

This is a repository copy of '*Deviants, punks and Pink Fairies*':counter-archaeologies for unreasonable people.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/142947/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Schofield, Arthur John orcid.org/0000-0001-6903-7395 (2017) '*Deviants, punks and Pink Fairies*':counter-archaeologies for unreasonable people. *World Archaeology*. pp. 281-290. ISSN: 1470-1375

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00438243.2017.1383182>

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

‘Deviants, Punks and Pink Fairies’: Counter Archaeologies for Unreasonable People

John Schofield

Department of Archaeology, University of York

john.schofield@york.ac.uk

Abstract

Like any subject, archaeology has its traditions, its conventional practices and guiding principles that ensure it stays loyal, true to its original aims. That is why today, archaeologists still excavate, generating yet more data, publishing in the latest volumes of long-established journals, or in expensive monographs that only other archaeologists will read. Archaeologists employed by heritage agencies care for monuments and historic buildings, ensuring they survive, ‘for the benefit of future generations’. For many, this is how archaeology should remain. A similar cultural conservatism lingered in the UK from the end of the Second World War until, arguably, 26 November 1976 when, according to musician Phil Oakey, the Second World War finally and abruptly came to an end. That was the day punk arrived with the thrashing of guitars and streams of abuse. But punk was about more than just the music. It was an ethos, a philosophy. Conventions were challenged and the old order gradually dismantled. Pre-1976 news footage now has the resemblance of ancient history. This semi-autobiographical introduction to a collection of essays that promotes new thinking on counter archaeologies wonders if that punk ethos could not have similar benefits for archaeology. Or perhaps it exists already, more than we care to realise.

Introduction

‘The reasonable man adapts himself to the world: the unreasonable one persists in trying to adapt the world to himself. Therefore all progress depends on the unreasonable man.’ George Bernard Shaw, *Maxims for Revolutionists* (1903).

Singer of Sheffield band ‘The Human League’ Phil Oakey said he didn’t believe ‘the Second World War finished until punk came along. Punk changed people’s attitudes, they realised they didn’t have to do what their parents did’ (cited in Lilleker 2005, 29). In the context of academic study or professional practice the role of parents as ‘guardians’, teachers, mentors and guides to convention and good behaviour can be replaced by that of esteemed senior colleagues, ‘the great and the good’, the respected pillars of the (in this case archaeological)

establishment. And they are all of those things, of course. We love and respect our parents or guardians, even though we often disagree and can find them exasperating! We may accuse them of being 'behind the times'. And so it can be with esteemed colleagues. This is a healthy situation: the fact of a younger generation having the confidence of youth, or the idealism (as 'seniors' might say) to challenge the conventions. Often they do this politely, and generally with focus on points of detail - specific things: an enforced bedtime, negotiating the extra half hour; or the choice of one theoretical framework over another to interpret artefact types or human behaviours. Sometimes bad behaviour and tetchiness will manifest itself. Rarely challenged are the foundations upon which that authority rests. Paradigm shifts are rare as visible crises within a longer process of change, yet how refreshing they can be. Punk is such an example, initially for the music industry but later for culture and society more broadly. The message then was: challenge convention; say 'no'; reverse the meaning.

This introduction examines the principles of punk (its 'philosophy' if you will) and the various ways by which such principles might transform archaeological practice, arguably for the better (in the sense of construction through destruction - 'DESTROY' being a punk slogan and with obvious parallels in the writings of Jacques Derrida and their adoption by some archaeological theorists). It also suggests that this is happening already, and many examples can be drawn upon to illustrate the emergence certainly of 'proto-punk' attitudes and approaches within the subject, in the form of post-processual archaeology for instance. Examples of such counter archaeologies are included within this collection, bridging archaeological and heritage practice and from prehistoric to contemporary settings around the world. If archaeology is to fully embrace the ideals of punk (as an example of counter archaeological practice), then edginess must become a characteristic not an exception, and authorities (grant givers, teachers, managers) must allow scope for alternative perspectives and practices to thrive. The fact of Historic England (the national heritage agency and governmental advisor on heritage matters for England) recently listing at Grade II* the building most closely associated with 'arch-punks' the Sex Pistols (Graves-Brown and Schofield 2016), or their awarding a blue plaque to Jimi Hendrix some years ago (Schofield 2000), is a sign that perhaps they do, at least to a degree.

Background

'The Pink Fairies, one of two "Peoples' Bands" along with Hawkwind, flew the flag for free music and Anarchy in the early '70s underground. Based around the thundering

blues guitar of Paul Rudolph and the double drumming of Twink and Russ Hunter, they were less a band, more a musical terrorist organisation, turning up to play anywhere for free, even unwanted. They were, in short, the ultimate ongoing rock 'n roll agitprop stunt.' <http://www.stevetook.mercurymoon.co.uk/pink-fairies.html> (Accessed 6 October 2016)

As a subject archaeology has always pushed boundaries, geographical, temporal and theoretical. In understanding past human behaviour, archaeology is a bold, creative and inclusive discipline drawing its theoretical and methodological influences from far and wide. Post processualism and the influence of Jacques Derrida immediately come to mind in their alignment with counter approaches to practice and interpretation. In reach archaeology now extends to the contemporary past (itself now rather conventional, for example Harrison and Schofield 2010), space (eg. Gorman and O'Leary 2013), and the future (eg. Holtorf and Hogberg 2015). In some ways then, archaeology does not need to be 'punk' to be sharp, creative or alternative. In much the same way, popular music before 1976 was diverse and exploratory - new trends came and went, while particular compositions or performances made waves. The emergence of electronic music was initially disliked by purists, as was folk rock (the first rock drum solo in folk music - in Fairport Convention's *A Sailor's Life* may have caused similar reaction amongst purists as Binford's [1962] *Archaeology and Anthropology* did amongst the archaeological community!). There were riots at jazz festivals in the early 1960s (one of the first being at Beaulieu Abbey in Hampshire, a festival coincidentally overseen by English Heritage's first Chairman, Lord Montagu of Beaulieu). Music was wonderfully eclectic and diverse before 1976, and many composers and performers were doing very original things. The Pink Fairies were anarchists and into chaos. They improvised on stage, often for the entire show. And perhaps this is the closest parallel: that archaeology may have had its Pink Fairies, and a great many of them, all doing very creative and original things - the New Archaeology of the 1960s for example, expertly critiqued in Clarke's (1973) seminal 'loss of innocence' paper, and post-processualism. But in spite of these significant shifts, archaeology has probably not yet had its '1976'.

But let us return to the conventions of archaeological practice. Some obvious ones spring to mind: That excavation is the mainstay of archaeological practice, and data retrieval. Excavation is a slow and meticulous process, 'Time Team' and some developer-led evaluations aside. The results of these excavations are often still published in expensive monographs few will read, and that lay readers (should they manage to access them) will

struggle to understand. Artefacts from excavations (and other collection contexts) are usually retained by museums after careful conservation. Museum stores are overflowing with the stuff and yet few people ever see it, and fewer still get to handle it. There is a presumption within the planning system that archaeological sites will be preserved 'for the benefit of future generations' where they are impacted by development (something Martin Biddle [1994] once described as 'anti-intellectual', and a process that demands endless excavations generating yet more data for which the public benefit is never questioned). That said, archaeologists are deeply passionate about their subject. They care about what they find and attach great value to these things, and to the age-old practices by which they are found and then analysed. Archaeologists (I find) are rarely (big C) Conservative. But they are sometimes rather conservative in the way these principles and practices roll through the generations. It is of course appropriate that such established practices should be resilient, as they are tried and tested and part of the subject's own heritage. They work. But that does not preclude the possibility of creative innovation. I am not talking so much about the technical innovations that create ripples of disquiet or disapproval perhaps, but those more significant changes of direction or emphasis that make waves. These waves might not impact universally on practice, but they might helpfully change the intellectual landscape in which archaeologists work. The Rolling Stones started recording in 1962 and they are still recording and performing today, with the core of their original line up. What they did before 1976 they continue to do brilliantly (in fact their new release [*Blue and Lonesome*, 2016] is highly reminiscent of their early recordings, with its 'stripped-back-to-basics' blues). Punk may not have influenced them directly. But the landscape in which they now work has changed dramatically nonetheless.

I personally became disillusioned with conventional archaeological practice quite early on. I was never one for excavation. I prefer to be mobile, with my eyes on the horizon. So the choice of being in one location for days on end, or covering an entire landscape (Schofield et al. 1999, Carreté et al. 1995), moving from field to field to create understanding of more extensive areas of terrain, was an easy one for me to make. I also think it was partly due to the fact I was taught about archaeology 'as excavation'; it is 'what archaeologists do'. I am not one for being told what to do! I was also drawn to places where little was known (in my case the Meon and middle Avon valleys of Hampshire [eg Schofield 1991], following Shennan's [1985] lead in East Hampshire), while most others in my field focused on rich veins of data in the heartlands of Wessex. Similarly with old stuff - archaeology, we were

told, is about the deeper past, beyond memory. So naturally I was drawn to question that presumption as well.

Archaeology is my passion, and I am interested in everything we do as archaeologists. But I quickly grew bored with the reliance on the conventions by which one must retrieve and investigate our human past. It is telling that in my undergraduate degree, it was ethnoarchaeology that captured my imagination, but not so much for what it told us about prehistoric behaviours at Pincevent (Binford 1983, 159), but rather for the insight it provided on contemporary society. The studies of nomads by Cribb (1991) and the Nunamiut by Binford (ibid and 1981) stand out as strong memories of the course, alongside Ucko's 'penis sheaths in prehistory' (1969) and Leach's 'Culture and Communication (1976), a mainstay of my final undergraduate year.

It was perhaps unsurprising that I went home from lectures to listen to records by The Adverts, The Clash and the Sex Pistols, and eventually developed an active interest in the archaeology of the contemporary past, with studies of a Transit Van (Bailey et al. 2009), the flat occupied by the Sex Pistols in 1976 (Graves-Brown and Schofield 2011 and 2016) and some contemporary peace camps (the ultimate places of opposition) (Beck et al. 2009; Schofield 2009). It may also be no coincidence that my co-researcher on numerous contemporary projects is Paul Graves-Brown, another Southampton alumnus who, like me, began his career as a prehistorian before switching attention to the contemporary world. Our comparison of artworks from two very different contexts (Lascaux cave paintings and pictures drawn on the walls of 6 Denmark Street, London, by Johnny Rotten of punk band the Sex Pistols in 1975/6) caused consternation (Graves-Brown and Schofield 2011, 2016), and - for me at least - was influenced by what I learnt and the way I learnt at Southampton.

At the same time, and often from the same root, core principles of archaeological and cultural heritage management have come under increasingly close scrutiny. Prominent within this counter-heritage movement is Smith's (2006) articulate and sustained assault on the heritage establishment and its 'authorised heritage discourse'. She recognises a heritage concerned with promoting a, 'consensus version of history by state-sanctioned cultural institutions and elites to regulate cultural and social tensions in the present' (ibid., 4). She sees a heritage that could be, 'a resource that is used to challenge and redefine perceived values and identities by a range of subaltern groups; that heritage is not necessarily about the stasis of cultural values and meanings, but may equally be about cultural change.' Given

that almost every paper written about cultural heritage since 2006 cites Smith suggests this publication to be as close to a paradigm shift in critical heritage thinking as there has ever been. More recently is Holtorf's (2015, 418) challenge to the principles of heritage preservation arguing that it is, 'not necessarily helpful to emphasise the conservation paradigm in major policy statements and professional codes of ethics but that there might be considerable benefits in averting the preference for loss aversion.' In other words, every age will have its own heritage, just as we do today, and that any particular age's heritage is shaped by a combination of influences which together ensure the survival of an assemblage of things from the past. That, of course, will happen with or without heritage preservation. This also raises questions about the presumptions we make about the future generations we are preserving all of this heritage for. Given that our heritage interests have shifted significantly in the past 25-30 years (since I became involved, in 1989 - when anything post Industrial Revolution was not considered heritage, except by enthusiasts and amateur special interest groups), how can we possibly claim to judge future priorities?

Thus heritage conventions are under close scrutiny and not only from archaeologists. This challenge comes also from philosophy (eg. Brumann 2014) and sociology (eg. MacDonald 2013), to name two of the many subjects with an active stake in increasingly diverse yet still coherent cultural heritage agendas. But I find it interesting that the challenge from archaeology appears coincident with the challenge to conventional archaeological practice, and involves some of the same people. This challenge probably isn't 'punk' because the rule books and the conventions remain firmly established, for now. Maybe these people are comparable more to the Pink Fairies (and predecessors The Deviants, formerly The Social Deviants), and maybe 1976 is just around the corner, for heritage and for archaeology?

Archaeology, Punks and Pink Fairies

To examine more closely the degree to which archaeology has adopted and made use of punk principles requires an understanding of what those principles are. Numerous authors have considered the philosophy or the meaning of punk (eg. O'Hara), what it set out to achieve and why (and why *then* - the reason often being (Oakey op cit) the years of conservatism that came before finally, boiling point in 1976 - ironically two years before Phil Oakey's Human League released '*Being Boiled*' in 1978!). Other authors have presented a history of punk (notably Savage 1991), participants have penned autobiographies (eg. Albertine 2014, Lydon 1994), and some archaeologists have published essays or collected works that together promote a punk approach (Caraher and Kourelis 2014). But to closely

interrogate how the principles of a movement can shape an academic discipline and shape practice, Beer's *Punk Sociology* alongside O'Hara's (1995) *The Philosophy of Punk* seem good places to begin. Following a brief summary of these works I will look at some principles or 'characteristics', describing how they relate to (or could in future shape) practice.

Originally a research dissertation at Boston University, O'Hara's (1995) study of the philosophies of punk prevalent within the US punk scene is a thoughtful and critical commentary. It documents trends and characteristics before focusing closely on what the author refers to as 'key particulars' such as anarchy, gender issues and environmentalism. The study notes how, 'rebellion is one of the few undeniable characteristics of Punk' (ibid., 23) and that, 'the most important (and perhaps most radical) thing for the Punks to do is take on responsibility. This goes first for themselves and how they order and live their personal lives, then extends to include others (ibid.)'. O'Hara goes on to describe (ibid., 56) how punks are primarily anarchists - they share a belief formed around the anarchic principles of having no official government or rulers, and valuing individual freedom and responsibility. We will return to some of these key principles of punk which O'Hara identifies below.

Beer's (2014) study reads less as historiography and more a call-to arms, combining an overview of what appears wrong with contemporary sociology, and how a punk approach might put that right. As such it deserves to be widely read, as well as serving as inspiration for other research fields that might benefit from some realignment or reorientation. Again, in his Chapter 2 ('The Punk Ethos') some defining principles are outlined. This paper will examine how some of these principles identified in relation to sociology might also relate to archaeological (including some cultural heritage) practice, and how the subject might benefit from such an agenda. But I will first recall the central focus of this argument: that while some of the 'innovative' practices and case studies described may appear radical to some, much has already been adopted as occasional (and in some instances common) practice within archaeology and cultural heritage fields. I will however suggest that at the core of a punk philosophy is 'gut rebellion and change', a 'formidable voice of opposition' (O'Hara 1995, 24). It is revolution, and arguably the revolution has not yet happened in archaeology even though a considerable amount of practice is clearly influenced by or closely aligned to the punk ethos. What we appear to have therefore is a fairly steady state of 'proto-punk'. And as with many 'proto' situations, there is appetite for the revolution to happen. We just do not always know how to engineer or provoke it, or what the landscape might look like afterwards.

Principles of Punk

These 'principles of punk' are not intended to be exhaustive, but rather an indicative outline of some of its defining characteristics. I will focus on two before briefly outlining four others.

First, *as a movement punk opposes conformity* (O'Hara 1995, 84). Punks display deep-seated discomfort with established ideas about the world, with consensus and with conventions (Beer 2014, 28). They question and challenge established modes of thought, opening up new questions and finding new perspectives. Cultural expression is relatively unrestricted. Punks can be bold and inventive in their work. Conventions do not hold them back.

This volume seeks to promote the view that counter archaeologies provide a helpful antidote to conventional approaches and interpretations. The volume's original title was to be 'punk archaeologies' but that seemed too narrow to capture the range of alternate and counter perspectives emerging within archaeological and heritage practice. That said, all of the papers contained within this volume do fall neatly under this earlier heading. Rathbone and Richardson, for example, tackle principles and core concepts in their respective and critical reviews of anarchist literature and archaeological practice. Conventional archaeological settings are examined from distinctly alternate perspectives in contributions by Fagan and Eriksen, for Neolithic and Iron Age settings in eastern and northern Europe respectively. Hale et al. explore the complex relations that can arise where conventionally-defined heritage assets come into contact with contemporary practices and place-making activities, at Dumby in Scotland, while historical counter archaeologies in New York form the subject of Matthews and Phillippi's contribution, returning nonwhites to historic white spaces. The final three papers are more contemporary, drawing first on the complex relationship between neo-relics and archaeological heritage in Finland (Ikaheimo and Aikas), and on the timely and relevant issues of migration and global protest, and the valuable and distinctive contributions made by archaeology towards their understanding, in papers by Clarke et al. and Soar and Tremlett. Together these contributions are indicative of extensions in scope and purpose, defining new ways that archaeology can helpfully support and arguably in some cases lead intellectual and socially meaningful debate specifically by adopting alternate, counter or punk viewpoints.

Second, *the driving ethic behind most sincere punk efforts is DIY - Do it Yourself* (O'Hara 1995, 132). Punks adapt to the terrain in which they are operating and refuse to be restricted

by limitations of access and funding. Punk is based on resourcefulness, a point highlighted in Richardson's contribution and evident also in Rathbone's review of anarchist literature. It is also an implicit assumption in the contributions of Hale et al and Soar and Tremlett. A more explicit example is a project initiated in 2009 to study contemporary homelessness through the lens of archaeological practice (Kiddey and Schofield 2011, Kiddey in press). The project cut through red-tape, broke many rules of conventional practice (but all within an agreed ethical framework), and had significant wellbeing and health/lifestyle benefits for the participants in two separate but related studies, in Bristol and York. The study involved two excavations (one in each city), both of which were sites chosen by the homeless participants. In the case of Turbo Island in Bristol (Crea et al. 2014) the place even took its name from the homeless people who participated in the publications and whose names appear amongst the authors. This project worked with minimal support. The research went unfunded. The disadvantages of this approach included limitations on what was possible. But the advantages included a freedom and flexibility to work often without constraint (except, as noted above, the obvious need for good ethical practice), and to feel as though we were somewhat 'under the radar', which helped homeless colleagues gain confidence, and ultimately take ownership of the project. This was a successful project. It has had real benefits for its participants, and we did it ourselves. It might not have worked so well otherwise.

Other principles of punk include the fact of punks *valuing individual freedom and responsibility*. Punks recognise the drive of the individual to make a contribution and to sometimes look to subvert restrictive or oppressive social categories, norms or conventions (Beer 2014, 28). As we saw earlier, O'Hara describes how punks are primarily anarchists - they share a belief formed around the anarchic principles of having no official government or rulers, and valuing. One might however extend this definition beyond the purely political, to one that concerns governance within the sector. The homelessness study might stand as an example of archaeological and heritage practice that flourished largely for being below the radar.

Similarly, punk is highly relativistic (Beer 2014, 28). Punk is not concerned with hierarchies attempting instead to see the world from plural and multiple perspectives. Punk is also open and eclectic (Beer 2014, 28). It is outward looking and keen to respond, react against and draw upon alternative cultural resources. Punk products are raw, stripped back and fearless (Beer 2014, 28), and punk seeks to transcend boundaries and obstacles and erode the lines

between performer and audience. Punks therefore will use opportunities to express creative forces - using media and social networks in new and unpredictable ways. There are numerous excellent examples of this, with archaeologists effectively unlearning established practices and contravening the restrictive requirements of excellence measures such as the UK's Research Excellence Framework to publish online. Much of the most provocative and thoughtful commentary on cultural heritage and contemporary archaeology appears in this form. Students are now taught to engage equally with these new forms of media and expression, as essential professional skills for life and for heritage practice.

Conclusion

"The ordinary man is an anarchist. He wants to do as he likes. He may want his neighbour to be governed, but he himself doesn't want to be governed." George Bernard Shaw.

I was brought up to be obedient and to not question authority. 'There is a right way and a wrong way' I was told, at home and at school. I never did rebel. Not really and certainly not as a child. But I did become rather unconventional, always seeking alternate pathways. I do this not to redress past imbalances. I do it because I firmly believe that to question and challenge convention is good, constructive (if channeled correctly) and healthy. Critical engagement need not be disrespectful or discourteous, and rarely is in my direct personal experience. As teachers in archaeology and heritage I hope we all encourage our students to think critically. My concern is that it only ever goes so far. We never look to turn the system. So with the exception of a few significant voices that lead others towards to incremental change, everything stays the same. My argument here is that those voices are important, but only in the sense of mirroring the reverberations of agit-pop anarchists The Deviants and Pink Fairies in the late 1960s and early 1970s, creating ripples and some amusement amongst an establishment which has no idea what lies around the corner. Hints of the fundamental change include the encouraging words in the 2005 Faro Convention (that heritage is about the future not the past, that heritage is something to be used, and is there for everyone - to paraphrase), and Smith's (2006) relentlessly energetic assault on the pillars of the heritage establishment. Maybe those involved in such initiatives and outputs are proto-punks foretelling a brave new future?

Returning to music, a world in which alternative views and perspectives often prevail, Mick Farren of the Pink Fairies (and before that The Deviants, another proto punk band, and a

political activist involved in pulling down the fence at the 1970 Isle of Wight festival - Schofield 2000) said, in 1976:

'If rock becomes safe, it's all over. It's a vibrant, vital music that from its very roots has always been a burst of colour and excitement against a background of dullness, hardship or frustration. From the blues onwards, the essential core of the music has been the rough side of humanity. It's a core of rebellion, sexuality, assertion and even violence. All the things that have always been unacceptable to a ruling establishment. Once that vigorous, horny-handed core is extracted from rock'n'roll, you're left with little more than muzak. No matter how tastefully played or artfully constructed, if the soul's gone then it still in the end comes down to muzak.' (Farren 2013)

Archaeology can feel a bit like muzak sometimes.

Many archaeologists are already punks in the sense of leading their lives and following practice according to many of the principles listed above. But these lifestyle choices are not nearly as radical or as 'dangerous' as they were considered to be in 1976. They now appear quite mild and sensible in fact. Which takes me back to the central point of this essay about rebellion and change. This is where the true punk ethos comes to the fore: challenging the age-old traditions that continue to shape the discipline, and turning them and the system that supports them upside down. Perhaps this is where Bernard Shaw's quote at the start of this essay is so apposite - that even (or perhaps especially) in a field of interest as comparatively small as archaeology, the influence of those few people who seek to change and adapt systems can still be felt. I believe there to be many 'unreasonable people' involved in cultural heritage and archaeology, and long may that continue.

An ultimate question for archaeologists and a cornerstone of any archaeological rebellion is whether the past even matters? When Sex Pistols' singer Johnny Rotten was asked about his musical heroes he said he didn't have any, and when given a list of names as prompts he described them all as 'useless'. This reminds me somewhat of Rodney Harrison's (2011) claim that the past is only relevant in spaces where it intervenes in the present, and the author J G Ballard's comment in turning down a CBE, that 'the image of Britain is too much pomp and not enough circumstance. It's a huge pantomime where tinsel takes the place of substance'. We do need a past and arguably especially now, as Graves-Brown (pers comm)

states, to 'offer material challenges in the era of post-factuality. ... The hard relativism of post-processualism is being perpetuated with some people merely embracing Paul Feyerabend's (1975) "anything goes" philosophy, just meaning that "everything stays"'. We need a past to *do* something in the present for the future, rather than as a 'cozy retreat from reality' (Graves-Brown pers comm., and Council of Europe 2005). Maybe this is where the closest resonances with the punk ethos are to be found - in being activist in our approach, putting the past to work.

Following the thesis presented by Feyerabend in *Against Method* (1975) appears a helpful, timely and relevant parallel. An audience member recalls his lecture course at a University in the 1970s, where he, 'demolished virtually every traditional academic boundary. He held no idea and no person sacred. With unprecedented energy and enthusiasm he discussed anything from Aristotle to the Azande. How does science differ from witchcraft? Does it provide the only rational way of cognitively organizing our experience? What should we do if the pursuit of truth cripples our intellects and stunts our individuality? Suddenly epistemology became an exhilarating area of investigation.' (Preston 2009).

Following the line of Harrison and Rotten, my school History report once suggested that I had 'no interest in the past whatsoever'. Given my age at the time, I probably thought 'so what, I don't care'. Now I take a very different view, more thoughtful and informed, the result of an excellent education and some wonderful experiences in heritage practice and archaeology: that my teacher was right; taking an interest in the past *for its own sake*, I don't! I did once. But I don't anymore. The past is only useful in what it contributes to the present and the future. And counter approaches will continue to ensure those contributions remain relevant.

Acknowledgements

I am indebted to my friend and regular collaborator Paul Graves-Brown for his helpful comments and suggestions on an earlier draft of this paper, and to an anonymous reviewer whose advice helped sharpen up the line of argument and make this a better introduction.

References

Albertine, V. 2014. *Clothes, Music, Boys: A Memoir*. London: Faber & Faber.

Bailey, G., Newland, C., Nilsson, A. and Schofield, J., 2009. Transit, transition: Excavating J641 VUJ. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 19.1, 1-27.

Beck, C., Drollinger, H. and Schofield, J., 2009. Archaeologists, activists and a contemporary peace camp. In Holtorf, C. and Piccini, A. (eds), *Contemporary Archaeologies: Excavating Now*, 95-112. Peter Lang.

Beer, D. 2014. *Punk Sociology*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bernard Shaw, G. 1903. *Man and Superman*.

Biddle, M. 1994. *What future for British archaeology?: the opening address at the eighth annual conference of the Institute of Field Archaeologists, Bradford, 13-15 April 1994*. Oxford : Oxbow.

Binford, L.R. 1962. Archaeology as Anthropology. *American Antiquity* 28(2), 217-225.

Binford, L.R. 1981. *Bones: Ancient men and Modern Myths*. New York: Academic Press.

Binford, L.R. 1983. *In Pursuit of the past: decoding the archaeological record*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Brumann, C. 2014. Heritage agnosticism: a third path for the study of cultural heritage. *Social Anthropology* 22(2), 173-188.

Caraher, W.R. and Kourelis, K. (eds) 2014. *Punk Archaeology*. Digital Press at the University of North Dakota. Available online at:

https://digitalpressatund.files.wordpress.com/2015/08/punk_archaeology_2014.pdf

Carreté, J-M., Keay, S. and Millett, M. 1995. *A Roman Provincial Capital and its Hinterland: The Survey of the Territory of Tarragona, Spain, 1985-90*. Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplementary Series Number 15. Michigan: Ann Arbor.

Clarke, D.L. 1973. Archaeology: The Loss of Innocence. *Antiquity* 47 (185), 6-18.

Crea, G., Dafnis, A., Hallam, J., Kiddey, R. and Schofield, J., 2014. Turbo Island, Bristol: Excavating a Contemporary Homeless Place. *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 48.1, 133-150

Cribb, R. 1991. *Nomads in Archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Farren. M. 2013 [1976]. The Titanic Sails at Dawn. *The Guardian*.

<https://www.theguardian.com/music/2013/jul/31/mick-farren-nme-rock-titanic-sails> -
accessed 4 March 2017.

Feyerabend, P. 1975. *Against Method: Outline of an Anarchist Theory of Knowledge*.
London: Verso.

Gorman, A. and O'Leary, B. 2013. The Archaeology of Space Exploration. In,
Graves-Brown, P., Harrison, R. and Piccini, A. (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of The
Archaeology of the Contemporary World*, 409-424. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Graves-Brown, P. and Schofield, J., 2011. The filth and the fury: 6 Denmark Street (London)
and the Sex Pistols. *Antiquity* 85, 1385-1401

Graves-Brown, P. and Schofield, J. 2016. 'The most awkward building in England: The
'rotten' heritage of 'Tin Pan Alley' revisited. *Antiquity* 90 (354), 1629-1642.

Harrison, R. 2011. Surface assemblages. Towards an archaeology in and of the present.
Archaeological Dialogues 18.2, 141-161.

Harrison, R. and Schofield, J. 2010. *After Modernity: Archaeological Approaches to the
Contemporary Past*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holtorf, C. 2015. Averting loss aversion in cultural heritage. *International Journal of Heritage
Studies* 21(4), 405-421.

Holtorf, C. and Hogberg, A. 2015. Contemporary Heritage and the Future. In Waterton, E.
and Watson, S. (eds), *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research*,
509-523. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kiddey, R. In press. *Homeless Heritage: Collaborative Social Archaeology as Therapeutic
Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kiddey, R. and Schofield, J. 2011. Embrace the margins: adventures in archaeology and
homelessness. *Public Archaeology* 10.1, 4-22.

Leach, E. 1976. *Culture and Communication: The Logic by which Symbols Are Connected.
An Introduction to the Use of Structuralist Analysis in Social Anthropology*. Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press.

Lilleker, M. 2005. *Beats Working for a Living: Sheffield Popular Music 1973-84*. Sheffield: Juma.

Lydon, J. 1994. *Rotten: No Irish, No Blacks, No Dogs*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

MacDonald, S. 2013. *Memorylands: Heritage and Identity in Europe Today*. London and New York: Routledge.

O'Hara, C. 1995. *The Philosophy of Punk: More Than Noise!!* Edinburgh and San Francisco: AK Press.

Preston, J.M. 2009. Paul Feyerabend. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Winter 2009 Edition*. Available online at <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2009/entries/feyerabend/>

Savage, J. 1991. *England's Dreaming: Sex Pistols and Punk Rock*. London: Faber and Faber.

Schofield, J. 1991. Lithic distributions in the Upper Meon Valley: behavioural response and human adaptation on the Hampshire chalklands. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 57(2), 159-178.

Schofield, J., 2000. Never mind the relevance? Popular culture for archaeologists. In Graves-Brown, P. (ed), *Matter, Materiality and Modern Culture*, 131-154. London and New York: Routledge.

Schofield, J. 2009. Peace Site. An archaeology of protest at Greenham Common Airbase. *British Archaeology* 104, 44-49.

Schofield, J., Millett, M., Keay., S and Carreté, J-M. 1999. Prehistoric settlement in the Tarragona region of north-east Spain: Results from the Ager Tarraconensis Survey. *Lithics* 20, 33-47.

Shennan, S.J. 1985. *Experiments in the Collection and Analysis of Archaeological Survey Data: The East Hampshire Survey*. Sheffield: Sheffield University Press.

Smith L. 2006. *The Uses of Heritage*. London and New York: Routledge.

Ucko, P.J. 1969. Penis Sheaths: a comparative study. *Proceedings of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 1969, 24-67.

Biography

John Schofield is Head of Archaeology at the University of York where he teaches and conducts research in cultural heritage and the contemporary past. He is also Docent in Archaeology at the University of Turku (Finland), Senior Research Fellow at Flinders University (Adelaide, Australia), Member of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists and a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of London. When time and opportunity allows he still listens to The Adverts, goes to gigs at local venues, and DJs as 'Unofficial Hippocampus'.