

CONCLUSION: THE ARCHAEOLOGIST IN-BETWEEN

He was a brown-eyed man, 178 centimetres tall with brown hair and fair skin, born into a world filled with candy in the same year as Hailie Selassie, Walter Benjamin, Edith Södergran, J.R.R. Tolkien, and – possibly – Ho Chi Minh. From his first home in Norrköping, Sweden he set off on a remarkable, almost unbelievable journey lasting over five decades, before he settled for good at 4000 Massachusetts Avenue in Washington, DC. He travelled around the world several times, often to find the places and people he used to know changed or destroyed by violent conflicts. He was present at a number of crucial moments in twentieth-century world politics, worked at some of the world's most important institutions, and had a network of influential friends that covered large parts of the northern hemisphere. An obituary in a Swedish newspaper says:

Olov Janse was a particularly noble, and at the same time modest person, who made considerable international achievements on the highest level through extensive knowledge combined with unusually broad language skills. A man who was once Swedish and then became a citizen of the world – a man to remember with pride and joy.¹¹⁶¹

¹¹⁶¹. Obituary “Olov Janse” by Margit Althin, *Svenska Dagbladet*, 28 March 1985. In the Swedish original: “Olov Janse var en sällsynt nobel och samtidigt personligen blygsam person som gjort stora internationella insatser på högsta nivå genom sina kunskaper inom vidsträckta områden kombinerade med ovanligt stora språkkunskaper. En man som en gång var svensk och sedan blev världsmedborgare – en man att minnas med stolthet och glädje.”

Yet he is not widely remembered today. He is nearly invisible in the international history of archaeology, in the history of the French Musée d'archéologie nationale (formerly the Musée des antiquités nationales) and the Swedish History Museum, in the history of French Indochina, in the history of UNESCO, and in the history of US foreign policy in the years before the Vietnam War, despite his real contributions in all these contexts. His name has been spelled in more or less creative variants: Alov Janse, Olor Janse, Olax Janse, Olof Janse, Otto Janse, Dr Jansse, Olof Jantse, Professor Janze, O. Jause, Osvald Jansé, and Alois Joure.

*

How can this lack of visibility be explained? In the history of archaeology, a major reason ought to lie in the historical focus on nation states in archaeological narration as well as archaeological practice. James Cuno explains:

[Archaeologists] are dependent on nation-states to do their work. Nation-states hold the goods – antiquities and archaeological sites as national cultural property and cultural patrimony – and they control access to them. The history of archaeology as a discipline is deeply embedded in the history of the politics of the regions within which archaeology has been practiced. There is no denying this. And some would say there is no way out of it, either.¹¹⁶²

Olov Janse's work was nearly always located in-between nations. Yet that is a location that defies exact definition, or rather, that fits under several different definitions. His professional position and personal space can be described as travelling, transnational, cosmopolitan, colonial, international, migrant, exilic, and diplomatic – often in overlapping forms.¹¹⁶³ All of these in-between experiences have been investigated by their own fields of theoretical inquiry: tourism studies; transnational studies; cosmopolitanism; postcolonial theory; internationalism; migration studies; exile studies; and public diplomacy studies. In our writing we have benefitted from insights from most of these fields, but none of them can alone account for the diverse practices, perspectives, and experiences

1162. Cuno 2011:154.

1163. E.g. Seyhan 2001:10.

that were contained in Olov Janse's private and professional personae.

Moreover, although his work was located in-between nations he had to abide by and work within the parameters of the national structures for archaeological heritage management to which Cuno refers in the quotation above. These structures were reinforced by political ambitions that brought a strong focus on nation states and reinforcement of national borders after the First World War. Janse's invisibility is at least partly due to his slippery, unreliable presence in such ideal national units, particularly in his native Swedish context, where he was considered *klen*, or unreliable, because he was "almost French". In France and French Indochina he was appreciated for speaking near-perfect French and for his willingness to become French "by adoption", but was nonetheless seen as a stranger, with whom it was difficult to make lasting attachments. Later, in the United States, he was never quite American. Even long after he became a US citizen, he was referred to as Swedish.

Moreover, the history of important institutions such as the Swedish History Museum, the Musée d'archéologie nationale, the OSS, the US Department of State, and even the supranational organization UNESCO, has been written mainly from stable national perspectives. A mobile actor such as Janse, who was not easily categorized in national terms or in relation to steady institutional belonging even during his lifetime, has been granted little or no room in such history writing. If his name occurs at all, it is often mentioned in passing, as a temporary visitor – even in contexts where we know that he made significant contributions.¹¹⁶⁴

Another important factor is his internationalist attitude to archaeological interpretation and narration. Janse maintained throughout his entire career a firm belief in the benefits of broad and bold comparative studies of human culture, and an internationalist attitude to museum collections. Remember his warning of "too much nationalism" in the interview in Saigon 1959, and how he advocated that everyone "try to act in a spirit of mutual interest and above all put scientific interest above human passions", because after all, "there are more visitors to the Guimet Museum [in Paris] than to the Saigon Museum".¹¹⁶⁵ In hindsight it is

1164. One example is in relation to the works of Henri Hubert and Hubert's last years in life, where we know Janse played an important role, but is not even mentioned in most of the literature (e.g. Olivier 2018).

1165. "Le professeur Janze souligne la contribution de la France aux recherches archéologique au Vietnam.", Article in *Journal d'Extrême-Orient*, 5 March 1959. NAA: Janse 2001-29.

clear that the spirit of mutual interest he refers to, and the scientific interest that ought to be free and above political ambitions, was formulated within the premises of an already-unequal playing field. It was a playing field defined not only by national parameters but also by colonial and imperialist politics, where some actors and areas were considered more important and accomplished than others.

Janse did not acknowledge the political dimensions of his own archaeological work. His interpretations and narratives were presented as if formulated according to scientific interests, above and beyond human passions.¹¹⁶⁶ In reality, of course, they were contingent upon their political contexts and did not escape national storytelling paradigms. Archaeology is expected to provide origin stories for modern nation states, and most sovereign states, then and now, want to have their origins located within their present national borders. The Swedish state has little interest in locating its origin in present France, just as the present state of Vietnam is not likely to look for its origin in Greece. In such a context, Janse's broad internationalist, and even pro-colonial narratives became uncomfortable and threatening to the dominant narratives of the nation states. This should, however, be regarded not as a natural given, but as a consequence of political decisions in a nationalist trend that started in the late nineteenth century and had its ups and downs since, but is experiencing a renaissance in many parts of the world today.

*

Which support systems and technologies enabled Janse's movements? First of all he was born and raised with a male gender, Swedish nationality, white Scandinavian ethnicity, and bourgeois class, which created a more or less ideal identity package for an archaeologist in-between in

1166. Not many archaeologists have acknowledged the political aspects of their own work. On the contrary, it is common to distinguish conceptually between archaeological methodology (which is supposedly free from passions and of a scientific character) and narration, particularly popular narration (which is more prone to be "politicized" or "used" for political purposes), especially after the Nazi uses of archaeological narratives in the Second World War. However, we firmly maintain that methodology and narration (academic, official, or popular) are two intimately intertwined parts of archaeological knowledge production which are both politically and historically contingent, and that any individual or group of archaeologists should be regarded as historically contingent with both aspects in mind.

the early twentieth century. It gave him opportunities and resources to be mobile and move in-between spaces and units that would not have been forthcoming had he been born with another gender, nationality, ethnicity, or class.

In terms of technology, most obvious perhaps are the travel technologies that enabled physical movement, and which are often used as narrative vehicles in his travel writing – from the horse-cart owned by his father and borrowed by his uncle Otto that gave him his very first archaeological inspiration, to the various mechanical vehicles that took him around the world and facilitated his surveys and excavations. He travelled by train across the European continent to study museum collections before, between and after the two World Wars, by car to excavation sites in Sweden, France, and Indochina, and to holidays in Florida. A particularly important means of travel were passenger liners. The first-class voyages in luxurious ships during their first two expeditions were, during the war years, replaced by more modest second-class passages in crowded vessels. But as soon they could, when they returned to Europe after the war and exile years, they travelled with the legendary luxury ocean cruiser *Île de France*. Later in life, Olov travelled alone by aeroplane a couple of times, but never warmed to that means of transport. In letters he complained that the pace was too fast, and that he preferred to travel by boat. Aeroplanes offered a fast and efficient means of transport, but passenger liners offered a much more attractive package for travelling and traversing distance. The weeks spent on board offered time to relax and reboot. Socializing with fellow passengers provided opportunities to expand their networks and prepare for the work that awaited them at the destination. Travelling in style on the right ships was in that sense a way to gain social prestige and position. Boat journeys moreover offered opportunities for triumphant homecoming – particularly on the visits Olov and Renée made to Sweden in the 1950s and '60s – when journalists waited by the gangway to get an interview with the famous people on board.

In addition to the technologies that enabled transportation and travelling in a physical sense, Janse was also keen to use media technologies that enabled a mental and phantasmic transportation of his audiences to bygone times and far-away lands. In the advertisements before and press reports after his public lectures, Janse's use of slides was often mentioned for its extraordinary effects. He worked with film, both to record memories of their journeys and their archaeological work, and for the purpose of ethnographic documentation. The films were later recycled into a new

context in the Office of Strategic Services, where they served a different purpose, but communicated much the same message as the original colonial films. In addition to the visual techniques of photography and film, Olov also worked with multisensory museum technology such as incense and traditional music in the *Art and Archeology of Viet-Nam* exhibition in 1961, which allowed a museum visitor to find himself “transported half way around the world in a fraction of seconds”.¹¹⁶⁷

*

An archaeologist moving in the spaces between nations and institutions could not rely on the same support system as an archaeologist who worked within one nation and one institution. Most administrative structures for archaeological practice (such as museums, databases, archives, contract archaeology programmes, and university education) were and remain defined and restricted by national and institutional borders. Such institutional and administrative structures have also contributed to a stabilization of discourses around nation states as historical units. These structures have changed little since the early twentieth century, when Janse deplored having to choose between a life in Stockholm and a career in Swedish archaeology, or a life in Paris and a career in French archaeology.

Janse, however, found ways to move and keep moving in-between nations and institutions. He found structural stability in the mobility by creating a customized support system for himself. Unlike the common national structures of archaeology, which are ideally based on impersonal bureaucratic institutions and legal frameworks, the core structure of Janse’s support system was based on personal relations with a number of influential mentors and patrons. These mentors and patrons gave him the necessary support, in terms of both position and funding, to move in his own ways in the spaces between national administrations. In return, the mentors and patrons gained prestige, information, and desirable things from far-away lands. In particular, Janse relied on the support from his mentors Henri Hubert, René Grousset, and Johan Gunnar Andersson, and from the wealthy influential patrons David David-Well, Gabriel Cognacq, and C.T. Loo. Let us stop here for a moment and take a closer look at the gift economy that was created by their relations and interactions,

¹¹⁶⁷. Masur 2009:293, and sources cited there.

with the use of a classic essay written by another one of Janse’s mentors, Marcel Mauss.

Marcel Mauss, Émile Durkheim’s nephew and Henri Hubert’s best friend, first published his famous *Essai sur le don* – Essay on the Gift, in *L’Année Sociologique* in 1925. Since then the essay, often referred to as *The Gift*, has become a legendary text in the fields of anthropology, sociology, and archaeology. It represents the exchange of objects, or gifts, as something much more complex than simple material transactions. It emphasizes the relations created around an exchange, through resilient obligations to accept the gift and reciprocate. The immediate focus for Mauss’s study is what he describes as “archaic” institutions, in historic contexts such as ancient Rome, and in contemporary ethnographic cases. It is, however, the almost unlimited comparative possibility that it contains, that “there is always implicit a comparison, or contrast, between the archaic institutions he is writing about and our own”,¹¹⁶⁸ that has contributed to its longevity and broad usefulness. For, as E.E. Evans Pritchard says in his foreword to the English translation, Mauss “is asking himself not only how we can understand these archaic institutions but also how an understanding of them helps us the better to understand our own, and perhaps to improve them”.¹¹⁶⁹ If that is true, then Mauss’s theories on gift exchanges and reciprocity may help us to understand the gift economies of which he was himself a part, which enabled Olov Janse’s archaeological pursuits in-between nations and institutions.

The core argument of *The Gift* is that a non-capitalist exchange of objects builds *relationships* between the people involved, directly or indirectly, in the process of exchange. Like most Durkheim-inspired sociology, this essay also had a political edge, and should be read as a critique of the Anglo-Saxon liberal focus on the individual as something universal. Mauss saw the “archaic” society as something to take inspiration from as an alternative to capitalist society,¹¹⁷⁰ and set out to demonstrate that the fundamental form of object exchange between humans is that of *total prestations* (that involve exchanges of not only goods, but courtesies, entertainments, ritual, feasts, etc.) which come with contracts of obligation and thus create and maintain relationships.

Janse’s academic mentors Hubert, Grousset, and Andersson inspired

1168. Evans-Pritchard 1966:ix.

1169. Ibid. See also Conklin 2013:4.

1170. See also Conklin 2013:4.

him to develop a certain (bold, comparative, continent-spanning) structure of cultural analysis and archaeological thought. These intellectual “gifts” were crucial building blocks in the in-between archaeology Janse wanted to pursue. In return, his mentors received information and research results to strengthen this particular structure of comparative archaeological (and ethnographic) thought that they (Hubert and Grousset) had mainly developed and maintained from their armchairs or museum storerooms in Paris. They could also count on Janse’s loyal input when it came to writing positive anniversary notices in the newspapers, giving their lectures when they fell ill, or finding private collectors with desirable objects in cities far away. His patrons, on the other hand, gave him funding and means to build a structure for practical activities (travels, excavations, purchases, films, exhibitions, etc.), which he reciprocated by bringing precious gifts to enrich their collections, and, not least, by allowing them to pose in public events as his benefactors and hence enhance their own prestige. His funding patrons could further rely on his loyal scholarly support with archaeological knowledge and new research results to illuminate their collections. As a long-term consequence, these necessary structures of bold comparative thought *and* practical collecting activities, together infused a gift economy which was fundamental for establishing the museum collections and popular imaginations of Asia that still reside in European cultural institutions today.

According to Mauss’s essay, the exchanges between Janse and his mentors (of support, funding, desirable objects, knowledge, research results, and the possibility to pose as a generous philanthropist at a public event) should be regarded not as mechanical but *moral* transactions, which created and maintained relationships between individuals and groups.¹¹⁷¹ Although the exchange of objects between individuals is always in some way related to groups or institutions (as is also confirmed by Janse’s case),¹¹⁷² gift exchange is also an articulation of social order. By accepting the involvement in a mentor-disciple or patron-client relationship by means of gift exchanges, Janse would remain in a subordinate, dependent position vis-à-vis his mentors and patrons, for as long as the relationship was maintained. His broken relation with Johan Gunnar Andersson is of particular interest in this respect. After the conflict over the position of Director at the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities in 1938, Janse stopped

1171. Evans-Pritchard 1966:ix.

1172. Mauss 1966 [1925]:3.

all forms of reciprocation vis-à-vis Andersson. He never mentioned him in official writing, never invited him to anything, nor did he send any objects from his last Indochina expedition to the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities. In that way, he had effectively broken their relationship and withdrawn from the gift economy in which they had previously engaged.

In the sense of political critique, which is a main theme in *The Gift*, Janse's mentor and patron relationships do not conform to Mauss's model of exchange as a non-individualistic enterprise. The lasting impression is that Janse himself engaged in these relationships with the prospect of personal gain (whether it was for his livelihood, an opportunity to develop his career, or pursue a scientific project he was passionate about). The result was not necessarily noble or solidary. On the contrary, it is possible to see how the gift economies created or activated around Janse contributed to the whitewashing of artefact-collecting activities in the slippery borderlands between legal and criminal, in the name of academia and public institutions.

Joined by their gift economies, Janse's mentors and patrons can be seen as more or less visible, more or less structurally important, threads in the fabric of Janse's career. When the threads met through their involvement with Janse (and indeed other projects that had already joined many of them), they also became entwined with each other. This is particularly clear in the relations between official museums and private collectors of Asian art and archaeology in Europe and the United States. Grousset and Andersson, who represented official national institutions, were intimately entwined with David-Weill and Cognacq who represented a semi-institutional collecting enterprise, and with Loo who was building a private business on Asian art and artefacts, and was accused of breaking Chinese law. An interesting and somewhat outstanding thread in the textile of Janse's career is the Swedish Crown Prince, later King Gustaf VI Adolf, who embodied the official and private in one person,¹¹⁷³ and was regularly used as a lubricant in the meeting between private and official artefact collection, by Johan Gunnar Andersson, David David-Weill, C.T. Loo, and Olov Janse.

It was not only in relation to his mentors and patrons that Janse had a certain skill in mastering the gift as a way to create helpful relations. Remember how he worked cunningly with gifts – a coin, a piece of candy, or a promise of employment – to create relations and a sense of mutual

1173. See also Isaksson 1972; Whitling 2014.

obligation with the farmers near his excavation sites in Indochina. For this ability to “make friends” with people around him he was widely recognized as particularly talented to work in faraway lands such as Indochina.

If we see Janse’s relationships with mentors and patrons as a form of gift economy in Mauss’s sense, it also offers a more complex understanding of the value of artefacts for an archaeologist in-between. Even if Janse kept and occasionally sold some artefacts from his excavated collections, their value was not primarily monetary. They had a much greater value as potential exchange objects. With artefacts, or even more importantly, with promises of future artefact collections, he secured support and funding for his work, and thereby gained professional prestige. Moreover, the exchange, shipments, or donations of artefacts or *moulages* – indeed, nearly all forms of artefact traffic between nations – gave positive echoes in the press. By organizing shipments of artefact collections (from Stockholm to Paris; from Paris to Stockholm; from Hanoi to Paris; from Saigon and Manila to Harvard; and back from Paris to Hanoi and from Harvard to Saigon), Janse could pose in the press as a national benefactor who enriched the recipient nation with valuable treasures. It gave him, just as it gave all his patrons and all institutions involved, much goodwill value and positive prestige. A lasting legacy of the gift economies created around Janse’s archaeological career can be seen in official museum collections in Europe, Asia, and the United States still today.¹¹⁷⁴

*

If narration is equally as important as methodology for the formation of archaeological knowledge, are there motifs and narrative structures in Janse’s work that can be connected with his mobile in-between situation? Well, first of all, the in-between demands a notion of elsewhere. Hence the *distant elsewhere* became a motif of great value for Olov Janse. Distance was a privileged figure in all of his work, and already in the first texts he wrote as a young student in Sweden he found a rhetoric regarding distance that he would repeat for the rest of his career.

Talking, writing, and showing photographs and films of the elsewhere – from Iceland to Indochina – he put emphasis on geographical distance and maintained notions of developmental distance between primitive

1174. See the chapter “Memorabilia”.

and civilized. In many examples through the different chapters of this book we have seen how he worked with the figure of distance by means of extrapolation. With ample use of contrasting adjectives signifying high and low, beauty and ugliness, health and sickness, prosperity and misery, his texts extrapolate civilized life at one end, from primitive life at the other.

Another narrative strategy is his use of temporal metaphors to denote distance and extrapolate between primitive and civilized culture. These metaphors are connected with a common-sense metonymical use of archaeological terminology, where “Stone Age” means the most distant and utterly primitive, and “medieval” means something slightly less primitive, in a linear teleological development movement towards the modern present. The association with ancient times is typically denoted by reference to technical details signifying primitivity that deserve to be regarded as “museum pieces”, to simple clothing, or rituals which (so it was claimed) had been the same for hundreds of years. We have seen examples of this narrative strategy in his descriptions of Iceland in his very first travel report, of Port Said and Djibouti on his first expedition with Ronny to Indochina, of mountain tribes in Indochina on their second expedition, and of natives in the Philippines on their third expedition. As a rhetorical device, it creates an illusion of a distant past that is retrievable from deep down in the archaeological trenches *and* played out in real life before the eyes of the traveller to distant lands.

The letter from Yunnan-fu quoted in our introduction, which describes a town “almost completely untouched by Western culture” where people “still live fully in the Middle Ages” and where they had found a firesteel quite similar to “those that were used in Sweden in the Viking Age”,¹¹⁷⁵ demonstrates eloquently how Janse operates as an archaeological-cum-ethnographic travel writer by moving through time *and* space, claiming a double control over distance. He gains prestige and position by moving between distant locations (between modern and prehistoric times, between West and East), and by offering explanatory translations between them.

1175. Letter from O. Janse to T. Nerman, 28 February 1935. Arbetarrörelsens arkiv och bibliotek. Ture Nerman. 3.1.7. In the Swedish original: “Staden är nästan fullständigt oberörd av västerländsk kultur. Människorna där lever ännu i full medeltid. På loppmarknaden i Yunnan-fu köpte jag ett eldstål av järn, alldeles av samma typ som de vilka var i bruk i Sverige på vikingatiden. I Yunnan-fu används de fortfarande.”

His use of temporal metaphors to describe living people in Iceland, Port Said, Djibouti, Indochina, the Philippines, and Yunnan-fu contributes to a metaphorical back-projection of these people to the distant past. This is a well-known rhetorical strategy, often in colonial contexts, that Johannes Fabian has called *the denial of coevalness*.¹¹⁷⁶ It is a tactic with much political potential. The projection of native people back into the past gives an illusion of their inevitable development towards modernity (since time has a natural movement “forward”) if they are not to stagnate in prehistoric misery. Hence the denial of coevalness offers an attractive self-image to colonizers and imperialists who can present various forms of colonial exploitation as benevolent contributions to the cultural development of otherwise backward and helpless people. In the context of French Indochina, this tallied well with colonial policy, and fitted what Alice Conklin has described as an “ambiguous positioning” of the new French school of ethnology fronted by Marcel Mauss: “trained in a humanist and anti-racist tradition, yet dependent in many ways on a racist practice of imperial governance”.¹¹⁷⁷

The fact that Janse was a qualified archaeologist – an expert on the past – added credibility and extra spice to his travel writing. Indeed, a Swedish review of Janse’s memoirs opines that the “opportunity to experience prehistory in a sort of double exposure” was considered one of the most important qualities of the book.¹¹⁷⁸ The same authority and credibility allowed him to contribute to the US administration’s fatal underestimation of native Vietnamese people in the 1950s and the first years of the 1960s.

*

Travelling and translating between distant places, Olov Janse built a successful career on his capacity to bridge and master distance. In a newspaper article from 1926 he is described as a “Swedish-French museum man”.¹¹⁷⁹ His identity was in the hyphen, literally in the space between

1176. This is a common characteristic of early ethnographic writing, which has been discussed and critiqued at length by Johannes Fabian (1983) and James Clifford (1988) among others.

1177. Conklin 2013:191.

1178. “Exotisk forntid”, review of *Ljusmannens gåta*, by Wilhelm Holmqvist, *Vi* no. 49, 1959.

1179. “Norrköpingsbo vik. fransk professor: D:r Olof Janse som svensk-fransk museiman”, *Norrköpings Tidningar*, 23 January 1926.

national or institutional units. The function of the hyphen is to separate distinct units in the text, at the same time as it connects them into a new combined form. The same can be said about Olov Janse's identity as an archaeologist in-between. Hence distance was not important per se. Distance was necessary for his in-between identity to be articulated, but it became meaningful and bore fruit only when it was bridged and the distant units were connected.

Longing is another central theme in Janse's work and personal life, from his earliest longing for cosmopolitan adventures in his teenage years in Norrköping, to the longing for his Swedish homeland in his senior years in the United States. A longing for the elsewhere kept him in movement throughout his life. From early on, and enhanced by his engagement in Indochina, his desire for adventure was connected with a more general longing for a colonial experience, here in the words of Stevan Harrell:

To be a European outside Europe in the early twentieth century meant privileges almost unconceivable in the twenty-first century. [...] The privilege these explorers and scientists enjoyed was less about direct political power than about the general assumption that a white person anywhere had a certain high rank in a worldwide hierarchy. In actual colonies, a white person outranked everyone, and the hierarchy was explicitly marked by a huge panoply of colonial ceremony and discipline, backed, of course, by the threat of violence.¹¹⁸⁰

To long for a colonial experience is also to desire a privileged identity, and that identity becomes connected with the distant colonial elsewhere. In Janse's narratives, as in most colonial travel tales and adventure stories, the distant elsewhere is made interesting and attractive by means of longing. Longing (for a simpler, warmer, more privileged, or less complicated life) connects one's own space with a distant, essentially phantasmatic, elsewhere.¹¹⁸¹

The temporal dimension is important here too. In her book *On Longing*, Susan Stewart writes that the main task of the antiquarian is to create an imagined past, wholly detached from the messy present, a time that

1180. Harrell 2012:16.

1181. Norindr 1996.

can be longed for, and that can be made available for consumption.¹¹⁸² Ancient artefacts are similar to exotic souvenirs, says Stewart, because they both represent appropriated distance. The souvenir and the artefact are both specimen and trophy. They are connected with nostalgia, a longing for a place of origin that is in some sense lost. They are valuable because they carry the signs of the foreign and exterior, but their value is also derived from their association with the immediate experience of their possessor, or collector. Souvenirs and artefacts are thereby involved in a transformation of distant time and space to interiority and personal or communal space. Hence the artefact and souvenir is placed “within an intimate distance”.¹¹⁸³ Olov Janse used both artefacts and souvenirs (often in hybrid forms when he gave excavated artefacts from Indochina as souvenirs to his Swedish friends or dignitaries visiting the excavation sites) as a way to create goodwill, confirm friendship, and enhance his own position and professional prestige.

Yet on its own, the artefact or souvenir is never complete. It must be complemented by narratives, in a narrative discourse that gives meaning, and creates a sense of longing for its distant origin.¹¹⁸⁴ In Janse’s handling of artefacts and souvenirs – in and between museum collections, as gifts to patrons and friends, and as souvenirs to influential people in key positions – distant time and space was controlled, tamed, and brought into the domain of modern Western culture, materialized in the bourgeois European home or the metropolitan museum collection. Distant time and space was thereby transformed to interiority by means of Janse’s immediate experience, knowledge, and academic credibility.

In this context, the archaeologist poses as a magician who tames and controls the prehistoric Other by traversing temporal distance. He is the translator of prehistoric fragments into animated narratives. His stories make prehistoric times come alive again, in a format that is contained and packaged for consumption here and now. Olov Janse, however, offers to perform a double trick, with the “double exposure” of prehistory – here in distant times, and now in distant lands, moving through time *and* space and thus claiming a double control over distance. Mobility is therefore key to the archaeological travel writer, as is translation. By moving between distant units (in time and space), traversing the gap and

1182. Stewart 1993:143

1183. Stewart 1993:147.

1184. Stewart 1993:136.

translating between them, the archaeological travel writer gains prestige and position. We have seen Janse's movements and translations resulting in concrete activities and narratives in a number of important institutions of twentieth-century culture and politics: from major museums in Sweden, France, Vietnam, and the United States, to the OSS, UNESCO, and the US Department of State.

Although mostly invisible in studies of political institutions, the political impact of academics in the humanities and social sciences is increasingly recognized:

The social sciences stand at the nexus of power and knowledge in the modern world. Universities and other research institutions have generated, incubated and helped to disseminate forms of knowledge, and programmes for social and political action, that have played a fundamental role in shaping the world in which we live. Global politics during the twentieth century and into our own times cannot be understood adequately without taking into account this dimension of human activity.¹¹⁸⁵

Olov Janse's scholarly archaeological perspective can be summarized as comparative and diffusionist. Hubert's comparative perspective and the Salle de Mars "laboratory" at the Musée des antiquités nationales worked to collapse distance in time and space. Similarity, not distance, was of key interest for the comparative sociological perspective. Social institutions, materialized in the form of artefacts, could be compared through time and space – like Marcel Mauss's essay on the gift, where Roman society was juxtaposed with ethnographic studies of the Pacific Northwest, in an analysis that was intended as a critique against contemporary liberal Western society.

Like the comparative sociological perspective, the diffusionist explanatory model in archaeological analysis connects distant parts of the world. But it relies (implicitly, but importantly) on a hierarchical notion of cultures as being more or less complex, following a law-bound trajectory from simple to complex. A "complex" culture, according to the diffusionist model, is bound to spread and replace "simpler" cultural forms. Thus the diffusionist model extrapolates cultural difference (from the most simple to the most complex) at the same time as it connects geographi-

1185. Bell 2009:3.

cally distant places. Combined with the colonial explanatory model with its teleological, evolutionary view of cultural development, diffusionism has the effect of emphasizing and hierarchizing cultural inequality.¹¹⁸⁶ When the comparative perspective meets diffusionist explanations in Olov Janse's work, the diffusionist explanation overrules the emphasis on similarity in the comparative perspective.

In a more practical sense, Janse built the first phase of his career on traversing distance, being a translator and mediator between geographically distant units. It was a position that gave him both benefits and problems. From a Swedish perspective, his presence in France was at first mostly regarded as an asset. He was a knowledgeable translator of events in Parisian academic life and the happenings in the Glozel affair; a facilitator of contacts between Swedish and French academics and institutions; a motor for artefact exchanges; and a door-opening guide for Swedes visiting Paris. He kept this bridging function for the rest of his life and career, and continued to gain professional value and prestige by sharing knowledge and building bridges to various distant elsewhere. Assuming this position, however, he eventually became a slippery figure. He was described as untrustworthy, as the man who is never present (by Sigurd Curman, Sune Lindqvist, Johan Gunnar Andersson, and Serge Elisséeff). Hence his chameleon talents were Janus-faced. His great ability to adjust to different cultural and linguistic contexts (for instance when he navigates between the French republican view of a nation resting historically on a foundation of several races, and a Swedish conception of the nation as built on one race with the ideal of purity of blood), made him unreliable from bounded national perspectives.

*

The biography of Olov Janse shows that the work of an archaeologist in-between is not necessarily less constrained by administrative and political structures than the works of an archaeologist operating within the

¹¹⁸⁶. In descriptions of diffusionism in the history of archaeological theory, it is sometimes described as a fundamentally different perspective from Darwinist evolutionary theory. In practical reality, however, we find that they are often combined as complementary models of explanation for change in archaeological narration (i.e. cultural change can be explained both by the occurrence of internal innovations ("mutations") and by external influences), as exemplified in the works of Oscar Montelius and Olov Janse (cf. Trigger 1989:158–160; Conklin 2013:42n58).

parameters of only one nation and one institution. The constraints are, however, defined in different terms, and the results and contributions of actors whose identities were defined by a hyphen have for long been more or less unnoticed in historical research.

In recent years, however, with the understanding of culture that we find in the works of Homi Bhabha and Trinh T. Minh-ha among others, the hyphen represents an interesting, creative space of cultural production. If an earlier understanding of culture (as essentially stable, homogenous and naturally contained within national borders) reduced the hyphen in “Swedish-French” to a mute non-space, Trinh’s and Bhabha’s works have demonstrated that the most fundamental form of human culture is hybrid, that the idea of bounded national culture is essentially a political project, and that it is in fact at boundaries and in border zones, where differences are articulated and made meaningful, that culture is created and recreated in new forms.¹¹⁸⁷

Olov and Ronny Janse both used mobility as a strategy to escape pressure, and ultimately, to survive. In Olov’s family history, his mother and uncle escaped the Ljung estate in the 1880s, and just like Olov half a century later, his uncle Axel Herman Svensson emigrated to a new life and new opportunities in the United States. Olov escaped from Norrköping after his mother’s death and his father’s depression, and Ronny survived literally by escaping from the Soviet Union. And their mobility later allowed them both to escape from direct involvement in the Second World War. Importantly, their escapes offered them new experiences that led to new positions, which together created the fabric of their lives and careers. Ronny’s employment in Stockholm led to their first meeting in 1929, and a life-changing marriage a year later. Olov’s studies under Henri Hubert in Paris meant a life-long intellectual inspiration. His fortuitous location in Paris led to a working relationship with Johan Gunnar Andersson, which in turn rendered him an extensive network of influential mentors and patrons. It resulted in three archaeological expeditions to Indochina and the Philippines, which filled museum stores in Vietnam, Paris, Brussels, Stockholm, and at Harvard with ancient artefacts and ethnographic collections, and resulted in a three-volume archaeological report, a memoir and numerous academic articles. When the crisis of potential unemployment and the Second World War led them to settle in the United States, their broad knowledge of languages and cultures gave

1187. Bhabha 1990; 2004, Trinh 2011. See also Anderson 1996.

them both positions in some of the most influential institutions of the post-war and Cold War period – at UNESCO, OSS, the US Department of State, and the Library of Congress.

A particularly important field of activity in the space between nations is that of public diplomacy. Olov Janse's activities in the years that he spent on the move between France and Sweden in the 1920s could be framed in terms of public diplomacy (although the concept has been used in academic studies mostly for post-war US politics). He organized and attended cultural events and lectures that worked as stages for diplomatic exclamations, and means to connect members of the political sphere and diplomatic community with the academic, intellectual, and museum worlds. At his first public lecture at the Sorbonne in 1924 (on the topic of Scandinavian Bronze Age rock carvings) there were over 200 people in the audience, among whom were the Swedish minister Albert Ehrens-vård, a number of notable French academics, and representatives from the Scandinavian embassies in Paris. The host of the lecture, Paul Verrier, emphasized in his introduction the importance of political and cultural contacts between France and Scandinavia through history.¹¹⁸⁸ In Paris, Olov also made himself a name as facilitator and guide for visiting Swedes from a much wider circle than his closest associates. He continued to act as a translator between national contexts and a promoter of political and cultural contacts (a practice which could be described in terms of public diplomacy) during his Indochina years, and in his work for UNESCO and the US Department of State. During the Cold War, when public diplomacy was developed as an important section of US foreign policy,¹¹⁸⁹ he was right at the centre of the important relations between the United States and Vietnam. In that function, he organized events such as the *Art and Archeology of Viet-Nam* exhibition in 1961. In this manner, he also contributed a particular organization of knowledge (of Vietnam's past and present), and an organization of relations (by invitations and meetings with key actors in the political, cultural, and diplomatic corps).

Olov Janse made a particularly canny use of press media to have his activities registered and acclaimed in the spaces between nations and lan-

1188. "Dr O. Janse föreläser i Paris: Intressanta föredrag om hållristningar i Skandinavien", by Harald Wägner, *Aftonbladet*, 15 December 1924; Letters from Olov Janse to Birger Nerman dated 9 December 1924; 14 December 1924. Riksarkivet. Kartong 1. Korrespondens brev II 1923–1934.

1189. Osgood & Etheridge 2010.

guage contexts. Reporting on his work in Indochina, he adjusted smoothly to the different languages and interests of the press in France, Sweden, and Indochina. In all three contexts, his work was described as a great success – based, however, on quite different criteria. We have seen how he pressured his Swedish friends to have his successful activities abroad noticed in the Swedish newspapers, and moreover urged his friends to use the press to get public opinion on his side in the inflamed struggle for the Director's post at the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities. He was always keen to be noticed in relation to international media events, such as the Glözel affair, where he could act as the perfect translator between French academic archaeology and Swedish readers. Press media were also crucial for him to have his activities known across borders – from his earliest academic endeavours in Paris, to the goodwill journey to South Vietnam that ended his academic career.

*

Shifting focus – from bounded national and institutional units, to movements in-between – has allowed us to emphasize the importance of connection, cultural ambiguity and translation in historical research. Following in the footsteps of Olov Janse has opened our eyes to the importance of soft “public” or “cultural” diplomacy in relation to archaeology and heritage; of narrative strategies that extrapolate human culture at the same time as they bridge distance; of technologies of physical travel and media communication; of the value of networks and personal relations built on gifts and the promises of total prestations; and of museum collections as professional currency in the slippery borderlands between official and private artefact collection. Despite their invisibility in official history-writing, such in-between movements and techniques have in fact influenced the formation of archaeological knowledge, and have left lasting legacies on bookshelves and in museum collections around the world.