient Troy, where the architecture goes beyond translating a historical narrative for the public and begins to create one of its own. When architecture does not strictly follow the established historical precedent, it can unintentionally provide an aesthetic supplement to history that is more identifiable to visitors than the known archaeological record. Similarly, the design interventions at Luxor rejected the historical precedent of the ancient architecture in the creation of the plaza spaces, and in doing so, missed an opportunity to create additional historical context through the design.
Visual media is a significant component of historical cultural identity

The studies each helped to establish that the visual media (both ancient and modern) available at archaeological sites and presented to the public is particularly important to peoples’ understanding of place, time, and culture, as well as to their personal cultural identity. At Ancient Troy, it was clear that both the ancient and modern architecture contributed to the understanding of the site by the local and international public, particularly with regard to its myth-history. This is perhaps even more important when examining Egypt and the delineation of space through architectural construction. Although ethnically only a small portion of the modern Egyptian population identifies with ancient Egyptians, they are connected through design, which is based significantly on environmental conditions. The concept of familial “homeplace” is also very important to understanding architecture and cultural identity, as related to the process of removing populations from familial homes to create tourism areas. New houses and planned communities were built, but the ideas of “home” and “community” in theory are not as easily replicated as architecture is.

This suggests the equally important theory that one group’s heritage and cultural identity can be weighed and measured against another group’s, or an outside identity can be imposed on a living population. In order to create a tourism-friendly environment surrounding the ruins of an ancient civilization in Egypt, another heritage was permanently removed. In managing these types of sites, organizers must often choose what to interpret, usually involving the removal of other historical architecture in order to accomplish the presentation of a particular time period. This certainly is the case in Luxor, where interpreting the ancient remains led to the removal of more
modern architecture. Although this case is not unique, it does suggest using caution in making decisions where modern and local populations may suffer in order to interpret an ancient complex, particularly for national revenue. Situations involving foreign archaeologists interpreting a living population’s cultural heritage can further complicate the situation, and interpreters must carefully poll all stakeholders in the heritage to determine the significance of particular time periods, artifacts, or architectural construction.

In a similar situation, the purposeful restoration and promotion of particular images and buildings can impose an inauthentic or unwanted heritage on the population surrounding a historic site. Chichén Itzá and Machu Picchu both saw the promotion of tourism often weighed against the livelihood of the local population, who can in some ways still identify culturally with the archaeological remains. The imagery produced in relation to their culture, therefore, becomes internationally popularized, but without the context for the outside world to understand it in a culturally authentic way.

It is also important to address is the idea that people from all over the world can feel a sense of cultural identity at many of the discussed sites. As one of the oldest decorated spaces in the world, Lascaux can represent for some the beginning of civilization, meaning that many different groups of people may feel an ancestral connection to it or to similar places. This drives the idea of “World Heritage Sites,” as locations that are culturally significant to the world. Although this

---

225 Another well-known example is the removal of 18th and 19th century houses and other architecture from the Athenian Acropolis during excavations and interpretation of the site. In order to restore the complex architecturally to its aesthetic during the 5th century BCE, a significant part of the historical narrative of the architectural transformation of the site was lost in the removal of what had been for a long period of time a bustling city. Today, the site is able to accommodate thousands of people, largely due to the removal, but visitors now see only a snapshot of the total history of the site in architectural reconstruction.
may promote the international push for preservation of this type of site, it suggests a larger base of people for whom to interpret. Therefore, many degrees of association must be carefully accommodated so that each group can feel the significance of the site.

*Interventions are dependent on modern political and social influences*

Stakeholders in particular play into the concept of political and social influences on the architectural interpretation of historical remains. Cultural heritage sites all over the world tend to be funded by multiple groups, each of which has personal agendas and insight into the way that a place is presented to the public. Stakeholders often include foreign and local archaeologists, tourism officials, as well as local and national governments intending to profit from opening the remains to an international audience. With many groups influencing the interpretation but often the national government providing support for the largest sites, the politics of the ruling authority tend to weigh heavily on the way that the interpretation is designed. Since many historical sites are excavated by universities or researchers, this can create a discrepancy between how foreign or local archaeologists would like to educate the public and how the government chooses to interpret for the sake of profit, particularly where cultural heritage tourism is a significant part of the national revenue, i.e. Egypt, Mexico. Therefore, a balance must be struck between all stakeholders to ensure that the site is maintained and interpreted in a way that first promotes preservation and then accomplishes other goals.

There is also the impact on the local population to consider for large-scale construction projects. Enhancing the infrastructure around a cultural heritage site will facilitate tourism and sometimes revenue for subsets of the population who depend on it, but as is the case with Egypt, this could adversely impact the daily life of other subsets of the local population, for the sake of the
international touring public. In the case of Chichén Itzá, the infrastructure to the site was enhanced for this specific purpose by the national government, but few could have guessed the success that the site would have as a major tourism destination. The promotion of the site by the government is now at the expense of the architecture of the site, which has seen significant deterioration based on overcrowding. If the ancient material suffers at the expense of the interpretation when tourism numbers continue to increase, this creates a non-sustainable situation if not mitigated through national intervention.

*Modern interpretations are often a direct reflection of the historical past of the site*

Lastly, one of the more surprising discoveries to come from the collections of studies is that the modern interpretation of the sites has in many ways mirrored the role played by ancient architecture in that particular place: the monumental horse at Ancient Troy serves a similar purpose to the Hellenistic tumuli; the large-scale plazas in ancient and modern Egypt were used both to organize groups of people and organize space; the use of undulating walls for painting at Lascaux and Lascaux II created a total aesthetic and experiential environment; the large-scale complex at Chichén Itzá is meant to signify political power and control and accommodate large crowds, much like the original purposeful of the city design. This can probably be attributed to a combination of factors including long-standing cultural traditions, environmental influences, and the intentional design of the interventions to recreate the context of an ancient place. In Egypt, the idea of spatial plazas is both cultural and environmental. The harsh climate necessitates the purposeful use of passive heating and cooling systems achieved through the use of hard-surface building materials and the implementation of plants and water features in public plazas. At the same time, the architecture can also used for the cultural practice of public gathering, whether or not the space successful uses these environmental techniques. Both are concepts that were
adapted by ancient and modern Egyptians and architecturally will continue to be prevalent in the area. Lascaux II is the total reconstruction of an ancient cave space, making its man-made cave design inherently contextual with the aim of creating similar atmospheric qualities to the original, while still providing space for interpretation and preserving the newly created art. The interpretive history had roots in the cultural traditions of France, where the cultural context was seen as secondary to the art, and thus Lascaux was interpreted to feature the art above found artifacts.

Although it can be said that as individual cultures and a single world/human culture have progressed significantly from ancient times through globalization, design is still dominant in creation and understanding of history. Surrounded by the ancient past at archaeological and heritage sites, we as a world population cannot help but be influenced in our present aesthetic traditions either in acknowledging and emulating the past or in reacting to it and designing in the opposite direction.

7.3 Where do we go from here?

It is important to understand these impacts of interpretation, not in order to judge interventions as “good” or “bad” but to acknowledge that they will have a significant impact on the visitor understanding of the site that is being represented. The impact may be major or minor but needs to be accounted for and constantly reassessed so as to achieve the desired result of a project planned as part of an archaeological or cultural heritage site. Once thought to be mainly for preservation, design has become integral to the interpretation of remains, sometimes in an unintentional way. By acknowledging the role of aesthetic choices in cultural and historical
interpretation and how these modern elements affect the way visitors view a particular place, we will be able to better plan and design cultural sites for future public consumption.
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