Why do we need gender archaeology when studying factories?

Susana Pacheco[230]

Introduction

The Working class has frequently been analysed as a whole, in historiography and archaeological studies, especially in Portugal. It is also common to see investigations that divide it according to geographical regions. This analysis leads us to believe that all the members of a certain region's working class (for example Lisboa) were the same, had the same problems, the same concerns, and backgrounds (Rosas 1994, 91). In most cases, gender divisions are non-existent, as if a man and a woman working in a determined industrial place were equals, had the same privileges, or concerns, and unfortunately, such assumptions remain today (Varela and Pereira 2021).

When it comes to Portuguese Industrial Archaeology discussion of people is mostly non-existent. When they happen, they usually are done in the same general way, referring to them as a collective entity. They are referred to only as workers as if they are emotionless machines, part of a chain of commands, or as mere numbers, percentages, or dots in maps.

More recently, some attention has been given to women (although we are still far from what we should be doing), but once again these people are mostly reduced to numbers (Baptista and Alves 2019, 524). It is (or it should be by now) known that women had an important role in Portuguese industry. So, why are they not been given the rightful attention, by historiography and archaeological research? Being remembered and historically studied should not be a women's right like it is for men?

It can be argued that the sources are scarce and that women had constantly been silenced by legislation (Guimarães 1986). However, we have other resources which could allow us to better understand these people's lives and deconstruct these narratives, but they keep being ignored by most historians and archaeologists. One of those alternative sources of material-

[230] CFE-HTC, Universidade Nova de Lisboa
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5503-8845. E-mail: susanalfsdpacheco@hotmail.com

ity is photographs, which should be looked at both as objects and as images (Edwards and Hart 2004, 9). Being both images and objects, they are present in social and cultural experience, entangled with the subjective, provoking different sensations in the ones who contact with them (ibidem, 1).

Although, as helpful as they can be in the process of deconstructing certain ideas or narratives, we can never forget they were frequently used as propaganda. This means we should not assume that if something is represented in a photograph that it was necessarily true or happened exactly that way. Obviously, it does not mean that they lose importance, it just means that we should be careful when analysing and interpreting them. Of course, not every industrial photograph was staged, but it is important to know that several of them were. These are the issues this paper aims to debate.

Where are women in Portuguese industrial archaeology?

Portuguese industrial archaeology, with a few exceptions (Sequeira and Casimiro 2021), usually ignores the individuals (Santos, Sequeira, Texugo 2022[231]). The ones who worked in industrial places, the unknown citizens who performed the hard work are the main "victims" of that. Studies about the employers or the owners of the factories have been developed (Custódio 1994; Cordeiro 1996; Ventura 2007; Faria and Mendes 2011; Guimarães 2019; Amaro 2021 only as examples), but we cannot say the same about the rest of the people who were present in industrial environments. Most of the time workers are mentioned in these studies, they usually appear as mere numbers or percentages in graphics or tables, which is problematic.

Besides economical historiography, we can see mentions of the working class in historiographical studies with a theoretical Marxist orientation, as for social conflicts (Varela 2010; Patriarca 1978; Paço et al 2013 only as examples), but even then, they are barely treated as human beings, let alone as individuals. Although concerning, these silenced or excluded people still have a few mentions in historiography, which is more than working class women ever had. Usually, they are just included as part of the "package" of workers, as if all their lives were just the same.

[231] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fKiQvc5gyr8&ab_channel=Associa%C3%A7%C3%A3odosArque%C3%B3logosPortugueses (Consulted in 23/07/2022)

But leaving economical historiography aside for a while, and focusing on archaeological studies, it is possible to verify that the situation is not so different, if not even worse. Most of the studies being developed over the years are focusing essentially on industrial architecture, engines, tools, products, surveys, and barely care about the people (Custódio 1998; Folgado 2004; Costa and Cordeiro 2013 as examples). Even studies about working class houses focus more on architectural and construction aspects than how were the lives of the people who lived there (Ramos 2010). The differences between people of different genders residing there together are completely left out.

As mentioned above, the situation for women who were part of the working class is even more concerning. It can be argued that the sources are scarce to study anonymous women in those periods, especially in those realities (industrial places). However, is it not the case for other times as well? Archaeologists usually (at least recently there has been an effort to do it) consider women in their studies, through the materiality they find. So, why not do the same for industrial places as well? If written sources are so important for archaeologists who dedicate their work to these realities, and if to study women they are clearly insufficient, why do not we, archaeologists, look for other sources or materiality, such as photographs, for instance?

In my research, I could not find a single paper specifically about women in any kind of industrial place from an archaeological perspective in Portugal. Should we not be worried about this? Should we not try to change this scenario instead of insisting on presenting similar papers repeatedly? Should we not, as archaeologists, who argue to have (at least in theory) as the main concern understanding past and present societies, ask different questions about the evidence we have in front of us? Should we not be more concerned about trying to know how those people's lives were instead of understanding why the architect X projected the building Y that way?

How can photographs help us to deconstruct narratives?

The relationship between people of different genders inside a working place is a topic that has not been properly discussed by archaeologists yet. However, it is (or should be, by now) widely known that inside an industrial place men and women had always (at least until recently, if not in the pres-

ent as well) had different treatment, different rights, and different salaries. Knowing these aspects, as I believe archaeologists who dedicate to these areas do, how is it possible that it continues to be ignored?

It can be argued that the typical sources archaeologists use are scarce. What can be found in an abandoned industrial place can give us an idea of some aspects of the daily lives of the people who worked there, but then it is necessary to complement that with other sources, such as documentation, photographs, or even the recollection of testimonies from those people. And that is precisely here, in my opinion, that the problem begins.

Portuguese historical documentation barely mentions these women, except to indicate how many of them worked in a certain industry or in a specific factory. Quick research in the *Inquéritos Industriais* or *Boletins do Trabalho Industrial* shows us the number of women working in a particular place or the regulation of female work, but the information practically ends there. While this seems to be enough for several historians and archaeologists, there are still other sources at our disposal, and they should be taken into consideration.

One of them, and that some archaeologists usually turn to, is the recollection of testimonies, but the "important" questions are constantly left out. As mentioned by Jörgen Skågeby and Lina Rahm, "when 'faced with an unfamiliar machine', do we ask 'how was it used?' or 'what can it do?'" (Skågeby and Rahm 2018, 7). Unfortunately, when faced with the opportunity to talk to someone who worked in an industrial place, most Portuguese archaeologists still ask questions such as those about the factory equipment. They are constantly more concerned with the number of machines existent, or the production capacity of that factory, instead of trying to understand how workers' daily lives were, let alone how people of different genders interacted there, those aspects are still considered secondary (or irrelevant) to study an industrial place.

But what is the purpose of knowing everything about the products and the machines that once existed in an industrial place if then we do not know a single aspect of how an ordinary (or not-so-ordinary) day in that place was? If we keep ignoring the kind of adversities those people had to face? Unfortunately, that is not just a problem of past times, and different forms of oppression are still present in our society nowadays (including towards women). We, as archaeologists, could use our studies as a form of activism (Kiddey

2020). By ignoring aspects such as these ones, we simply are choosing not to and to be complacent with them.

I know that it is often hard for people to talk about those times, especially if they were tough. So, it is understandable that people who suffered more at work in industrial places have more trouble in giving testimonies for archaeologists to study. This may constitute another challenge for archaeologists who work on these themes. Nevertheless, other sources are still available, like photographs, which can be extremely useful if looked at correctly. Sadly, archaeologists tend to ignore them. When analysed, usually it does not happen in the proper way, using them only to confirm something they already assume to know. Archaeologists believe (more often than they should) that if something appears in a photograph it is necessarily true and happened exactly like that.

Most archaeologists still look at photographs as an objective source of knowledge, as if no kind of manipulation existed. Sometimes even stating that paintings are subject to a client's will, who chooses what should or not be included, while photography serves merely as a way of recording reality just the way it is[232]. This idea could not be farther from the truth, as I will try to show in the next section of this paper.

But let us take a step back and focus on the real importance of photographs. They can be especially helpful in the process of understanding the daily lives of factory workers, particularly women. For them, documentation is even more scarce, and (at least in my experience) usually, they are the ones who feel more uncomfortable talking to some stranger (i.e., archaeologist or anthropologist) about their past lives as factory workers. This difficulty they feel is probably related to the fact they suffered quite a lot while working there, even more if we keep in mind how catholic and conservative Portugal has always been. If they are not rightfully mentioned and represented in the documentation and they feel uncomfortable giving testimonies, photographs are one of the few remaining sources to study them. So, it is important to look at them and analyse them in the proper way, using them to deconstruct pre-established narratives instead of assuming they will just serve to prove what we already know.

One of the most flagrant ideas that photographs can help us deconstruct is the importance and role of women inside an industrial place. It is

[232] Arqueoclass – Lição nº 2: Parte II Arqueologia Industrial. Available in: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=d-OeD83SzjU&t=515s&ab_channel=ArqueoExplorers (Consulted in 21/07/2022).

often assumed by archaeologists that women's place in a factory is limited to light work, and documentation is not usually useful to review these ideas. So, unless we find someone willing to give us their testimony (assuming their memory is not playing them tricks), photographs (and sometimes moving images too – which is not the focus of this paper) are our only source to understand each people's place in a factory unit or other kind of industrial place. The following example shows exactly how far from the truth is the idea that women executed only light tasks in industrial places.

1 – Photograph of São Pedro da Cova Coal Mines, by Maria Lamas, in "As Mulheres do Meu País", pág. 375. Not covered by Copyright (available at https://alexandrepomar.typepad.com/alexandre_pomar/2008/09/maria-lamas-nr-iii.html).

2 - Photograph of Robinson Factory in Portalegre, by Mário Novais. Not covered by Copyright (available at https://www.flickr.com/photos/biblarte/23074737012/in/album-72157606220845802/).

In the first photograph, taken by Maria Lamas, we see a group of two women pushing a wagon full of coal over rails in São Pedro da Cova Coal Mines. In the second photograph, taken by Mário Novais, we see a similar task (but instead of coal, the wagon is full of cork) being executed by a group of two men. There are several aspects relevant to analyse in these two photographs, as we will see. But perhaps the first thing we need to understand, to examine them, is who their authors are, what is their background, what are their motivations, or what led them to capture these moments with their cameras. Only after identifying these issues, we will be able to comprehend these photographs and why they are the way they are.

Maria Lamas (1893-1983) was a Portuguese writer and journalist. Between 1948 and 1950 she wrote and illustrated a book that is considered "the first systematic use of photography to oppose Estado Novo propaganda: a counter-discourse" (Cabral 2021, 234), entitled *As Mulheres do Meu País* (that included the photograph in analysis). With this book, her intentions were to record how Portuguese women were at the time, in different regions of the country, with different occupations according to their social background, as

a result of the author's opinion and ideology through the Portuguese political situation, which also gives her a certain biased approach to these women (Cabral 2021, 234-235).

Mário Novais (1899-1967), on the other hand, was a photographer that did not oppose the regime at all (he even got to photograph Salazar in what seems to have been a private session – which certainly was not something that just any photographer could "achieve"). He was a photographer that owned a studio and worked on commission, which meant he had to please his clients if he wanted to keep them happy and get paid. In fact, in 1941, this photographer gave an interview where he confirmed to work with photomontage (there go all the arguments of photography being always objective) (André 2018, 229). He certainly was not the only one to do it. Even photographers who opposed the regime could have done it, we do not know.

Knowing who these photographers were, it is easy to conclude how distinct their motivations were, which helps to explain how different these two photographs also are (even if they look similar at first sight). In the first, the intent was to show us women's work in an industrial place. At least it was not made with the intention of pleasing a client that would pay for it, it is just the author's vision of that situation. In the second one, the photographer was getting paid to shoot the camera and capture that moment according to the client's wishes.The first photograph also includes a caption, where the author exposes her motivations "This photograph helps to evaluate the violence of coal wagon's transportation services (…). This effort is repeated dozens of times a day, always the same, always crushing. It is surprising the women's resistance, that executes it without any help, solely at the expense of their sore muscles." (Lamas 2002, 375). The second one does not have any caption by the author, or at least I could not find it in my research.

Analysing these two photographs more closely, it is possible to notice a few aspects. In the first one, neither of the women is wearing a jacket, and their sleeves are rolled up on their elbows. The woman in the foreground uses what seems to be a scarf on her head (possibly to protect from the sun), and we cannot see any signs of clouds in the sky, which leads us to infer it was a hot day (certainly making the job tougher). In the second one, although clouds in the sky are still not seen, the men are wearing long sleeve (not rolled up) shirts, and a jacket with a hood on their heads, leading to believe the day was not that warm. Showing us these tasks had to be completed no matter the external conditions. As for the rest of their clothes, women are

wearing skirts and tights which, as a woman, let me tell you, is not the most comfortable outfit for a working day. But in a conservative and catholic country in the late forties, as Portugal was, it was almost mandatory to wear a skirt preferably with tights (no matter how hot the day was, a woman not wearing tights would be considered to have deviant behaviour), even if you worked in the industry. We can also verify they were wearing slippers which, once again, certainly were not the most comfortable type of shoes to push a wagon for who knows how many kilometres, over several hours. The men's shoes are not visible, since their long pants are covering them, but it is doubtful they were wearing slippers. Those were not so common for men to wear back then. Even these aspects, that at first sight could be considered secondary or even ignored, show us the differences that women and men had to deal with in their workplaces. While the first ones had to obey society's customs and norms, the seconds could wear comfortable outfits, more adequate for the tasks they were performing.

Another aspect of these photographs, that immediately called my attention, is the fact that in the women's photograph a white man (wearing what seems to be a hat) can be seen in the right corner. This indicates the presence of a supervisor, while in the men's photograph that does not happen. Can this mean that women were believed to need more supervision than men? Or that, since the second photograph was clearly taken as propaganda, supervision was not welcomed (as we will see next)? This is just one (among hundreds or maybe even thousands) example(s) of how helpful photographs, when looked at carefully and in detail, while asking the right, more humane, questions, can be. They can be a powerful source to better understand how those people's lives were, especially (in this case) concerning gender differences in the workplace.

Can photographs still be interpreted as objective sources?

As Roland Barthes stated, "photograph is a message" (Barthes 1977, 15). If that is so, we can infer that they are never neutral and must have some sort of "connotation, the imposition of second meaning on the photographic message" (Barthes 1977, 20). Assuming this is the truth (as I will try to exemplify later), how can we keep saying that photographs are faithful, true, and objective representations of reality?

Several techniques exist that can manipulate an image (even without using recent technological tools like *Photoshop*), such as framing, layout, posing of objects, and so many other "tricks". Photographers have always recurred to them to transmit messages to viewers. Being that easy to create and manipulate an image, taking significantly less time to make than paintings did, it is not surprising that photography had such a fast, huge, and global acceptance. Some can even say it became a powerful weapon to spread a message, after all, how many times have we heard the expression "a picture is worth a thousand words"?

If we recognize the power of images and being photography the easiest and fastest way to obtain them, it is not surprising that governments have often used them to spread their ideas. 20th Century dictatorial regimes are the perfect example of that. Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin, Mao, Franco, or Salazar, all used them to spread their messages to the people. Besides, illiteracy rates were still quite high back then, making photography the simplest way to reach everyone. Knowing all of this, how can so many social science researchers keep saying and using photographs as objective sources that (as they defend) are telling us the truth exactly the way it was?

Let us now take focus on Portuguese reality. In his inaugural speech of the National Propaganda Secretariat (SPN), on 26 October 1933, Salazar emphasised that SPN should "use the image and the number as the most striking expressions, most eloquent facts of public life". In fact, it certainly was the reason why the first propaganda exhibition of Estado Novo used statistics, advertising, and photography in a massive way to present the facts of Salazar's governance (Serra et al 2021, 26). In order to spread the messages, the government wanted to propagate, hundreds or thousands of photographs were taken by the regimes' "favorite" photographers of all aspects of public life. But governments were not the only ones using photographs as advertising or propaganda. Company owners used them too, and industrial photography was a way to show the greatness and quality of those companies and their products. Obviously, this does not mean that all industrial photographs were staged.

But certainly, the dirty and worrying aspects of the industrial sector were to be left out. That is probably why we have so many clean photographs of industrial places. Does someone really believe that a factory was supposed to be a clean (sometimes almost immaculate) place? Well, we may have that conscience now (or at least the ones of us who accept photographs are not

always faithful to reality), but back then the situation was different. Portugal was mostly a poor country where illiteracy rates were high (in fact, in 1970 almost 26% of the population was still illiterate, with even higher rates for women[233]), so it is understandable that most people believed those images to be real or had bigger problems to even care about that. If industrial work was so clean and easy as some photographs suggest, who would not want to work there? Besides, by doing so, people were being patriotic by helping the country to develop.

As for women, the situation was a bit different. In this conservative and catholic country, women did not have many rights and were supposed to stay at home, taking care of their husbands, children, and household duties, but that was not always possible. The small salaries of their husbands or fathers often made them had to leave the household chores for a secondary plan or abandon school to go work in the factories, otherwise they (and their entire families) would probably starve. Besides, believed to be inferior creatures, they had lesser rights, which also meant smaller salaries, being more profitable for factory owners to hire them. But even those who worked in industry had to keep a certain image, and for the government that was important too. Women certainly could not be seen as strong and independent people, they should be kept in their places, even when they had to work outside of their homes because they had no other alternative. In the following examples, questions such as those of women's appearance and the importance of photography as propaganda will be discussed.

[233] https://www.pordata.pt/DB/Portugal/Ambiente+de+Consulta/Tabela (Consulted in 25/07/2022).

3 - Photograph of Braço de Prata Factory in Lisboa, by Mário Novais. Not covered by Copyright (available at https://www.flickr.com/photos/biblarte/5204007306/in/album-72157606220845802/).

Looking at this photograph, we can immediately acknowledge several of the aspects mentioned above. However, before addressing them, it is important to mention the fact that this photograph was taken by Mário Novais (sometime during Estado Novo). This means that it was a commissioned photograph, most certainly taken as an order by the owner(s) of the factory. So, he/they had to be pleased, otherwise, the photographer would risk not getting paid.

This was taken in Braço de Prata factory in Lisboa, a factory specialised in military equipment. Here we see women working in the sewing workshop, producing what looks like to be shoes or boots. According to society's norms of the time, a military equipment factory was certainly not the best place for a woman to work on. Though, in this photograph, they are portrayed in front of sewing machines, equipment traditionally associated with this gender. Nevertheless, other photographs exist of women working in other sectors of this factory, all taken by the same photographer. A common aspect of all of them is cleanliness. No matter what kind of machines women are working with or the type of objects they are producing. In fact, of all the ones I could

find, this is the messier one. There are several objects on the floors, while in some of them, the floors are so clean that one could be led to believe the industry is a clean and easy sector to work on, after all. Besides, for society, women should take good care of their homes, keeping them always presentable and clean, so it would be better propaganda for the government's values to show they did the same in their workplaces.

Taking a closer look at this photograph, some aspects immediately come to mind. The first is that the supervisor is a man (on top of the working bench, wearing a tie under his uniform). Let us not forget that women were considered inferior beings when compared to men. So, they could not assume positions of power as one of supervisors, let alone that if they did, it could mean a woman supervising a man's work, which surely was unacceptable. But if we really look closely, we will notice the only supervisor is on the women's working bench, while there are several men minding their jobs. Why are they not being supervised as well? As mentioned above, women could not be seen as independent people, and they needed a supervisor, while men did not. This is one possible explanation. Another is that the owner(s) did not consider women to be trustworthy to develop their jobs correctly and efficiently without any supervision.

Another issue that deserves attention is the fact that besides the aforementioned supervisor, who is looking directly at the camera, no one seems to even notice the photographer's presence. This leads us to believe the photograph is not staged or is it? Most photography of industrial places had to please the clients. It meant they had to represent the owner's idea of the factory, because without them they would not even exist. Entering factories were completely forbidden without their authorisation. This frequently meant portraying clean workplaces, focused employees, minding their tasks without any distractions, happy workers, and always busy (Monteiro 2013, 581). No owner would want to show (and therefore pay for) a photograph where his employees are seen taking breaks or talking to their colleagues instead of minding their own work, or even a dirty workplace. What image would that give of the factory? Definitely not one that would please the company's clients. Thus, it would be preferable to take photographs that looked like the workers were all so pleased with their jobs, that they would not even notice the photographer's presence. In the next example this question will be analysed in more detail.

In this photograph, every woman is wearing the same uniform, showing how organized this factory was. They even provided similar uniforms for every employee, or at least that's what the owner(s) and consequently the photographer wants us to believe. This was not the reality of most Portuguese factories. In this photograph not a single woman has messy hair, leading us to believe their tasks were so easy that nothing would get messy. Women of different ages are portrayed here, including the elderly. Another proof of how easy women's work in industrial places was, or at least that was the idea these photographs wanted to transmit to society. Earlier in this paper, I discussed that it was not always the situation.

4 - Photograph of Couraça Factory in Lisboa, by Mário Novais. Not covered by Copyright (available at https://www.flickr.com/photos/biblarte/5342206227/in/album-72157606220845802/)

This photograph, also taken by Mário Novais, during Estado Novo at Couraça Factory in Lisboa, was also commissioned. This factory specialised in soap, toothpaste, skin cream, perfume, and some makeup. So, it was certainly considered by society a more adequate place for women to work, than a military equipment factory. Most of these products were largely associated with the female gender. Once again, several aspects can be discussed from this photograph. But first let us notice how much this woman must have loved her job, that not even a photographer almost on top of her would distract her from it. While I cannot know how much of the previous sentence is true, it can be inferred that this was the idea the owner(s) wanted the photographer to transmit to the "outside world". Once again, to be pleased, the client had to see focused employees in a clean environment, but it was technically impossible not to notice the photographer's presence. To take a photograph with the quality of this one, especially in an interior place, proper lighting was necessary, and the photographer could not be that far from the subject. Zoom lenses exist since the 19th century, however, it was only in 1959 that a version of a zoom lens with good image sharpness and a minimum of optical anomalies was produced[234]. So, unless this photographer was one of the first in the world to have one of those, and even if he was, he would still need proper lighting. This means that in an interior space, it was impossible for this woman not to notice his presence while being photographed.

Once again, this woman is wearing a skirt below the uniform (although it is not noticeable if she is wearing tights or not), but an interesting aspect is that she is wearing high heels, and although the totality of the shoes are not seen, they look like sandals. This certainly was only possible because her job was easy, or was it? Often in factories, a person performed the same task for the entirety of their shift. If it was the case for this woman, it meant she would spend several hours standing on her feet, so heels were not the best option, but women had always to appear a certain way to be respected, even if that caused them tremendous pain, which meant that using heels was probably a habit on this woman's life, no matter the situation or place she was in. In this photograph, the woman is working with an unidentified paste that probably contained chemical components. However, she is not wearing any sort of protection, which is a common aspect of all the photographs analysed in this paper. Since most of the photographs analysed here are com-

[234] https://mikeeckman.com/2021/06/kepplers-vault-94-the-history-of-zoom-lenses/ (Consulted in 13/09/2022).

missioned, it shows that those were not concerns of the society. Otherwise, owners would be careful to only allow photographers to shoot their cameras when all the security measures were assured.

The previous examples show us just a few issues (much more could be addressed) that prove photographs are not always as trustworthy as some researchers want to believe, which does not mean they are not extremely helpful sources, in fact, is quite the opposite, as long as they are analysed carefully.

Conclusion

Portuguese industrial archaeological research still lacks studies about the working class, and for women, the situation is even more concerning. Sometimes researchers argue that since sources are scarce, it becomes difficult to change this scenario, and most are yet to recognise photographs as the powerful source they can become if looked at and analysed carefully.

Hundreds or maybe even thousands of photographs from Portuguese industrial places survived until our days. But for sure many others disappeared over time, so why did these survive instead of others? Although I do not have the answer to this question, I believe that, as for almost everything, that is related to the photographer's name, the more famous he/she is, the higher the probability of his/her photographs being kept safe, thus surviving longer. Sure, we do not have access to all the surviving photographs as, although smartphones and digital cameras have not always existed, for sure thousands of other photographs were taken in industrial places across the world over decades, by the owners, the employees in some special events, or even others. And since they were taken by anonymous people they are not of public knowledge (and several did not survive for sure), thus they cannot be found as easily as the ones taken by recognised photographers. But even so, we still have thousands of photographs that we can use in our research, not only for industry, but almost for every sector of society, since their appearance, and their full potential is yet to be generally accepted. Only through photographs, we can analyse some issues that are not visible anywhere else, besides they can help us deconstruct narratives that are often assumed to be undeniable truth, even if that is not necessarily the case.

Ideas such as the work developed by women being light and easy are still present in archaeologists' minds nowadays. Photographs are extremely helpful to deconstruct that, as we could verify through the previous examples. However, that is not the only myth that occupies archaeologists' minds. There is still an idea that photographs are objective sources that will show us exactly how things happened. That is another aspect that this paper tried to deconstruct. Besides, they can also help us to better understand the relationships between different genders inside a workplace. Also, the way society saw or imagined those people, since those ideas were conditioned by photography, was quickly realised by governments across the world.

Governments had no problem recognising that and took as much advantage of it as they could, by manipulating photographs for their own good. However, some researchers seem to have yet to realise that photography is not always a truthful, and objective image, that needs to be analysed carefully. As for social scientists, especially archaeologists, how is it possible to keep saying that if something is represented in a photograph is because it happened just like that? Photography has always, since its appearance, had a significant role in society, in fact there several expressions exist that prove exactly that, like the famous "pics or didn't happen". This proves that even nowadays, despite all the staging *Instagram* looks, several people still assume photographs to be the most faithful representation of reality, meaning they have (and will always have) a tremendous influence on the way they see and interpret some event or object portrayed on it. This means photography holds a huge part in the way our memories are constructed, both as individuals and as a collective society. So, as archaeologists or social scientists, we should start addressing these issues more often and more carefully.

Some of the issues debated in this paper are still (unfortunately) a reality today, at least in some societies. So, we should go further with our research. Instead of addressing the same issues repeatedly, as is flagrant for Portuguese industrial archaeology, is important to start using the tools we have available to lead more humane and activist research. By doing this, we will be helping present societies to deal with these issues, so they do not keep happening in the future. Recognising photographs as a source to study issues such as gender, racial, ethnic, religious, social, or sexual discrimination, which can also help us to better communicate our investigations to society is a good start. They are more appealing than statistics, spreadsheets, percentages, charts, or maps. Governments, advertising, and commerce have

quickly realised the power of photography to spread a message, so why are we (researchers) yet to recognise that?

Bibliography

AMARO, António Rafael. 2021. "Teoria Económica e História Empresarial: Empresário e Capitalista em Joseph Schumpeter". In *História, Empresas, Arqueologia Industrial e Museologia*, edited by Irene Vaquinhas, et al., 33-58. Coimbra: Coimbra University Press.

ANDRÉ, Paula. 2018. "O valor patrimonial da fotografia impressa enquanto campo discursivo da metaimagem em Portugal (1934-1948)". In *interFACES* 28 (2): 218-251.

BAPTISTA, Virgínia and ALVES, Paulo Marques. 2019. "As Mulheres trabalhadoras em Portugal (1890-1970): as representações sobre o trabalho remunerado e o trabalho não remunerado numa perspectiva feminista". In *Actas de las XIV Jornadas Nacionales de Historia de las Mujeres y IX Congreso Iberoamericano de Estudios de Género*, edited by Vázquez Lorda, L., 523-531. Mar del Plata: Universidad Nacional de Mar del Plata.

BARTHES, Roland. 1977. *Image Music Text*. London: Fontana Press.

CABRAL, Manuel Villaverde. 2021. "As Mulheres do Meu País". In *Fotografia Impressa e Propaganda em Portugal no Estado Novo*, edited by Filomena Serra, 234-237. Lisboa: Muga.

CORDEIRO, José Manuel Lopes. 1996. "Empresas e empresários portuenses na segunda metade do século XIX". In *Análise Social* XXXI (136-137): 313-342.

COSTA, Francisco da Silva and CORDEIRO, José Manuel Lopes. 2013. "Património Hidráulico e Arqueologia Industrial: O Caso do Rio Ave no Noroeste de Portugal". In *Actas do II Congresso Internacional de Engenharia Civil e Território "Água, Cultura e Sociedade"*. Colegio de Ingenieros de Caminos, Canales y Puertos de Galicia.

CUSTÓDIO, Jorge (Coord.). 1994. *Empresariado Português: uma abordagem às suas realizações*. Porto: Associação Industrial Portuense.

CUSTÓDIO, Jorge 1998. *A Máquina a Vapor de Soure. Um Património Industrial da Fundação Belmiro de Azevedo*. S.l.: Fundação Belmiro de Azevedo.

EDWARDS, Elizabeth and HART Janice. 2004. *Photographs Objects Histories. On the materiality of images*. New York: Routledge.

FARIA, Miguel Figueira de and MENDES, José Amado. 2011. "Grupos empresariais portugueses, da República ao Estado Novo (1910-1974). Balanço historiográfico e novos dados". In *X Congreso Internacional de la AEHE*. Sevilla: Universidad Pablo de Olavide Carmona.

FOLGADO, Deolinda. 2004. "Fábrica Nacional de Munições. Salvaguarda de uma caldeira Babcock & Wilcox". In *Pedra & Cal* 21: 18-19.

GUIMARÃES, Elina. 1986. "A mulher portuguesa na legislação civil". In *Análise Social* XXII (92-93): 557-577.

GUIMARÃES, Paulo Eduardo. 2019. *Elites e Indústria no Alentejo (1890-1960)*. Évora: Publicações do CIDEHUS, Edições Colibri.

KIDDEY, Rachael. 2020. "I'll tell you what I want, what I really, really want! Open Archaeology that is Collaborative, Participatory, Public, and Feminist". In *Norwegian Archaeological Review*, 53 (1): 23-40.

LAMAS, Maria. 2002. *As Mulheres do Meu País*. Lisboa: Editorial Caminho.

MONTEIRO, Bruno. 2013. "Natureza-morta com máquinas. A política de representação do espaço fabril na fotografia industrial nas décadas de 50 e 60 no Porto". In *De Pé Sobre a Terra. Estudos sobre a Indústria, o Trabalho e o Movimento Operário em Portugal* edited by MONTEIRO, Bruno and PEREIRA, Joana Dias, 573-592. [s.l.]: [s.n.].

PAÇO, António Simões do et al (Coord.). 2013. *Atas do I Congresso de História do Movimento Operário e dos Movimentos Sociais em Portugal*. Lisboa: Instituto de História Contemporânea da Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas da Universidade Nova de Lisboa.

PATRIARCA, Maria de Fátima. 1978. "Operários Portugueses na Revolução: a manifestação dos operários da Lisnave de 12 de Setembro de 1974". In *Análise Social* XIV (56): 695-727.

RAMOS, Fernando Manuel Amaro Barata. 2010. *O Bairro Operário de Portimão. História e Património*. Masters diss., Universidade Aberta.

ROSAS, Fernando. 1994. *O Estado Novo (1926-1974). História de Portugal* (dir. José Mattoso), Vol. VII. Lisboa: Círculo de Leitores.

SEQUEIRA, João Luís and CASIMIRO, Tânia Manuel. 2021. "Humanizing Industrial Archaeology". In *Historical Archaeology* 54, 1: 45-48.

SERRA, Filomena et al. 2021. "A Fotografia Impressa e a Propaganda no Estado Novo". In *Fotografia Impressa e Propaganda em Portugal no Estado Novo*, edited by Filomena Serra, 23-39. Lisboa: Muga.

SKÅGEBY, Jörgen and RAHM, Lina. 2018. "What is Feminist Media Archaeology?". In *Communication +1*, 7 (1): Article 7.

VARELA, Raquel. 2010. "Os Operários da Lisnave – do conflito à negociação (1967-1987)". In *Cadernos AEL Trabalho e Política*, 17 (29): 337-363

VARELA, Raquel and PEREIRA, Luísa Barbosa. 2021. *"O Mundo é Um Moinho" História Económica e Social de Albergaria-a-Velha no Século XX*. Vila Nova de Famalicão: Edições Húmus e autores.

VENTURA, António. 2007. "Para uma Cronologia da Fábrica Robinson (1848-1966)". In *Publicações da Fundação Robinson* 0: 8-23.

Webgraphy

https://alexandrepomar.typepad.com/alexandre_pomar/2008/09/maria-lamas-nr-iii.html (Consulted in 21/07/2022)

https://www.flickr.com/photos/biblarte/23074737012/in/album-72157606220845802/ (Consulted in 21/07/2022)

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fKiQvc5gyr8&ab_channel=Associa%C3%A7%C3%A3odosArque%C3%B3logosPortugueses (Consulted in 23/07/2022)

https://www.pordata.pt/DB/Portugal/Ambiente+de+Consulta/Tabela (Consulted in 25/07/2022)
https://www.flickr.com/photos/biblarte/5204007306/in/album-72157606220845802/ (Consulted in 25/07/2022)
https://www.flickr.com/photos/biblarte/5342206227/in/album-72157606220845802/ (Consulted in 25/07/2022)
https://mikeeckman.com/2021/06/kepplers-vault-94-the-history-of-zoom-lenses/ (Consulted in 13/09/2022)