

# **Chapter 8**

## **Another Proof of the Preceding Theory: Film, Materialities and Stonehenge**

**Helen Wickstead**

The last 10 in. vinyl record I bought was by a band called WE. When WE play, WE wear black Perspex blocks over their heads and identical futuristic black and white suits. All of WE play the same instruments—guitar or keyboard—and make the same motions. All of WE's songs begin with WE: WE want to hold your hand; WE will always love you; WE will be your father figure. WE are indistinguishable, substituting the collective in place of the individualistic 'I' of Western pop. In this way, WE reveal the Western pop canon to be implicated in the way subjectivities are produced and commodified through neoliberal capitalism.

In this chapter, I explore the work of one of the entities that comprise WE: Pil and Galia Kollectiv. In 2008, Pil and Galia Kollectiv took up residency on excavations at Stonehenge. This chapter discusses this residency and the work that resulted from it: Pil and Galia Kollectiv's video piece *Another Proof of the Preceding Theory* (2008). I approach this film as a work of materialisation that might be said to enter into the constitution of Stonehenge as an event. In this way, I suggest that Stonehenge is both performed by media and plays an active role itself in the performing of media.

I begin with a discussion of some existing approaches to the materiality of moving images in archaeology and film theory. Next, I introduce Pil and Galia Kollectiv's work and the context of their art residency at Stonehenge. I develop this background through a discussion of druid protests surrounding the Stonehenge excavations, showing how this created an additional context for the work. I go on to discuss the active role Stonehenge itself plays in relation to its art and visual culture, arguing that images have not only shaped the way Stonehenge is perceived, but have influenced its physical structure. Finally, I analyse *Another Proof of the Preceding Theory* in detail, interpreting it in relation to Pil and Galia Kollectiv's writings on antihumanism and the performances of objects.

---

H. Wickstead (✉)

Faculty of Art, Design and Architecture, Kingston University,  
Knights Park, Kingston upon Thames,  
Surrey KT1 2QJ, UK  
e-mail: h.wickstead@kingston.ac.uk

## Archaeology and the Materialities of Film

From a certain commonsense standpoint, moving images have no materiality. They constitute a dreamland populated by spectres and opposed to the brute heaviness attributed to materials. From such a standpoint, the materiality of celluloid, cameras or cinemas is easy to grasp, while moving images projected as light or stored as binary code conjure immateriality. Miller (2005) traces the links between this assumption of immateriality and the humanist notion of transcendent abstract thought, spirituality and fantasy. The language of moving images is metaphorically connected to this humanism, not least through the psychoanalytical notion of ‘projection’ (Freud 2006, pp. 64–68; Mulvey 1975). The idea that film communicates through and to the unconscious mind, has tended to separate it from the body in ways that recall Cartesian splitting. Models of vision are significant here, with the mind like a camera obscura, split from an outside world (Crary 1992; Thomas 2004). The assumption of moving images’ immateriality can be linked to their paradoxical ‘invisibility’; what Piccini (2012, p. 292) has called the ‘blindingly obvious’ quality which makes media ‘difficult to see, yet at the same time, crucially important to study’.

Why, Angela Piccini asks, can archaeologists not consider moving image production as ‘ritualized industrialization akin to the magic of the medieval smith’? Why do we find it difficult to consider film ‘as material culture’? (Piccini 2007, p. 222). For archaeologists, screen media—film, cinema, video, television, online gaming, Second Life—are a bountiful terrain supplying numerous field sites for contemporary archaeologists (e.g. Marwick 2010; Holtorf 2007; Gardner 2007; Harrison 2009). Simultaneously, moving images have become ubiquitous in the technologies of heritage interpretation, diffusing across a multitude of heritage environments (Griffiths 2008). Reviews of the archaeological literature on moving images accuse archaeologists of ‘narcissism’, since the literature is skewed in favour of portrayals of archaeologists, archaeology and archaeological monuments (Marwick 2010). Archaeologists seem to be less interested in media than a particular kind of media ‘content’—the representation of archaeology.

Piccini (2007) observes that archaeological literature is concentrated on documentaries, reflecting the importance of documentary practices to archaeology itself. Archaeological discussions, she observes, often focus on the extent to which TV documentaries show ‘the truth’ or are ‘staged for the cameras’, pitching documentaries that are true against those that are ‘faked’. But, Piccini points out, the terms of this discourse are flawed; reality does not arrive ready-made as documentary; life doesn’t comprise ‘pro-film reality’ complete with credits, framing, edits, voiceover and soundtrack. Film, video and television are always artificial, always, in this sense, art. To say this is not to reduce every film to some degree of fakery or ‘bias’. On the contrary it is to accept that ‘truth’ must be made rather than found, and that things are constructed and act in the world within relations that engender different kinds of truth (Latour and Weibel 2002). Documentaries may mobilise many very different claims to facticity, from mockumentary hoaxes to reality TV (Roscoe and Hight 2001); however, moving images are never transparent or unmediated ‘windows on the world’, but ‘truths’ that have been crafted.

Film-makers and theorists are intimately involved with the work of making moving images. Histories of moving images chart to varying degrees the trajectories of combined technologies, encompassing, cameras, celluloid, projected light, screens, Cathode Ray Tubes and Liquid Crystal Display. Exposing the material conditions of film's production has long been an important strategy in cinema, connected to neo-Marxist imperatives that sought to dispel the illusion that film supplied a transparent window on reality (Pil and Galia Kollectiv 2011a). The "Platonic hatred of images" (*ibid.*) that treats media as mere representations which distort underlying realities and mislead the viewer is also an aspect of archaeological discourse (Wickstead 2009). Many recent approaches seek to hold on to both the crafting of film and the 'emancipation' of its spectators (Ranciere 2009) in studies of the materiality of moving images. Writers examine technologies used in the production of moving images (Kelty and Landecker 2004; Clarke and Doel 2007), the environments into which they emanate (Freidburg 1993), and the interpretations of objects of which film is a trace (Mulvey 2006). An important recent focus has been on the way film is not only seen but also physically felt. Laura Marks (2000) writes of the "skin of the film" to emphasise how film signifies through material contact between perceiver and object represented. The nature of this contact is more than visual, involving what Marks calls "haptic visuality". The event of the film's materialisation is not restricted to the event of viewing. The materiality of film can thus be understood as a process of combined embodiment; a relation of tactility 'shared—in complex and not always comfortable ways—by both spectator and film' (Barker 2009, p. 2). Film, often called 'the industrialisation of memory', is also re-enacted, in body and mind together, through its active performance and reassemblage in memory (Burgin 2004). Explorations of the way film extends beyond the moments of its production and viewing can also be seen in recent film art (see discussion of Brice Dellspreger in Pil and Galia 2011a). Many of these studies understand moving images as relational processes that actively constitute 'realities' rather than representing them. As Piccini puts it:

media do not merely record or represent, they produce the event itself. They do this as part of their own material unfolding, creating material-discursive relations and assemblages through which notions of the past are materialized: contesting, reproducing, modifying and generating relations between past and immanent materialities. (Piccini 2012, p. 292)

If media are understood as relational, this may suggest reasons other than 'narcissism' for archaeologists urge to write about moving images with archaeological themes. Moving images are part of the relations through which archaeology occurs—they are part of how the archaeological event is produced. From this point of view, images of Stonehenge are not just records or representations of Stonehenge; they might also be seen as part of the ongoing coming into being of Stonehenge—of its contemporary materialisation.

**Fig. 8.1** Archaeologists of the Stonehenge Riverside project during participation in filming of *Another Proof of the Preceding Theory* (2008). (Copyright Simon Mills. Reproduced with permission of Simon Mills and Pil and Galia Kollectiv)



## Pil and Galia Kollectiv at the Stonehenge Riverside Project

Pil and Galia Kollectiv's film, *Another Proof of the Preceding Theory* (2008), imagines archaeologists as disciples of a future cult. Shot on Video Home System (VHS), the film features a theremin and percussion soundtrack by Zuzushi Monkey. Two initiates of the archaeology cult stray from their excavation, and are pulled towards the drone of the henge. Through their choreographed bodily proximity they are able to interfere in the vibrations of the stones, playing them like a gigantic theremin. *Another Proof of the Preceding Theory* was shot when Pil and Galia Kollectiv undertook a short funded residency as part of Artists in Archaeology (since renamed art + archaeology). Between 2007 and 2009, Artists in Archaeology created a programme of short residencies exploring archaeological research around Stonehenge. Most residencies took place around the Stonehenge Riverside Project (SRP)—a huge multiuniversity excavation, with over 100 staff under the leadership of Mike Parker-Pearson, Josh Pollard, Colin Richards, Julian Thomas, Chris Tilley and Kate Welham (Parker-Pearson and the Stonehenge Riverside Project 2012). The model for Artists in Archaeology was influenced by archaeological excavation more than traditional arts administration. Artists were approached as an excavation team would be, and understood as working a little like excavators, going into the field without knowing what they might discover through their art. Artists lived and worked alongside each other near the excavations and brought “a new dimension to the project” (Parker-Pearson and the Stonehenge Riverside Project 2012, viii). SRP staff and students were extremely hospitable to the artists, taking an informed and scholarly interest in the work. Staff and students worked alongside the artists, sharing equipment and participating in the production of performances and film and video artworks. Both excavation and art became processes through which relationships could be generated and interrogated (Fig. 8.1).

Pil and Galia Kollectiv are London-based artists, writers and independent curators. Their research occurs at the intersections between the legacies of modernist utopias and the fantastical projections of the neoliberal present. They develop Walter Benjamin's proposal that 'Capitalism is a purely cultic religion, perhaps the most extreme that has ever existed' (Benjamin 1913; cited in Pil and Galia Kollectiv

2008b), and they observe the transformations of this ‘cult of capitalism’ as it enters its postindustrial phase (Pil and Galia Kollectiv 2012a). Neoliberal capitalism, they argue, is based on the conquest of time. Like religious fundamentalism it ‘eliminates the immediate material world in favour of an eternally deferred metaphysical liberation, in the shape of speculative, future-orientated debt . . . offering its worshippers an eternally deferred salvation by emptying out and colonising the future’ (Pil and Galia Kollectiv 2011b). Pil and Galia Kollectiv’s films, videos, plays and ballets often use choreographed and ritualised movements, as well as costumes that resemble modern uniforms or religious vestments, to highlight the cultic aspect of contemporary capitalism, restaging elements from contemporary life as ritualised re-enactments created in the future. For example, in 2006 a new Ikea store opened in a London suburb with a special offer promotion on sofas of its trademark modernist design. An estimated 7,000 people turned up at the sale and a riot ensued. Pil and Galia Kollectiv’s ‘The Future Trilogy’ (2006–2009) explored the premise that the consumer riot had led to circumstances in which the tenets of modernism became a totalitarian state religion. In the final film ‘The Future is Now’ (2009) a band of flat-pack-furniture-inspired revolutionaries re-enact the riot which has since become an element of their revolutionary utopia.

At Stonehenge, Pil and Galia Kollectiv continued their explorations of the relations between science, work and ritual. They recruited archaeologists from the SRP excavations as well as artists from the Artists in Archaeology group to participate in the making of their film, which thereby became an intervention into social relationships at the site, as well as the production of a film. The situation of any excavation, especially an excavation at Stonehenge, is inseparable from the wider landscape of postindustrial labour in which ‘narratives, experiences and theatrical settings are produced, managed and analysed’ (Pil and Galia 2012b). The institution of the training excavation, often supplied through an increasingly marketised university sector, conforms to a general pattern identified by Pil and Galia Kollectiv in which ‘the Post-Fordist worker does not produce commodities external to the self but merely enhances or invests in the self by acquiring skills, generating ideas, extending networks and so on’ (Pil and Galia 2012a). For *Another Proof of the Preceding Theory* archaeologists assumed white robes which recalled both medieval monks and science fiction ‘Star Wars’ Jedi. ‘The archaeologists’, Pil and Galia write, ‘were encouraged to perform their normal work in the robes, in an attempt to explore the meeting points of science and ritual’ (Pil and Galia 2008a). At the same time as the archaeologists were participating in the filming however, an extraordinary series of events was unfolding around the excavations, which gave the cultic aspects of *Another Proof* . . . another resonance.

## Stonehenge 2008

Let there be blood!

(Frank Summers, Knight Templar and Stonehenge Druid 2008)

On Tuesday 26th August, the SRP was preparing for the excavation of a feature inside the Stonehenge enclosure. Aubrey Hole 7 was part of a circle of pits discovered

during excavations in the 1920s. It had been reopened in the mid 1930s and backfilled with cremated human remains from the 1920s excavations. At the time, there was little in the way of scientific analysis that could be performed on these remains. In 2008, the intention of SRP was to recover these bones and ashes for laboratory analysis. However, before the excavations could begin there was an extraordinary stand-off that took place close to the Stonehenge entrance gates. A druidic procession by the group ‘Honouring the Ancient Dead’, which was assembling to bless the reopening of Aubrey Hole 7, was headed off by other druid groups, including King Arthur Pendragon, Battle-chieftain of the Loyal Arthurian Warband. Both groups of druids formed a circle in the field opposite the stones. One by one, druids came into the middle of the circle to speak. It became obvious to the waiting audience of archaeologists, artists and Stonehenge visitors, that something had gone very wrong indeed. Raising a great cheer, a spokesperson for ‘Honouring the Ancient Dead’ said that they withdrew their support from the excavations. Instead of bestowing their blessing they would be joining King Arthur and others to protest against the “removal of the guardians” from Stonehenge. With drumming and chants the circle dissolved. Grey-bearded druid elders, including King Arthur, came to parley with grey-bearded archaeological elders. The audience were left only to marvel at the spectacle, and to review the photographs and videos many had captured on their cameras and mobile phones (Fig. 8.2).

Stonehenge has a long and difficult political history, bound up with issues concerning physical access to the stones (Chippindale et al. 1990). Demonstrations demanding access to Stonehenge, by Druids and other groups, go back to the first enclosure of the Stones and henge in 1901 (Barber 2013b). In the 1970s and 1980s, violent confrontations occurred after the suppression of the Stonehenge Free Festival and summer solstice gatherings, including a police riot force attacking travellers and their homes at the ‘Battle of the Beanfield’ (see Worthington 2004 for history of these events). In 1991, Barbara Bender, with a minibus of archaeologists, attempted to enter the Stonehenge ‘exclusion zone’, established to prevent travellers approaching the monument, and was turned back by police using the 1986 Public Order Act. This act ‘laid down that two people processing in a given direction can constitute a procession and can be arrested as a threat to civil order’ and was widely interpreted as an attempt to stamp out traveller convoys altogether, not just at Stonehenge (Bender 1998, p. 148). In 1992, Bender and Mark Edmonds published an article in *The Guardian* which argued that control over access to Stonehenge involved “intellectual as well as physical access” (reproduced in Bender 1998, p. 147). The current ‘management and presentation of Stonehenge . . . make it almost impossible for different groups to have access to something which is supposedly part of a common heritage . . . [and] foster the assumption that the interpretation of the past is un-contentious and easily separable from contemporary concerns’ (Bender 1998, p. 147). At Stonehenge, they argued, access was intimately bound up with control over the kinds of interpretation that can be made of the past.

Accounts of the Druid protests of August 2008 have already been published, notably by Mike Pitts (2011), and King Arthur Pendragon (2011). Some of the Druids assembled at Stonehenge demanded that cremated bones recovered from the

**Fig. 8.2** King Arthur Pendragon speaks within the Druid circle. (Copyright Simon Mills, reproduced with permission)



Stonehenge Riverside excavations, including those from Aubrey Hole 7, should be reburied. These demands dove-tailed with a reinterpretation of the 1857 Burial Act, which, it seemed, might lend such demands extra force (see Jenkins 2010; Sayer 2009; Parker-Pearson et al. 2011). Although the debate around human remains is significant and ongoing, it is also embedded in disputes over physical access. Before the archaeologists arrived, King Arthur Pendragon was already holding a Stonehenge Picket at the site calling for the restoration of Stonehenge to open downland. Several druid protests in the week of the 25th August directly challenged regulations around physical access at Stonehenge. On the evening of 25th August, King Arthur and Kazz Smith invaded the temple at night for a ‘naked’ ritual (Pendragon 2011). On the 27th August, a Stonehenge Druid donned a hi-vis jacket and entered the central area of the stone settings (closed to visitors during normal opening hours) in the guise of an archaeologist and was compelled to leave. Stonehenge in 2008 was the nexus of numerous arguments, debates and theories, some of which proceeded from seemingly irreconcilable premises concerning both Stonehenge’s past and the utopias that might inform its future.

By encouraging archaeologists to wear ritual robes while carrying out excavation as they usually would, Pil and Galia Kollectiv created a performance through which archaeology could be seen as cultic. They did not in any straightforward way seek to put druids in the place of archaeologists, or archaeologists in the place of druids. Planning for the film had begun before the protests, and filming at the site was ended by English Heritage before they could finish. Consequently, Pil and Galia Kollectiv chose to film a new sequence at Avebury. *Another Proof of the Preceding Theory* (2008), by envisaging the work of science as a sacred act, refuses to allow science to occupy the high ground of objective ‘rationality’, but at the same time, does not offer a romantic ‘irrational’ position outside science from which its work can be attacked (see Pil and Galia Kollectiv 2012b). Using a fictional, future point of view the film undermines the power relations that allow particular interests to take ownership of the past, suggesting that all attempts to decode the stones “may themselves become encoded in their cumulative meaning for future researchers” (Pil and Galia Kollectiv 2008a). In this way, *Another Proof* . . . denies the priority of any among the competing utopias that coincide over what Stonehenge has been, is or should become and suggests that the stones themselves may resist such finality.

## The Art of Stonehenge

Pil and Galia’s work often investigates how objects—such as surveillance cameras, office equipment or Ikea furniture—look back at us, mirroring our desires, fears and perversions. *Another Proof* . . . reveals Stonehenge as ultimately unknowable, at the centre of gestures beyond which the stones remain forever out of reach. These gestures towards the stones produce music (the theremin soundtrack) suggesting that actors intervene in a force field that the stones themselves generate: ‘Stonehenge has unique acoustic properties, its large sarsen stones are finely worked on the inside, left rough on the outside, intensifying sound waves within the inner horseshoe’ (Pil and Galia Kollectiv 2008a, see Fig. 8.3). Stonehenge’s capacity to intensify sound has been at a focus of recent research (see Banfield 2009). The theremin soundtrack for *Another Proof* . . . connects Stonehenge’s capacity to reflect and intensify sound to its abilities to reflect and intensify both feeling and thought. For archaeologists and others, Stonehenge has become an amplifier, reflecting back our contemporary preoccupations and intensifying them.

*Another Proof* . . . seems to suggest Stonehenge itself plays a role in perpetuating and regenerating an ongoing process of assemblage, through which attempts to uncover truths are able to be performed and reperformed. Olsen et al. have recently made a similar point concerning the active role Stonehenge plays in, often dissonant, struggles over heritage:

‘. . . it may well be the case that “significant” sites evoke *their own* importance. Things—monuments, topographic features, landscapes—may stand out as significant because of their unique, conspicuous qualities. Stonehenge after all *is* different from other collections of rocks in the field . . . Not just any collection of rocks is

**Fig. 8.3** Still from 'Another Proof of the Preceding Theory', Pil and Galia Kollectiv, VHS transferred to DVD, 2008. (Copyright Pil and Galia Kollectiv, reproduced with permission)



the focal point for the accretion of numerous landscape features over the millennia. Not just any collection of rocks has a parking lot, museum, and hundreds of texts written about it that are easily found on most library shelves. Not just any collection of rocks draws paying crowds by the hundreds of thousands annually. And not just any collection of rocks is listed as a UNESCO world heritage site. Stonehenge's inherent, exposed difference has played a major role in making it unique as heritage' (Olsen et al. 2012, p. 201, their emphasis).

Things play a role in the performance of heritage, Olsen et al. suggest. *Another Proof* ... implies that among the reasons Stonehenge is 'not just any collections of rocks' is the invitations it offers as a space of performances, including performances that produce theory.

Stonehenge has long been an invitation to 'serious' artists (Chippendale 2004) as well as contributing to an enormous and sometimes exuberantly unserious visual culture (Richards 2009). Far from simply representing the place, it could be argued that art has both metaphorically and literally played a role in performing the event of Stonehenge as experienced today. Even before the famous watercolours produced by Turner (*Stone Henge* 1829) and Constable (*Stonehenge* 1836) Stonehenge was already attracting attention as a romantic and picturesque ruin (Chippendale 2004). The caption to Constable's watercolour exhibited in the 1836 Royal Academy Summer Exhibition, and probably written by Constable himself, read: '... the mysterious monument ... standing remote on a bare and boundless heath, as much unconnected with the events of the past as it is with the uses of the present, carries you back beyond all historical records into the obscurity of a totally unknown period' (Thornes 1999, p. 92). Turner's Stone Henge (1829) diverted from the careful sketches he had made in 1811 and a decade earlier, crowding the site with 'inaccurately drawn stones, bearing very little resemblance to the place' (Imms 2012, see also Pitts 2007). The powerful image of Stonehenge inhabiting a romanticised natural wilderness that was produced by landscape painting shaped how the Stonehenge landscape developed.

For example, in 1918 the layout of the Stonehenge Aerodrome appears to have been influenced by concerns over preserving certain views to and from Stonehenge, with the bizarre result that the aerodrome shared Stonehenge's astronomical alignment on the summer and winter solstices (Barber 2013a). From 1927 onwards, The Stonehenge Appeal campaigned for Stonehenge to be 'restored' to the wilderness that an important tradition of painting suggested was its natural home, through the removal of the aerodrome and purchase of land surrounding the site. The Stonehenge Appeal linked the restoration of Stonehenge to the modernist utopian visions of rational town planning (Matless 1998). Adopting the language of Clough Williams Ellis and others campaigning for 'rational' design and architecture, O.G.S. Crawford focused on the supposed threat land speculators and 'bungalooid eruptions' might present to Stonehenge where its surroundings to remain in private ownership (Crawford 1927, also see Hauser 2008). The romantic image of an isolated Stonehenge thus became allied to modernist landscape design, at just the time Stonehenge's prehistoric design was revealing itself through aerial photography (Barber 2011).

It might be argued that Stonehenge is not only a ruin of prehistory, but counts among the ruins of modernism as well. The re-erection of many stones and the resetting of others in concrete during the twentieth century (Barber 2013b) has significantly changed Stonehenge's aspect for image-makers, as the leaning stones of a romantic ruin have been rationalised into a more orderly upright design based in the pre-eminent material of twentieth century modernism—concrete (see Forty 2012). Stonehenge's status among the ruins of modernism is underlined by its role in the work of significant modern artists including Walter Gropius, Bill Brandt and Henry Moore (Pitts 2008b).

The history of Stonehenge and the moving image is considerable and yet to be exhaustively catalogued (see papers in Banfield 2009). However, the widespread contagion of Stonehenge as an internet meme means film and video of Stonehenge is subject to the wider forces that are decomposing traditional film into "compressed small morsels of visual information" (Pil and Galia Kollectiv 2011a). As a digital image, Stonehenge is subject to endless repetition and permutation, available to recombination with swarms of other viral matter.

### ***Another Proof of the Preceding Theory***

White noise buzzes and fizzes on the soundtrack. The projection flickers with static lines. We see marks showing that we are watching analogue video, recorded on low-resolution magnetic tape, and showing the washed out tones of a tape that looks as if it has been played and replayed. The opening credits scroll upwards in mid-1980s computer graphics. We hear unearthly hollow and echoing noises seemingly made by figures in white robes scraping and rattling the earth, and beneath this a magnetic industrial hum. Slowly, as if summoned by sound, the robed figures look up, get up from the ground, and start to move towards Stonehenge . . .

**Fig. 8.4** Galia Kollectiv filming on VHS at Stonehenge, 28th August 2008. (Copyright Simon Mills, reproduced with permission of Simon Mills and Pil and Galia Kollectiv)



*Another Proof of the Preceding Theory* draws attention to its VHS origins, beginning with the ‘white noise’ familiar to anyone who has played analogue video till it runs out. The VHS is based on the traces electromagnetism leaves on ferro-oxide coated tape. The tape can be cut, looped, spliced, stretched and crumpled. However, it is gradually erased each time it is played, and so has an inherent temporality of decay. (During the 1980s, the ‘white noise’ on VHS tape was rumoured to contain other-worldly messages from aliens and the dead). The decay of VHS tape, and the unevenness of mechanical recording are made visibly present as horizontal lines flickering up the screen throughout the film. Use of electromagnetic tape can be connected to the theremin soundtrack for *Another Proof* ... since a theremin similarly relies on interrupting an electromagnetic field. In choosing to use electromagnetism in their art Pil and Galia Kollectiv associated their video both with modern physics and with aspects of physics historically invested with occult significance. From Mesmer’s Animal Magnetism to new age earth energies, magnetism has long been associated with mystical attractions (Fara 1996). It is also significant that the SRP archaeologists were using both magnetism (gradiometer survey) and electromagnetism (Ground Penetrating Radar) in remote sensing activities around Stonehenge. In sensing, but not touching, Stonehenge archaeologists were already engaged in repetitive actions, whose rationale may seem obscure, even fantastical, to the uninitiated observer (Fig. 8.4).

Although shot on VHS, *Another Proof* ... was transferred to DVD, and the titles and credits within the ‘white noise’ are clearly produced digitally. Transferring VHS to DVD means that the marks of authenticity, the scratches and lines on the tape, might equally be simulated, drawing the viewers attention again to the work’s production. Digitisation allows the VHS footage to appear like a found or excavated artefact, while also making it apparently ageless, in that it is not subject to the forms of decay to which VHS is subject. The film itself becomes a piece of film history, a ‘preceding theory’ subject to its own encodings and recodings. In this way *Another Proof* ... refers outwards to wider debates surrounding the status of film in the digital age. In cinema, the increasing digitisation of analogue formats and their circulation in

new forms means that, as Mulvey has observed, ‘cinema is increasingly inhabited by spectres’ (2006). The nature of spectatorship itself is changing, with the spectator able to exercise ‘fetishistic’ forms of control (Mulvey 2006). The forms of spectatorship enabled by DVD were there in embryo in VHS, one of the first home viewing systems to allow moving images to be arrested, fast-forwarded, rewinded and recorded over in a domestic environment.

From the opening ‘white noise’ and title, *Another Proof of the Preceding Theory* cuts to an excavation, with robed figures trowelling, heaving buckets, sieving soil and turning pieces of flint over in their hands. The cowls of the robes prevent us seeing their faces, and, since there is no dialogue, it is difficult to distinguish individuals. The camerawork avoids movements that might individuate characters, although there are cuts to show hands and gestures. One figure glances briefly at his watch. As the music intensifies a single figure is shown walking away from the excavation towards the stones. The film is cut so that, suddenly, one figure is replaced with two. Their procession towards the stones is shown in a sequence that is intercut with views of Stonehenge over the horizon, while the soundtrack rises and falls as if the stones are calling to the figures. The walk from henge bank to outer sarsen circle is cut so that a single figure approaching the stones appears to speed up and then slow down supernaturally. It seems impossible to judge how far away Stonehenge is at this point. Two figures, one large, possibly male, one smaller, possibly female, meet inside the inner circle. Their interactions are cut with images of the waiting stones, in ways which personalise Stonehenge as a character within an unspoken conversation. The figures engage in a sequence of choreographed movements stepping towards and away from each other and the stones, and ‘scanning’ the inner face of the outer sarsen circle with outstretched hand. Cut to single ‘male’ figure leaving the outer sarsen circle. Cut to the Avebury Avenue. Here a single figure (the same figure as at Stonehenge?) walks along the avenue, and then, in a series of close ups ‘plays’ the stones in a virtuoso display perfectly matched to the theremin. Indistinct voices can be heard on the soundtrack. Distorted and just out of hearing, maybe they are lecturing or telling a story. The video cuts to a single figure walking down the Avebury Avenue. The video runs into ‘white noise’ inside which credits appear.

In its refusal to identify individuals, and its embrace of Stonehenge as a presence equal to other noncharacters, *Another Proof of the Preceding Theory* envisages a future that is distinctly post-human in which performances are made by things. However, they reject the ‘object-orientated’ art that has arisen in parallel with object-orientated philosophy and speculative realism (e.g. Harman 2009). In object-orientated art, they see ‘a generalized, universalizing humanism that disables political action . . . [and] . . . undermines the potential for anti-humanist critique latent in object-orientated philosophy’ (Pil and Galia Kollectiv 2010). For Pil and Galia Kollectiv antihumanism supplies a ground for opposing the requirements that postindustrial capitalism imposes on workers to perform the self for a living: ‘Post-Fordist work means that the individual is thought of as the raw material from which wealth is produced. The very things which constitute the human—sociability, language, creativity, cognitive ability etc.—are thought of as economic products of . . . the “society factory”’ (Pil and Galia Kollectiv, citing Negri 2012a). The archaeological training

excavation, which places a premium on ‘experience’, extending networks, and acquiring skills, is an instantiation of the kind of investment in the self that postindustrial capitalism demands. The conventions surrounding art production, which have often relied on notions of individual creativity, ‘genius’ and the originality of the avant garde, equally enforce the development of the liberal individual. Pil and Galia Kollectiv oppose the institution of this subjectivity into art production, and problematise notions of individual creativity and ‘authorship’ of art (for example in their adoption of a ‘Kollectiv’ name). The antipop group WE, with which I opened this chapter, is a good example of their approach, working from within contemporary capitalism (i.e. by selling records and playing gigs) in ways that undermine its structuring premises. By adopting a fictional future standpoint, Pil and Galia Kollectiv’s film, *Another Proof...*, similarly undermines notions of individual creativity in archaeology, suggesting that individuals who claim to ‘author’ the past are mere signifiers, produced by the greater forces of a society and history that is beyond them.

## Conclusion

I have suggested that moving images need not only to be understood as representations, but also that they perform events, including the events through which pasts are made present. At Stonehenge, I have suggested art and visual culture have more than metaphorically or ‘socially’ constructed the site, influencing the way Stonehenge has been ‘restored’ as a modernist ruin. I have related the circumstances of an art residency undertaken by artists, Pil and Galia Kollectiv at the SRP excavations, showing how their work challenged the positioning of both art and archaeology within postindustrial capitalism. Among those circumstances, I discussed the resonances of Pil and Galia Kollectiv’s film *Another Proof of the Preceding Theory* (2008) in relation to druid protests taking place at Stonehenge in 2008. I underlined how Stonehenge itself activates and reactivates media as performance. Lastly, I examined the materiality of *Another Proof...* to explore how Pil and Galia Kollectiv’s art resisted the demands of selfhood and individuality imposed by contemporary work environments. Working with the structure of temporality, Pil and Galia Kollectiv used Stonehenge as a time machine from which the contemporary human could be put in its place. Revealing Stonehenge as the location for an ongoing process of encoding and re-encoding meaning, *Another Proof...* denies any finality from which individuals might claim ‘authorship’ of the site, its past or future. In this way, they suggest that ‘the power of things is that they refuse to conform completely to our intentions and interpretations, to become means to an end—even when we have designed them ourselves’ (Hansen cited in Pil and Galia Kollectiv 2010).

**Acknowledgements** All production, as Pil and Galia Kollectiv make clear, is collective production. This paper thus depends on a multitude of contributors. The work of the artists Pil and Galia Kollectiv and Simon Mills has been foundational. I would also like to thank the SRP for working alongside the artists and facilitating their research and mine. Art + archaeology was made possible by The

Caroline Humby-Teck Trust. My codirector Leo Duff contributed enormously to its development and success. I would like to thank all the art + archaeology artists—Mark Anstee, Sian Bowen, Simon Callery, Chris Chippendale, Rebecca Davies, Leo Duff, Brian Fay, Janet Hodgson, Pil and Galia Kollectiv, Nadine Patterson, Julia Midgley, Simon Mills, Varvara Shavrova and Gail Wight. The editors of this volume, Ian Russell and Andy Cochrane, transformed and improved this chapter immeasurably. Martyn Barber offered access to his forthcoming research on the twentieth century construction of Stonehenge and its landscape, advised on the text and provided valuable counselling during writing. It is customary to end ones acknowledgements by claiming blame for any mistakes (and by implication appropriating individual credit for the text), while I accept such blame, I also here reveal this custom (and the institutions of academic authorship that surround it) as a device of the liberal subjectifications required by post-Fordist capitalism. Thanks to Pil and Galia Kollectiv for making me conscious of such operations.

## References

- Banfield S. (Ed.). (2009). *The sounds of Stonehenge. BAR British Series 504*. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Barber, M. (2011). *A history of aerial photography and archaeology: Mata Hari's glass eye and other stories*. Swindon: English Heritage.
- Barber, M. (2013a). *Stonehenge aerodrome and the Stonehenge landscape*. English Heritage Research Report.
- Barber, M. (2013b). *Stonehenge: Restoration and preservation 1881–1939*. English Heritage Research Report.
- Barker, J. M. (2009). *The tactile eye. Touch and the cinematic experience*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bender, B. (1998). *Stonehenge. Making place*. Oxford: Berg.
- Burgin, V. (2004). *The remembered film*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Chippendale, C. (2004). *Stonehenge complete* (3rd revised ed.). London: Thames and Hudson.
- Chippendale, C., Devereux, P., Fowler, P., Jones, R., & Sebastian, T. (Eds.). (1990). *Who owns Stonehenge?* London: Batsford.
- Clarke, D., & Doel, M. (2007). Engineering space and time: moving pictures and motionless trips. *Journal of Historical Geography*, 31, 41–60.
- Crary, J. (1992). *Techniques of the observer: On vision and modernity in the 19th century*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Crawford, O. G. S. (1927). Editorial. *Antiquity*, 1(3), 257–260.
- Fara, P. (1996). *Sympathetic attractions: Magnetic practices, beliefs, and symbolism in eighteenth-century England*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Forty, A. (2012). *Concrete and culture: A material history*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Freidburg, A. (1993). *Window shopping. Cinema and the postmodern*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Freud, S. (2006). *The Penguin Freud Reader* (edited by Adam Phillips). London: Penguin.
- Gardner, A. (2007). The past as playground: the ancient world in video game representation. In T. Clack & M. Brittain (Eds.), *Archaeology and the media* (pp. 255–272). Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.
- Griffiths, A. (2008). *Shivers down your spine: Cinema, museums and the immersive view*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Harman, G. (2009). *Prince of networks: Bruno Latour and metaphysics*. Melbourne: Re Press.
- Harrison, R. (2009). Excavating second life: Cyber-archaeologies, heritage and virtual settlements. *Journal of Material Culture*, 14(1), 75–106.
- Hauser, K. (2008). *Bloody old Britain. OGS Crawford and the archaeology of modern life*. London: Granta.

- Holtorf, C. (2007). *Archaeology is a brand. The meaning of archaeology in contemporary popular culture*. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Imms, M. (2012). Stonehenge sketchbook 1811. In D. B. Brown (Ed.), *J.M.W. Turner: Sketchbooks, Drawings and Watercolours*. <http://www.tate.org.uk/art/research-publications/jmw-turner/stonehenge-sketchbook-r1137522>. Accessed 28 June 2013.
- Jenkins, T. (2010). *Contesting human remains in museum collections: The crisis of cultural authority*. London: Routledge.
- Landecker, H., & Kelty, C. (2004). A theory of animation: Cells, film and l-systems. *Grey Room*, 17, 30–63.
- Latour, B., & Weibel, P. (2002). *Iconoclash. Beyond the image wars in science, religion and art*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Marks, L. (2000). *The skin of the film: Intercultural cinema, embodiment, and the senses*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Marwick, B. (2010). Self-image, the long view and archaeological engagement with film: An animated case study. *World Archaeology*, 42(3), 394–404.
- Matless, D. (1998). *Landscapes and englishness*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Miller, D. (2005). Materiality: An introduction. In D. Miller (Ed.), *Materiality (politics, history, culture)*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Mulvey, L. (1975). Visual pleasure and narrative cinema. *Screen*, 16(3), 6–18.
- Mulvey, L. (2006). *Death 24x a second. Stillness and the moving image*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Olsen, B., Shanks, M., Webmoor, T., & Witmore, C. (2012). *Archaeology: The discipline of things*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Parker-Pearson, M., & The Stonehenge Riverside Project. (2012). *Stonehenge. Exploring the greatest stone age mystery*. London: Simon and Schuster.
- Parker-Pearson, M., Schadla-Hall, T., & Moshenska, G. (2011). Resolving the human remains crisis in British archaeology. *Papers from the Institute of Archaeology*, 21, 20–22.
- Pendragon, K. A. (2011). Resolving the human remains crisis in British archaeology: The counter argument. *Papers from the Institute of Archaeology*, 21, 20–22.
- Piccini, A. (2007). Faking it: Why the truth is so important for TV archaeology. In T. Clack & M. Brittain (Eds.), *Archaeology and the media*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.
- Piccini, A. (2012). Materialities, moving images and the Vancouver 2010 Winter Olympic Games. *World Archaeology*, 44(2), 291–305.
- Pil, and Galia Kollectiv. (2007). *RETRO/NECRO: From beyond the grave of the politics of re-enactment*. Atlanta: Art Papers.
- Pil, and Galia Kollectiv. (2008a). *Another proof of the preceding theory*. <http://www.kollectiv.co.uk/Another%20Proof.html>. Accessed 30 June 2013.
- Pil, and Galia Kollectiv (2008b). *Capitalism as cult. The institute of psychoplasmics*. London: Pump House Gallery.
- Pil, and Galia Kollectiv. (2010). *Can objects perform? Agency and thingliness in contemporary sculpture and installation*. Paper presented at Sculpture and Performance, the Henry Moore Institute and Tate Liverpool. <http://www.kollectiv.co.uk>. Accessed 30 June 2013.
- Pil, & Galia Kollectiv. (2011a). In defence of the image: Structuralist film and Brice Dellsperger's cinema of re-enchantment. *Benedictions*, 1, Ciao Peter Gidal.
- Pil, & Galia Kollectiv (2011b). *Belief. Useless*, Magazine 10-zero, 17.
- Pil, & Galia Kollectiv. (2012a). *Against human nature. Umelec Magazine*. London: Divus, The American Issue.
- Pil, & Galia Kollectiv. (2012b). The divided stage: Splitting the dialectics of performance. In B. Crone (Ed.), *The sensible stage: Staging and the moving image*. Bristol: Picture This.
- Pitts, M. (2007). Stonehenge. In D. Gaimster, S. McCarthy, & B. Nurse (Eds.), *Making history: Antiquaries in Britain 1707–2007* (pp. 227–231). London: Royal Academy of Arts.
- Pitts, M. (2008a). A year at Stonehenge. *Antiquity*, 83(319), 184–194.
- Pitts, M. (2008b). A photo by Bill Brandt, and the intimacy of perceptions of stonehenge and landscape. *Landscapes*, 9(1), 1–27.

- Pitts, M. (2011). Digging deeper: Comment on resolving the human remains crisis in British archaeology. *Papers from the Institute of Archaeology*, 21, 20–22.
- Rancière, J. (2009). *The emancipated spectator*. London: Verso.
- Richards, J. (2009). *Inspired by Stonehenge: A celebration of the weird and wonderful*. Salisbury: Hobnob Press.
- Roscoe, J., & Hight, C. (2001). *Faking it: Mock-documentary and the subversion of factuality*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Sayer, D. (2009). Is there a crisis facing British burial archaeology? *Antiquity*, 83, 199–205.
- Thomas, J. (2004). *Archaeology and modernity*. London: Routledge.
- Thornes, J. E. (1999). *John Constable's skies: A fusion of art and science*. Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press.
- Wickstead, H. (2009). The Über-archaeologist: art, GIS and the male gaze revisited. *Journal of Social Archaeology*, 9(2), 249–271.
- Worthington, A. (2004). *Stonehenge: Celebration and subversion*. Marlborough: Alternative Albion.