

# Archaeology in the Age of Globalization: Local Meanings, Global Interest

Ludomir R. Lozny

## Introduction

Archaeology is now a worldwide operation. A look at this global scale allows for identification of problems and pressures inflicted on archaeological research by the overwhelmingly potent socioeconomic and political contexts. Political environment stimulates our thinking and creates conditions for our professional engagement. Hence, a basic principle must be invoked: our understanding of the past relates to our understanding (and acceptance) of the present. A world in which meanings and cultural differences play only inconsequential, secondary role is incomprehensible. Thus far we have been able to suggest that a satisfactory explanation for the various trends in archaeology must incorporate a sociological analysis of the way the discipline is structured, the knowledge is produced, and the purpose to which it is put.

Current tendencies regarding research and preservation of cultural heritage worldwide<sup>1</sup> indicate a globalized approach to the past and archaeology as the only discipline to study bygone societies not recorded through script. Such integration of interest about the past contributes to a shift of power thus far represented by academic centers produced through the socioeconomic and political constraints explained by the world-system model. Their power was represented through the abilities to control research worldwide by setting research agendas, distributing and controlling funds, designing methodologies, and offering theoretical outlooks. The current integration is qualitatively different as archaeology becomes nationless and cultural heritage is understood as global rather than local patrimony. It is assumed that interests in the past represented at the nation-state level will be replaced with a more global approach. The point is that national agencies will no longer have decisive control over the

---

<sup>1</sup>Protection of Cultural Heritage Worldwide, UNESCO, and the Malta Convention serve as examples of international (supranational) organizations which control research and preservation of cultural heritage.

L.R. Lozny (✉)

Department of Anthropology, Hunter College, CUNY, New York, NY, USA

e-mail: llozny@hunter.cuny.edu

research of the past. Archaeology may become more democratic and decentralized as power will be allocated to agents on regional, national, and international scale, private and public, as political space will no longer be identified with specific administrative boundary of a nation-state.<sup>2</sup> The key problem is how such globalized approach should be crafted, what theory and practice to follow, and more generally, what do we want to know about the past and how we are going to answer these questions.

As in all sciences, competing theoretical propositions are also present in archaeology. Since the inception of archaeology as an academic discipline,<sup>3</sup> the British, German, and French schools of thought competed and were followed by many. In the 1960s and 1970s, the Anglo-American-devised approach, “New Archaeology” or processual archaeology, later counterbalanced by the elusively labeled postprocessual archaeology, entered the competition and impacted academic centers worldwide. The common ground among theorists is to discuss how ideas and approaches, especially the “appropriate theory,” are matched with the various problems archaeologists deal with locally as locally acquired data do not always fit the explanatory models that originated elsewhere (Lozny 1995). Theoretical schools have arisen and claimed to have had a privileged status in determining what constitutes a valid explanation in archaeological research, and the recent literature shows that this is still the case (Trigger 1989, 2006; Johnson 1999<sup>4</sup>; Hodder 2001; Klejn 2001, 2004). In historical perspective, such schools were seen not only as grounded in partial bodies of empirical material, but also as reactions to preceding theoretical positions.<sup>5</sup> My research contributes to understanding of the interconnection among the social sciences, economy, and politics. Specifically, it explains why certain theoretical aspects of archaeology are resilient and new ideas leisurely penetrate local scenes.

## **Archaeology and Its (Changing) Intellectual, Socioeconomic, and Political Contexts**

Social sciences are strongly influenced by three factors: (1) intellectual tradition, (2) socioeconomic conditions, and (3) political stress. Scientific theories and practice are not free of political and socioeconomic constraints<sup>6</sup> and this bond is reinforced through a variety of means, especially financial sponsorship of research,

---

<sup>2</sup>For discussion on global power structure see Held et al. (1999); Grewal (2008); de Blij (2008); also see discussion on the idea of complex interdependence put forward by Nye and Keohane (1977) and Keohane and Nye (2000).

<sup>3</sup>Here I refer to archeology as a modern science and not just human interest in the past which is discussed in any good textbook of archaeology, for instance Chazan (2007).

<sup>4</sup>See review of Johnson by Klejn (2006).

<sup>5</sup>They develop in cladogenetic rather than anagenetic manner, to use a biological metaphor.

<sup>6</sup>See the World View column in *Nature* for a range of issues underlying interactions between science and politics; also Guston (2000) who thoroughly analyzed this uneasy and troubled relationship. The Kennewick Man controversy serves as a good example of how politics and science related to human past intersect.

whether private or state-controlled.<sup>7</sup> Such constraints create extreme conditions for the social sciences and their general paradigmatic outlook. My studies conducted in Eastern Europe<sup>8</sup> show that this relationship is especially strong in transitional societies.

## ***Intellectual Tradition***

Hodder (1991) wrote that *...the failure of New Archaeology to take an equally firm hold throughout Europe suggests the possible existence of European perspective in archaeological theory which is diverse and different from the North American view.* And further suggested that *...the European rejection of theory derived from particular political context of the recent political manipulation of history and prehistory, and from theoretical perspective that was deeply historical....* Both statements imply the existence of politically inspired, European-specific model of archaeological theory, rooted in local intellectual traditions. A historical review of archaeology in Eastern Europe confirms this suggestion. For the past 50 years, social theories in that region have been influenced by western writers such as Marx, Gramsci, Hegel, Croce, Levi-Strauss, Dumezil, Elide, Braudel, Wittgenstein, Feyerband, Weber, Habermas, Althusser, Sartre, Collingwood, Breuil, Leroi-Gourhan, to name just those whose works were available on both sides of the Cold War divide. Local theoreticians<sup>9</sup> presented original ideas in their native languages not commonly read in the West, and most showed intellectual affinity with the mentioned scholars. Obviously, local intellectual traditions are permeable, but the outside influence has been limited as Eastern European scholars traditionally favored two foreign languages: German and French.<sup>10</sup> It has been a long-lasting tradition among Eastern European *intelligentsia* to learn German or French, and not English. Many scholars were efficient in Russian which, from the end of WWII until the systemic transformation of the 1989–1990, was a mandatory second language at school in the Soviet Bloc countries.

Analyzing the post-WWII intellectual tradition in Eastern Europe, it becomes clear that the traditional culture-history approach has been widely followed. There are also theories rooted in Marxism<sup>11</sup> that have been mixed with the elements of

---

<sup>7</sup>Using early functionalism by Malinowski as example, Eric Wolf (2001[1999]:72) emphasized that funding was available not necessarily for interesting research, but for the one the money-controllers liked for different reasons, usually political (to study colonized areas).

<sup>8</sup>Throughout the text, I use Eastern Europe in the political pre-1990 sense. Presently, most of the former Eastern European countries, especially the EU members, would be labeled as Central Europe or Southern Europe. The data regarding Eastern and Central Europe quoted throughout the text were collected while on a Fulbright fellowship in Eastern Europe 1996–1997.

<sup>9</sup>For instance, in Poland works by Topolski, Kmita, Nowak, Tabaczynski and Kolakowski – his latest works are available mainly in English.

<sup>10</sup>French and German were very common among older generations, while younger scholars are more sympathetic toward the English language.

<sup>11</sup>History of material culture was the leading methodology.

other theoretical approaches adopted from the West, and such blending resulted in a “vernacular” outlook of archaeological theory pointed out by Bursche and Taylor (1991), who suggested that East European Marxism was fused into the western form of positivism in, as they put it, ...*an alliance which many in Anglo-American archaeology would abandon*. This hypothesis certainly deserves further elaboration.

Other authors reported on a similar phenomenon concerning the elements of the processual approach blended into local methodologies. In Poland and the Czech Republic (Kobylinski 1991; Neustupny 1991 respectively), the methods of New Archaeology were integrated within the problem orientation provided by Marxism, while in other Eastern European countries, Marxism was never rejected but used as an analytical tool and mixed with other ideas. In fact, a range of Marxist viewpoints developed in European archaeology of the last 50 years rejected the intellectual values of positivistic in its foundation’s processual approach in archaeology. Instead, complex dialectical and critical approaches have been proposed (for instance Palubicka and Tabaczynski 1986).

Obviously, the post-WWII politics was essential in sharpening the division between European archaeologies on both sides of the Iron Curtain, but political isolation may have been secondary to affect regional archaeological theory and practice (for a contrary view see Marciniak and Raczkowski 1991). Local intellectual traditions are critical in understanding regional approaches to archaeological explanation. Marxism, positivism, and scientific methodology were all linked and, among others, this blend can be seen as a distinctive idiosyncrasy of Eastern European archaeology of the past 50 years. Naturally, because of political constraints, there was quite a different perception of Marxism in West European countries than in Poland or the Czech Republic. Despite these diverse reactions to Marxism, it is interesting to notice a phenomenon of quite similar response in terms of adopting (or rejecting) Anglo-American ideas.<sup>12</sup>

### **Whose Idea: Yours, Mine, Theirs?**

As might be expected, the rhetorical appeal of scientific developmental policy is aimed at western academic institutions. Knowledge is treated as valuable commodity to be sold or otherwise transferred. The evaluation of the effectiveness of methodologies has been slow to develop, for criteria of success are problematic to determine. My approach focuses on how knowledge, western or not, is used in practice. I treat knowledge not as an abstract conceptual system, but as situated practice. Such practice shapes local approaches to knowledge, although this does not imply that there are no

---

<sup>12</sup>Archaeological theory in Eastern Europe still awaits serious study. An attempt has been made in Poland in the three-volume publication titled *Theory and Practice of Archaeological Research* (Hensel et al., 1986–1998), but this publication is not tightly focused on theory and presents mostly methodological discussions. Strangely, one volume of this set has been published in Polish and two in English.

written general canons (for discussion of several case studies see Hobbart 1993). Local approaches should be considered as sensible to the particularities of place, occasion, and circumstance. The stress is on the value of treating local approaches seriously and examining their potential contribution to intellectual and general welfare. Scientific knowledge as observed in developmental practice generally represents the superior knowing expert as agent and the people being developed as ignorant passive recipients or object of this knowledge. Such knowledge requires the homogenization and quantification of what is potentially qualitatively different. Homogenization, however, underwrites a linear evolutionary view of history by ignoring the discontinuities and differences in discursive construction of the economic and political conditions. Whatever its merit, scientific knowledge applied to development is not neutral, nor is the implications of its use, and is generally constituted around a metaphor (see Salmon 1982 for discussion).

The criteria of what constitutes knowledge, what is to be excluded, and who is designated as qualified to know involve acts of power (Foucault 1971). The nature of knowledge is metaphoric, for it reflects our perception of reality (truth is a mixture of facts and their intellectual, symbolic comprehension). As Rorty (1980) has pointed out, the assumption of western epistemology is that the human mind is like a mirror, which reflects reality and problems with accurate knowledge boiled down to preparing the mirror. Knowledge is positivistically conceived as true propositions about the world being treated as a valuable resource. Both the mirror and commodity metaphor exclude criticism. Criticism, if appears, is limited to telling other scholars about their ignorance and not used as the means to understanding or, more realistically, reducing the degree of misunderstanding.

Ironically, the growth of knowledge entails the possibility of increasing ignorance (through selective learning). It might practically happen as local approaches to science become devaluated or simply ignored in favor of foreign-induced scientific practice and theories. It has to be pointed out, however, that historical and anthropological knowledge are dialectically related similarly to the relationship identified between scientific and philosophical knowledge (see Collingwood 1933:26–53). This relates directly to a more serious problem on the nature of understanding of the parties involved. The naïve implication is that if both sides improve communication, a major obstacle will be removed. Its naivety is twofold, it rests in a possibility that people may not want to communicate but prefer to dissimulate, and in an optimistic assumption that knowledge as communicable proposition presumes rationality to be shared.

### ***Socioeconomic Constrains***

Socioeconomics is about the bilateral relationship between economic conditions and social life. Socioeconomic data concern a range of variables from demographics to income level, employment, and overall status of sciences. The impact of a wider socioeconomic context on theory and practice of science is obvious (for instance

Cottle 2002). In such context, histories of science can be presented as a discourse of development intended to show that local socioeconomic conditions contributed the most to creating the background for the social sciences. Development is a political and economic concept and is recognized through a dialectical confrontation with underdeveloped. The usual thinking is that politically or economically underdeveloped regions will also be considered as such in all other aspects of social life, science included. The problem of identifying and describing development is enormously elusive, however, for it has been thought of as more or less planned change. Bringing together anthropological and sociological theories concerned with development allows for a debate on development, developmental priorities, patterns, and projects and the social and cultural implications and consequences of developmental programs. These include practice and policy transformation in development, local knowledge and the creation of ignorance, the analysis of power relations and resources distribution between interest groups, participants, institutions, and organizational linkages, and the “translation” of meaning and policy.

I am interested in how local socioeconomic conditions may have impacted the development of archaeological thinking at times of systemic transition (cf. Lozny 2002), and in my view, changes observable in some Eastern European countries since 1989 should be characterized as a spontaneous patchwork of ideas rather than coherent agenda. In consequence, I see a potential danger in that as scientific knowledge on archaeological theory and practice grows, so will grow the possibility of ignorance about local knowledge. Ignorance, however, is not antithesis of knowledge. It relates to moral judgment (see Hobbart 1993:1) and, ironically, also local authors participate in such ignorance.

There is also another reason why development (change) may not be welcomed, which relates specifically to the control of development; who decides what to change, when, how, and why? The centralization of political and economic decision-making includes centrally controlled science. Such structural relationship between politics and science materialized, for instance, in the idea of national academies of sciences propagated in all the Soviet Bloc countries. The academy was a flagship institution to the centralized structure of academia.

Dissolution of the Soviet Bloc order has launched massive and unmatched scale changes in social, economic, and political structures. As the old system crumbled, new problems surfaced abruptly. With no ready-to-use solutions and well thought-out remedies, the new social and economic arrangements constitute a patchwork of ideas and wishful thinking rather than well-structured systems. Such socioeconomic instability and constant uncertainty reflect poorly on the status quo of sciences, education, and culture in general. As the transitional period extends into the third decade now, the future of these social aspects does look bleak as other socially more sensitive areas will be given full priority. Such situation may create a dangerous vacuum for the social sciences, with many fields regressing and remaining well behind the (Anglo-American?) mainstream. Such pessimistic scenario, neither unusual nor unexpected, may, ironically, turn into a situation, which eventually will force the necessary changes in the right direction.

Social policy which encompasses culture and education is perhaps among the most important areas neglected by postcommunist reformers. Liberals who came to power throughout much of Eastern Europe after 1989 initiated radical structural changes in macroeconomic policy, property ownership, corporate governance, tax laws, market regulations, and many other areas, but social policy has ranked relatively low on the policy agenda (see Ringold 1999). Observers of the early transition period noted that the first days following the collapse of communism provided a unique opportunity for policy innovations and substantive reform. The absence of a coherent and coordinated approach to social policy reform has left an unfinished agenda for successive postcommunist governments to address. It seems that many changes in education policy can take decades to affect educational outcomes. No doubt, social policy making in the postcommunist countries has been shaped by the inheritance of communist institutions and processes (Barr 1994). The achievements of the communist regimes in social policy provision were notable, including education and culture. On the other hand, institutional and organizational weaknesses were significant. When transition began, spending on the social sectors in the region ranged from 15 to 25% of GDP, but little of it went to sponsor culture and education. Poland was the most dramatic case where the share of GDP devoted to social expenditure expanded from 17% in 1989 to 32% in 1995. Even if the social spending has not been cut by many governments, there was no significant increase in expenditure on education and culture in 1996 when real GDP surpassed its 1989 level. Ringold (1999) estimated that the real expenditures on education in the region declined by as much as 70% of the pretransition level. Without exception, the countries of Central and Eastern Europe inherited education systems that provided full and equitable access to education at the preschool and primary levels. However, the legacy of central planning distorted patterns of access, especially at the secondary and tertiary levels. Education was tailored to the demands of the socialist state and, as a result, was biased toward highly specialized vocational training at the expense of more flexible programs. Two decades into the transition process, there is increasing evidence of deterioration in quality and access to education, particularly in the poorer countries of the region.

### ***Political Stress***

Another principal factor of my analysis relates to political conditions inspiring archaeological theory and practice. Archaeologists should critically examine the political environment in which knowledge is produced. Knowledge is never absolute, nor certain, but must be contextualized and related to a particular time and space. It seems that any adequate conceptual and theoretical framework developed to study the past must reflect upon archaeology as professional discipline in the present. The political context and theoretical school to which archaeologists subscribe impact the way they think and argue. I propose to identify those areas in which archaeological theory and practice are profoundly influenced by specific

political conditions. We should not seek to reduce our thinking about the past to a mechanical application of naïve positivism dressed up as scientific procedure (in which methodology is confused with theory); equally, we should not believe that criteria of testability and falsification should be abandoned in favor of speculations about unrecorded intentions in which anyone's opinion is as good as anyone else's.

The principal factors of the analysis are specific political conditions which contribute to answering questions like: How is archaeology administered? What conditions inspire research agendas? Who sponsors projects? If the research topics are designed outside of the professional circles, what are the consequences of such an approach for both scientific and social spheres? The perception of archaeology and its findings by the public should certainly be one of major concerns. We have created enormous public interest about the past and the majority of projects are currently publicly funded (tax payers).

Political agendas affect all of the social sciences and can be seen in research themes, theoretical perspectives and methodology, project designs, structuring of the field, (for instance, academic vs. applied archaeology, the role of national academies of sciences), etc. Communists' governments lavishly sponsored archaeological research, but the results have often been used for political gains (this is not inherent to communists regimes alone). Just the name of the discipline, archaeology, anthropological archaeology, prehistory, history of material culture, etc., suggests certain political orientations. The past is viewed, researched, and interpreted according to a perspective the scholar follows. I am suggesting here that we should be after understanding the past, but also after understanding how we understand the past.

## The Common Traits of Archaeology Worldwide

I view current archaeology as part of geoculture (Wallerstein's term) and identify the most common characteristics of its social history. It seems that the nineteenth century German-devised culture-history is the most common archaeological paradigm around the globe and contributes to the use of archaeological data for nationalistic purposes, while other approaches, like processual studies or historical ecology, are far less popular. Its popularity might be in the fact that it answers the most basic questions about the past like: who, when, and where, but not necessarily how or why.<sup>13</sup> A quick review of histories of archaeology around the world also suggests that the most common practice is to use archaeological data for political and nationalistic gains.

Trigger (1984:358) pointed out that most archaeological traditions are probably nationalistic in orientation, especially in Europe where the past has been romanticized

---

<sup>13</sup>Synchronic in its essence culture-history approach is not evolutionary and therefore certain questions which require diachronic approach will not be asked (cf. Steward 1972).

and used in official governmental propaganda as part of nation-building ideologies (see also Kohl and Fawcett 1995 for more detailed discussion). A quick historical review strongly suggests that archaeology was keenly supported by oppressive, totalitarian regimes (see Klejn 1997 for Soviet Russia; Chang 1981 for Communist China; Arnold 1992 for Nazi Germany; Lech 1997–1998 for Communist Poland). Glyn and Renfrew (1988:109) pointed out that in 1939 courses in prehistory were given in about 25 German universities and archaeological research was generously supported by the Nazi government (also see Arnold 1990). Less oppressive regimes also used archaeological data for political gains. In Scandinavia, there was a notion of ethnic continuity and archaeologists were in fact discovering the Bronze and Iron Age ancestors of, for instance, modern Danes (Trigger 1984). Fowler (1987:234) discussed the use of archaeological data to build nationalistic sentiments in Britain from the early 1500s until the nineteenth century, when history and archaeology were used to glorify the Britain's past.

The two volumes of the journal *World Archaeology* published in 1981–1982 (Trigger and Glover 1981b, 1982) contain idiographic summaries of archaeologies in several regions of the world and some authors also discussed wider social and theoretical contexts. Here, I briefly review some of the points presented in those volumes to give the reader a chance to confront them with arguments offered by the contributors to this book. In case of regions not represented in this book, like China or the Middle East, I provide a more detailed synopsis.

Chang (1981:166) pointed out that all major aspects of traditional antiquarianism and modern archaeology were present in China after 1949. However, under the new political regime, significant new changes occurred: Marxist historical materialism inspired the theoretical frame and the state-controlled archaeology financially and ideologically by structuring it within state-run bureaucracies. Since 1949, Chinese archaeology has occupied a privileged political position stimulated by a governmental policy to “include archaeology as an important part of the political education” (Chang 1980:497). Chinese archaeology has also been politicized in other ways by redirecting its focus from studying the past to researching class conflict. As Chang (1981:167) pointed out, Mao's policy was to “let the past serve the present,” and therefore archaeologists attempted to justify their work in terms of its current applicability. Chang also pointed out (ibid. 157) that, despite its scientific outlook, Chinese archaeology remained a tool serving Chinese historiography. The nationalistic outlook was introduced through the emphasis on the cultivating national dignity and confidence (Trigger 1984:359).

Jose Lorenzo (1981) reflected on the history of archaeology in Mexico and pointed out that the positivistic approach in archaeology was present since the days of the Commission Scientifique du Mexique established by Napoleon III in France to direct researchers who were a part of the French Expeditionary Force of 1862. The research was ignored in Mexico as being related to the invaders, but the positivistic approach to archaeology lasted until the early twentieth century when modern archaeology was introduced in Mexico.

Lorenzo's (ibid. 201) statement on the goals of archaeology in Mexico is clearly motivated by the state ideology:

We archaeologists of Hispano-America have a historical and social commitment in our work and obligation to our people. This includes not only those of us who practice in regions which held the splendid high civilizations and where the Indians are in the majority, but also the others, in countries where these are not great architectural monuments, rich tombs or pieces of exceptional esthetic interest. To us archaeology must be history.

Lorenzo pointed out that in the National School of Anthropology and History, the key academic center in Mexico to train archaeologists, students were generally taught in similar way as in the United States, but at the same time the school maintained its historical orientation (as emphasized in its name). Although Boaz and Kroeber's influences were clear, the historical approach prevailed. Nationalistic tendencies of Mexican archaeology were reinforced throughout the twentieth century when archaeologists focused on demonstrating links between modern Mexican society and the pre-Hispanic civilizations (for discussion see Trigger 1984:359).

Abdullah H. Masry (1981:222–239) discussed archaeology in the Near East and pointed out that the older generation of local archaeologists in Arabia (term used by AHM) was strongly influenced by the historic significance of the region during the pre-Islamic and Islamic periods. He further suggested that the emphasis on the historic glory of the region was triggered by two conditions: the Ottoman rules and colonial context. This tendency to acknowledge cultural identity through archaeological data also endured among the younger generation of local scholars (*ibid.* 228). The traditional historic approach continued into the 1940s and 1950s, while new approaches oriented toward historical ecology and paleoenvironments infiltrated the region in the 1960s and in later times. The new approach to archaeological research included methodological innovation like problem-oriented research designs and more anthropological outlook of archaeological research. Works on the Ubaid period in the 1970s serve as an example of ideas propagated most likely by foreign scholars working in the area. Since the mid-1970s, archaeology was again redefined as science of the past, when a comprehensive survey of sites with no regard to their historical significance or problem-oriented research was conducted in Saudi Arabia. During the 1980s, a tendency to relate archaeological research to problems and questions relevant to contemporary societies emerged and local archaeologies were flavored with nationalistic sentiments (in the appearance of pan-Islamic or pan-Arab orientations, see Trigger 1984:359) as the culture-history approach was entrenched in the local tradition of practicing archaeology.

European evolutionist ideas mixed with American influence are very clearly seen in the practice of archaeology in Japan (Ikawa-Smith 1982:299–301) since the Tokugawa Period, which marked the openness of Japan to western influence. The nationalistic interest of Japanese archeology was propagated through the activity of the Archaeological Society established in 1895 and the Tokyo National Museum. The key interest, as pointed out by Ikawa-Smith (*ibid.* 301), was to research the Japanese cultural patterns of the past. Two schools of archaeological practice emerged: the “ethnic archaeology” dedicated to nationalistic objectives, and the “museum school,” also labeled by Ikawa-Smith as “fine art archaeology,” or “antiquarian school,” oriented toward studying the material objects of the past. It contributed to the creation of meticulous typologies and enforced interest in the

history of material culture (clearly a Marxist-influenced approach). Within the last century, archeology in Japan was strongly related to local politics with periods of nationalistic objectives giving way to more liberal approaches. As pointed out by Ikawa-Smith, Japanese colleagues were primarily interested in culture-history and typology, and in the 1980s, archaeology in Japan was in its post-WWII beginnings.

Bulkin et al. (1982:272–295) took on the Soviet archaeology and pointed out that prehistory was considered a part of history that filled the gap between natural and social history. They (ibid. 287) wrote that:

The unity of the various branches of archaeology, together with their common ties to history and emphasis on a historical approach helps archaeologists to understand better from the holistic perspective the culture-historical process and the evolution of culture and society.

This quote suggests that the Soviet archaeology followed two key principles: culture-history was the focal point of interest and the evolutionary outlook on cultural change served as its explanatory devise. The authors emphasized that socioeconomic conditions heavily influenced Soviet archeology of the 1920s and later, when a new generation of archaeologists found themselves in a very different social environment founded on Marxist dogmas. Since the 1930s, Soviet archaeology was also heavily nationalistic. In the 1950s, certain attempts were made to ensure archaeological research for areas of adverse effects due to infrastructural changes. Dialectically understood historical materialism became the key methodological principle of Soviet archaeology used to analyze data from seven different perspectives (ibid. 279–282), which included: archaeological history, archaeological ethnogenesis, archaeological sociology, descriptive archaeology, archeotechnology, archaeological ecology, and theoretical archaeology. Traces of these trends are also visible in the Soviet satellite countries in Europe, and Soviet-influenced countries in Asia, and Central and South America. Very recent examples of nationalistic sentiments concern sites related to the Indo-European ancestors, like the one at Arkhaim (see Medvedev 1999; Shnirelman 1995; Lamberg-Karlovsky 2002), and the Slavs (Chesko 1998).

A clear nationalistic outlook of archaeology is visible in Israel (Bar-Yosef and Mazar 1982:310–325; Trigger 1984:358–359). Archaeology was employed to justify the antiquity of the Israeli state and nation. Archaeology there is understood as historic field providing evidence to support a blend of religious and political claims. Archaeology is considered a part of the humanities and generations of archaeologists were trained within this tradition. As pointed out by Bar-Yosef and Mazar (ibid. 318), the anthropological approach was not common in the early 1980s.

The beginning of archaeology in India is dated to the late eighteenth–early nineteenth century when the Asiatic Society and a museum were formed in Calcutta. The outlook of archaeology was strictly historic, to inquire on the history of antiquities of Asia (Chakrabarti 1982:226–343). Nationalistic in nature, Indian archaeology followed an evolutionary approach to investigate changes observable through material evidence. The British colonial influence is clear.

Waterbolk (1981:240–254) did not see any specific characteristics of Dutch archaeology, which seems to be a blend of several European traditions, namely

German, French, and British, but he pointed out that there was a nationalistic context in the history of archaeology in this country (Waterbalk 1981:245).

A historic approach to the past is also visible in Australia (Murray and White 1981:255–263), where the term “prehistory” is favored over ahistoric sociocultural anthropology in relation to studying the past. Australian archaeology, as the authors point out, was initially (the early twentieth century) devoted to tracing the colonial past.

A very strong relationship between history and archaeology existed traditionally in Scandinavia (Klindt-Jansen 1975; Moberg 1982:209–221) and contributed to the nationalistic flavor of archaeology since its inception. The typological approach was the key method to see changes of Scandinavian cultures over time and also to claim the longevity (continuity) of those cultures. Moberg (1982:213) pointed out that in the beginning of the 1980s Scandinavian archaeology refocused its key interests from meticulous chronology to other aspects of the past.

In France, a new approach to archaeological research identified as “ethnographic digging” (Auduze and Leroi-Gourhan 1981:172) surfaced in the 1960s. The authors pointed out that the Soviet archaeology and the Marxist notion of archaeology as the history of material culture played a part in this new development.

It seems that nationalism fueled especially European archaeology (and European-inspired archaeologies elsewhere) by the end of the nineteenth and early twentieth century and ethnicity, even if not stated *expressis verbis*, became one of the key research topics guided through the culture-history approach. Certain explanatory approaches emerged throughout Europe to identify “others” (see Harris 1968: 100–102) and scholars focused on tracing histories of modern ethnic groups in the past. Archaeology in the US appears to be free of nationalistic sentiments (see Fowler 1986:151), or at least, it is not as nationalistic as in other countries around the world.

The three most common characteristics of social histories of archaeology worldwide are:

- Culture-history approach as the key methodology and basis for locally generated theories (with strong nationalistic flavor).
- Use of archaeology for political (nationalistic) goals.
- Tendency to relate topics of archaeological research to the existing political conditions and demands.

Archaeological theory correlates with the general outlook on science and scientific ideas offered at certain times. When evolutionism was introduced and the comparative method used to identify stages (types) in biological evolution, archaeologists employed the Three Age System (Thomsen in 1820) and typology as the key approach to systemize and manipulate data, which formed the basis for theorizing on the past human behavior. At times of the Cold War-related technological inventions of the 1950s and 1960s, scientists (especially natural scientists like geographers, but also archaeologists) concluded on the use of new methodologies, which included new data processing methods. By the end of the twentieth century, when the idea of sustainable development was introduced, archaeologists, along with most natural scientists, are more concerned about the preservation and conservation of cultural heritage. I therefore hypothesize that there is a correlation between overall socioeconomic conditions and intellectual outlook on things and this correlation

**Table 1** Generalized correlations between innovations in archaeological research and socioeconomic and political conditions

Period	Innovation	Saturation point	Key figures/events
Industrial revolution; colonialism	Taxonomy and interest in evolutionary explanations; Linnaeus, Lamarck, Darwin	WWI (1918)	Engels, Boucher de Perthes, Breuil, Childe, Kidder, Morgan, Thomsen
Nation-building of the 1900s; Social revolutions	Historicism propagated by Boas and Kossina; development of social theories; nationalistic movements in Europe; culture-history approach; historical materialism	Cold War (1950s)	Boas, Bordes, Childe, Hensel, Kossina, Petire, MacNeish, Willey, International Congresses of Slavic archaeology in Eastern Europe, UISSP
Cold War technological progress of the 1950s–1970s; developmentalism <sup>14</sup>	New Archaeology; processual approach; neoevolutionary outlook on culture change; remix of historicism; historical and dialectical materialism	Globalization (1990s until after 2000)	Binford, Clarke, Courbin, Flannery, Gardin, Hodder, Klejn, Kohl, Leone, Neustupny, Renfrew, Sanoja and Vargas, Steward, Shanks and Tilley, Tabaczynski, TAG
Globalization of the 20/21 c.	Sustainable development; world heritage conservation and preservation; nondestructive research methods; indigenous partaking	2050(?) what after globalization?	Cleere, Demoule, King, Kobylinski, Lipe, Politis, Ucko, Willems, WAC; UNESCO, Malta Convention

seems to follow a nomothetic path similar to what in history of economy has been labeled as the Kondratiev wave (Table 1, see also Barnett 1998; Devezas 2006; Grinin et al. 2006 for more discussion on K-waves and the explanatory value of this model). A much generalized look at the key developments in archaeology and overall scientific breakthroughs corroborate my claim. I do not concern here academic buzzwords and fads which are fickle and usually last but a decade or two; my interest is in durable ideas.

<sup>14</sup>As discussed by Wallerstein (2004a, b).

Modern anthropology and archaeology developed in Europe at the time of nation-building (Wolf 1999; reprint in Wolf 2001). History and archaeology were used to glorify the past, especially if there were glorious events and/or individuals in the past. Museums were considered the bastions of the war to win the past and first institutions to employ anthropologists and archaeologists as curators and research scholars. For most of the nineteenth century, there was no market for anthropologists as teachers or members of state administrations. The academic (scientific) research was limited to certain institutions for the elite, like the royal academies of sciences, or Napoleonic *grandes ecoles*, or the Stalinist's academies of sciences. Eventually, universities combined teaching and research in one institution.

At the end of the nineteenth century, two distinct approaches to human culture emerged: the evolutionist approach propagating gradual change and the diffusionist approach focusing on the distribution of cultures on the "space grid." Wolf (2001[1999]) points out that the rising tide of nationalism accorded increasing importance to space by propagating the idea of people's distinctive souls rooted in living landscapes, thus providing ideological fuel for the territorial aspirations of nation-states. This way of thinking about the past materialized after WWI when administrative boundaries of many European states have been reinterpreted and changed. For instance, in Poland which emerged as a sovereign country after more than a century of political nonexistence, archaeologists combined the "time grid" with the "space grid" and offered a mixture of evolutionist and diffusionist ideas to discuss the emergence of "archaeological cultures" and their distribution over the living landscape. This approach is still strong, especially among those who research the problem about the origins of ethnic groups (like the eastern European archaeological genre called Slavic archaeology). The debate between the two opposing views, *allochthonic* vs. *autochthonic*, suggests the fusion of evolutionary ideas with diffusionist way of thinking. It seems that one group (of *allochthonic* persuasion) accepted the view propagated in the nineteenth century by the German geographer Friedrich Ratzel (1844–1904 in Wolf 2001:68), who believed that each world region was originally populated by people with cultures of distinct origins and characteristics and that each culture was carried outward through mass migrations in search for living space. In this perspective, cultural integration preceded migration, which then carried whole cultural complexes integrally into lands of new settlement. The second (*autochthonic*) variant of the diffusionist approach, also of German origin, visualized a multiplicity of diffusionary mechanisms in which aggressive migrations were featured only as "crass instances of the process" (Kroeber 1948:427). In this perspective, culture complexes did not travel as integral wholes, but were only gradually assembled over time. Wolf points out (2001:69) that such diffusionism, relying on *Schlagkraft* (strike force) of its carriers in the process of migration, fits well into nationalist and imperialist ideologies, especially in the eastern borderland of Europe (Russia, Prussia, and Austria). Thus, German diffusionism was welcomed into Marxist *etnografia* after the Soviet revolution in order to emphasize local history and diffusion (pan-Slavic movement and the origin of the so-called Slavic archeology).

## Archaeology as Geoculture

Archaeology as a global phenomenon is viewed as part of global culture (other elements of global culture include global economy and commerce, political system, patterns in teaching and education, etc). At times of globalization and the global impact of commerce, politics, and environmental stress on culture, it is interesting to see what effect those stressors made on archaeology worldwide. I am interested in the world of modern archeology seen as a part of geoculture (Wallerstein) or world culture (Meyer) and suggest that its present condition is a by-product linked to the spread of economic and political ideas identified by Wallerstein (1974, 1993) as the modern world-system.<sup>15</sup> The spread of archaeology worldwide in the twentieth century is considered an aftermath of the capitalist world-system and not one of its elements. The world-system theory (Wallerstein 1974) suggests that economic conditions integrate labor forms within functioning division of labor. It is a dynamic social system organized according to certain rules and maintained through internal disparate relations. Although Marxist in its essence, it explains global economic constraints rather than just political imperialistic dominance and hegemony. In Wallerstein's (1974) terms, it is a "world economy," integrated through the market rather than a political center, in which two or more regions are interdependent with respect to necessities like food, fuel, and protection and two or more polities compete for domination without the emergence of one single center forever (Goldfrank 2000). Wallerstein (1974) also considered world-system as a "... multicultural territorial division of labor in which the production and exchange of basic goods and raw materials is necessary for the everyday life of its inhabitants." This division of labor refers to the forces and relations of production of the world-economy as a whole and it leads to the existence of two interdependent regions: *core* and *periphery*. These are geographically and culturally different, one focusing on labor-intensive and the other on capital-intensive production (Goldfrank 2000). The core-periphery relationship is structural. Semiperipheral states act as buffer zones between core and periphery and have a mix of the kinds of activities and institutions that exist on them (Skocpol 1977).

I see the world-system as the result of the increasing interdependence of cultures and ecosystems that were once relatively isolated by distance and boundaries. For instance, archaeologists trained in core countries propagate their ideas in semiperiphery and periphery countries either because they get jobs there or because they get funding in the core country which is limited or nonexistent in semiperiphery and periphery. In consequence, world-system theory argues that the present-day interconnectedness of the world has generated a global culture, wherein the trends

---

<sup>15</sup>A similar phenomenon has been observed in relation to the spread of certain models of education, especially with the use of modern communication tools (see Arnove 1980, 2009; Spring 2009); the idea of "world culture" introduced by John W. Meyer in the 1970s (1971; Meyer and Hannan 1979) was in a much simplified way and in a broader context discussed recently by Friedman 2005.

of complementarity and specialization are being manifested at international level. However, if from the economic point of view we could entertain the idea whether it is possible (desirable) for the whole world to attain a similar standard of living, such objective (similar standard of research) may not be preferred in regard to archaeological theory and methods simply because objectives behind researching the past may differ locally. Diversity in scientific approaches and methods to collect and manipulate data is needed, whereas any attempt to unify both will seriously limit our quest for knowledge (it would be comparable to ideology with all its limitations and shortcomings and will contribute to ignorance discussed above). It has been argued that objectivity in studying the past is limited (see Shanks and Tilley 1987 for more discussion) and meaningful explanations require specific approaches to studying cultural changes in the past and present.

I use the world-system approach to view the circulation of ideas within a global scientific community driven by similar rules as Wallerstein's "world's economy." The process is asymmetric with the core areas impacting periphery harder than periphery may retaliate. The impact might be of different scale, from minimal to full dependency. Peripheral people can at times negotiate effectively due to control of key resources and extensive local knowledge (Blackhawk 2006; Hall 1989, 2006; Kardulias 2007). The idea is that if countries with high export rate become economically dominant, also countries with high export rate of ideas become intellectually hegemonic. Since the Industrial Revolution and mass migrations of the nineteenth and the twentieth century, scientific community became interconnected. Archaeology also can be used to demonstrate such interconnectivity. Following Wallerstein's (1974) model of redistribution of resources, I suggest that ideas infiltrate from the (political, economic) core (developed) to the periphery (undeveloped) not because they are desired, but because they are propagated by political and economic dominants. Such dynamics is antagonistic by nature and might be seen as imperialistic or hegemonic. In effect, certain level of homogenization of ideas is achieved, which contributes to the creation of identities (memberships) necessary for affinities with certain "schools" of thought. The magnitude of such influence is changing and depends on the technological means and levels of communication (language, meetings, personal contacts, etc.). It is in the economic context that the *core* exploits the *periphery* through the market-regulated economy. Among the most important structures of the current world-system is a power hierarchy between *core* and *periphery*, in which powerful and wealthy *core* societies dominate and exploit weak and poor peripheral societies. The division of world-economy involves a hierarchy of occupational tasks, in which tasks requiring higher levels of skill and greater capitalization are reserved for higher-ranking areas. Similarly, there seem to be a hierarchy in the network of ideas, where those coming from a context of economic and political domination tend to be easier accepted than others if not simply preferred. A good example here would be the spread of processual archaeology of the 1960s and 1970s seen, for instance, through the number of grant proposals funded because they related to this methodology.<sup>16</sup> The problem that should be examined is:

---

<sup>16</sup>The processual methodology was not uncritically accepted, however, as the Eastern European scenario discussed above demonstrates.

What characteristics of local archaeologies were diffused from elsewhere so their appearance can be explained through the world-system analysis (WSA), and which were home-grown products and emerged according to the rule discussed by Meyer et al. (1997) (see below).

A historic overview is necessary in order to understand the present condition of archaeology worldwide. Histories of archaeology are usually idiographic reviews aiming at presenting ostensibly objective accounts of ideas and practices. I am neither interested in a merely idiographic presentation of changes in archaeological thought, nor in a simplistic analysis of a bimodal opposition underlined by the existence of the dominating and dominated, which relates to the dependency theory (Gunder Frank 1969; see also Chirot and Hall 1982; Godsen 2004), followed by the proponents of the so-called colonial concept of archaeology. My goal is to look for a nomothetic context of the spread of archaeology worldwide and to see how socioeconomic realities inflict on the social sciences and especially archaeology.

I employ the WSA (Wallerstein 2004b; Kardulias and Hall 2007) to analyze specific conditions that stimulate social change on a global scale in order to see whether they may provide insights into the comparative study of social history of archaeology worldwide. The approach points out to two particular analytical contexts, European expansion and the rise of modernity, and helps in understanding of the global trends in theory and practice of archaeology. I consider two hypotheses here:

- More affluent and modernized countries enlarge access to cultural resources by generating public interest in archaeology.
- Interests in archaeology existing in more affluent countries also appear in other regions regardless of local socioeconomic and political conditions.

Ample evidence exists to test the first hypothesis. The second hypothesis is supported by an imaginary scenario discussed by Meyer et al. (1997:173–174) that an isolated society when confronted with modern world culture would adopt its basic constitutive patterns in more or less spontaneous manner. Both options justify the use of the world-system approach, which suggests import of ideas along with interests present in affluent regions combined with the availability of funds. In regions where local funds were limited and may have hindered local developments, archaeological theory and practice were diffused from other economically and politically more significant regions. Such diffusion commonly included scholars from the core countries conducting fieldwork and inspiring local colleagues with new ideas.

Since the Middle Ages, foreign education was significant in introducing ideas and creating international networks of followers. Italian universities created a network of users of the Latin language through which certain ideas were propagated onto foreign territories all over Europe. But those universities also produced such thinkers as Galileo and Copernicus who turned against the commonly accepted models of thinking. Since the Industrial Revolution, Germany and France dominated European education and were replaced by the UK and US-based academic centers in the aftermath of WWII. Russia served as an educational center for Eastern Europe before 1917, while from the late 1940s until 1990 the USSR had a more widespread impact in Europe, Africa, Asia, and South America. After 1991, which

marked the end of the Cold War, western academic centers gained exclusive power in dictating academic agenda. Currently, universities in the core countries educate foreign students who go home to spread out what they learned and they became significant elements of the WSA. Clearly, for the past 500 years, patterns of thinking were propagated along ideological lines supported by the economic and political supremacy.

Throughout the twentieth century, ideas were introduced via global communication networks to remote regions. Local practitioners may have not always accepted a new idea literally, but conceptualized it through their own cultural meanings to see whether the idea fits the local conditions. Eventually, it might have been rejected. Development of communication technologies at the end of the twentieth century caused a rapid increase in information flow and access to information became instantaneous.<sup>17</sup> In consequence, archaeologists, regardless of their localization, have access to world archaeology journals, books (via the Internet), and online education. Such access raises few additional questions on regional and global scale about identity and cultural meanings (see Edwards and Usher 2000 for discussion), and also information control and manipulation, as information controlling agencies integrate in a hierarchically structured web. It also creates a base for global cultural homogenization as presently visible in several patterns of popular culture. The danger of cultural homogenization might be described using world-economy as example. Because capitalist world-economy rewards accumulated capital, including human capital, at a higher rate than “raw” labor power, the geographical maldistribution of these occupational skills involves a strong trend toward self-maintenance. The forces of the marketplace reinforce them rather than undermine them. And the absence of a central political mechanism for the world-economy makes it very difficult to intrude counteracting forces to the maldistribution of rewards. Hence, the ongoing process of a world-economy tends to expand the economic and social gaps among its varying areas in the very process of its development. A similar pattern can be noticed in regard to the network of ideas, where economically most dynamic regions produce new ideas, whereas other regions either followed them uncritically, create hybrid mix of local and foreign ideas, or remain unchanged (conservative).

The condition that contributes to the process of development of ideas relates to technological advances through which it is possible to expand the boundaries of the worldwide web of ideas.

Technology is central in the positioning of a region in the core or the periphery. Advanced or developed countries are the core, and the less developed are in the periphery. Peripheral countries are structurally constrained to experience a kind of development that reproduces their subordinate status (Chase-Dunn and Grimes 1995). In this case, particular regions of the world may change their structural role in the worldwide web. It is in order to observe this crucial phenomenon clearly that I have insisted on the distinction between a peripheral area of a given set of ideas and its external arena. The external arena of one century often becomes the periphery of the next – or its semiperiphery. But then too, core-states can become semiperipheral and semiperipheral ones peripheral. These tend to be called traditional rulers. The political struggle is often phrased in terms

---

<sup>17</sup>Information processing is seen as the key condition of cultural structures, see van der Leeuw (1981).

of tradition vs. change. Following the evolutionary approach, we might accept that qualitatively new data contribute to changes in archaeological theory as novel ideas about human behavior formulated within the social sciences (natural sciences also provide interesting insight into human behavior – see for instance Fisher 2009) might be more critical in theory-building. I therefore strongly disagree with the often postulated claim that intensification of archaeological research (quantity of data) will contribute to improved theoretical basis for archaeology (see Trigger 1989:7 ff for more discussion).

I feel it is significant to account for political and economic constraints of archaeology and its spread around the world as the world-system context may explain why certain tendencies in archaeological research, like nationalistic sentiments, appear. As Trigger noted (1984:360):

The primary function of nationalistic archaeology (...) is to bolster the pride and morale of nations or ethnic groups. It is probably strongest amongst people who feel politically threatened, insecure or deprived of their collective rights by more powerful nations or in countries where appeals for national unity are being made to counter serious divisions along class lines.

Another term used by Trigger (1984:360), “colonial archaeology,” explains my approach more accurately. What he meant by it was archaeology that “developed either in countries whose native population was wholly replaced or overwhelmed by European settlement or in ones where Europeans remained politically and economically dominant for a considerable period of time.” This description applies especially to Africa and Asia, but certain elements of “colonial archaeology” are present in South America and, if we look closer, also in North America.

In the 1990s, various approaches to WSA were subsumed into the semantics of “globalization.”<sup>18</sup> Applied archaeologists were engaged in evaluating the relationship between archaeology and globalization (see Appadurai 2001; WAC5 2003, session entitled: Archaeology and Globalization: Challenges in Education and Training for the twenty-first century; Willems and van den Dries 2007; Lapadi and Long 2010). What needs to be pointed out here is a tendency to unify rules and standards, a move toward isomorphic state of archaeology worldwide. I doubt, however, if we will be able to understand archaeology globally without paying attention to local contexts and meanings (Lozny 2002). Consider, for instance, introduction of a new idea to an intellectual context not ready to accept it. The point discussed elsewhere (Lozny 1995) can be summarized as follows:

The more serious problem, which is not emphasized by the critics, lays in the applicability of foreign theories and methodological concepts into a local reality. This profound omission refers to the problem of applying foreign concepts to the local empirical and epistemological tradition and to regional goals of the public. The problem, therefore, is not in the diversity of questions being asked. Rather it refers to the ability of answering these questions coherently. What would be the point of applying a theory that cannot be tested against the database at hand?

The conclusion from the above is that there is little connection between the theory of rationally planned development and the implementation of development policies. It points out to limitation of a paradigm which combines an idealist theory of

---

<sup>18</sup>See discussion presented by Wallerstein (2004a) in his keynote address at the conference, “Development Challenges for the twenty-first Century,” Cornell University, Oct 1, 2004.

rationality and naturalist epistemology. A prime example is the difficulty of coping with unintended consequences, the nemesis of so much elegant theorizing, when it encounters practice (for further discussion of the problem of unintended consequences see Fabian 1991:189–98).

We cannot expect any top-down reforms to produce similar results in different regions, but we should expect changes on local levels that will to certain extent follow global trends (similar argument was made by Anderson-Levitt 2004 regarding global tendencies in modern education). The United Nations (UN) and European Union (EU) agencies promoting cultural heritage preservation initiatives act upon the principle of world culture (neoinstitutionalists in Arnone's terms) and not world-system approach (realist in Arnone's terms). The realists point out to domination in spreading ideas, whereas world culture proponents view social change as a result of ideas introduced by rationalized others whose authority exceeds power and resources (Meyer et al. 1997:173). Ideology of multilateralism has been put forward by the EU agencies and UNESCO in terms of heritage preservation and conservation. But it is not certain how different nations will respond to such attempts to globalize archaeology and especially to globalize ideas about archaeological theories and practice. Also, how the position of a country in the world economy and its size, resources, and political strategic significance influence how much autonomy it has in responding to the policies and regulations imposed by such global institutions? To what extent will state control over the nationally important and culturally sensitive domains be compromised by joining the global organization? What are the implications for developed countries as compared with an underdeveloped and impoverished? The expected reactions range from resistance to accommodation (for comparison see Arnone's (2009:10) discussion of Calyton's (1998) argument about the need to study the various ways in which nation-states respond to globalization and specifically international educational assistance). There is also a growing interest in cultural heritage preservation from NGOs,<sup>19</sup> a phenomenon which deserves its own study.

Following these arguments, I identify four conditions that in my view contributed to globalization of archeology:

- Europe (Great Britain, Germany, France, and to certain extent the Soviet Union) and USA as key players in the world-system became centers of archaeological thought and practice and long-lasting interests and practices contributed to the selection of most effective methods to investigate the past elsewhere.
- The use of German, French, Russian, and currently English made regional ideas global and global available regionally.
- Locally significant questions have been answered using ideas and methods available in the global pool of research and globally significant questions have been answered using the local pool of research (data).

---

<sup>19</sup>In 2006, Heritage Watch launched a series of workshops for NGOs on heritage preservation and conservation. In October 15th and 16th, 2007, the steering committee of the Inventory of Heritage Organizations in Europe (IHOE) organized an international Think Tank Meeting on the Role of Heritage NGOs in Europe attended by experts and representatives of important European heritage organizations to reflect and discuss the future of Heritage NGOs in Europe.

- The approach to cultural heritage research and preservation contributed to globalization of archaeology as an attempt to unify goals and direct actions toward preserving what counts as world heritage and not just national heritage.

These points outline archaeology as a part of world culture. A more detailed analysis should include a scrutiny of agencies promoting and imposing agendas for archaeology worldwide including academic curricula, governmental policy-making agencies, and state-controlled and private funding agencies which profoundly manipulate research agendas by promoting the use of certain methods and theories or focus on certain regions.

## **Restructuring Archaeology (A Quest for Sustainable Archaeology)**

Despite its global scale, academic archaeology is at critical juncture. As state budgets shrink and private foundations focus on highly selected (and spectacular) projects, archaeologists are expected to produce more with less funding. These drastic conditions have challenged everyone with an interest in the past to develop creative ways to ensure protection and wise treatment of our cultural heritage. Changing legal and economic conditions present archaeologists with professional dilemmas unknown decades ago. Sustainable archaeology relates to the necessity of reevaluating the status of the discipline under economic and political pressure. Such reevaluation must include serious propositions on restructuring archaeological activities, insistence on tightly focused research agendas, and the inevitability to limit fieldwork in favor of salvage projects which stipulate an attempt to combine academic archaeology with the pragmatics of applied archaeology.

The key problems I examine here relate to issues of conservatism and innovation in decision-making. This dialectical opposition underlies the empirical background for the presented study and its political, economic, institutional, pedagogic, and financial elements. My interests focus on addressing the key question: In what shape will archaeology emerge from the deconstruction of social, economic, and political condition, which prevailed locally, especially in Eastern Europe, but also South America, Africa, and southeastern Asia? My goal is to sketch a scenario of a possible outlook of archaeology that changes under very specific socioeconomic conditions. Obviously, as a scientific discipline, archaeology is constantly undergoing changes, for the change is inevitable. As any academic discipline, it has to undergo changes, as new ideas are being introduced and turned into practice. The change itself is not as interesting, however, as the circumstances under which it occurs and consequences it causes. My research is guided by the following question: Under what socioeconomic and political conditions changes can be adopted and what innovations in archaeological thought and practice can we identify in the beginning of the twenty-first century?

The goal is to begin setting an agenda for archaeology in the twenty-first century by discussing the following three interrelated topics:

- Creative ways of joining academia and applied archaeology.
- Selective use of archaeological resources.
- Opportunities and challenges offered by the incorporation of indigenous perspective into archaeological undertakings.

Specific questions to be addressed include the following: What are the best methods for joining applied archaeology and academia to produce significant research outcomes while insuring the maximum protection of archaeological deposits? How can CRM companies and academic departments collaborate in student training to produce individuals qualified to undertake important research in CRM context? What approaches can we take to ensure the greatest public benefit from archaeology and the widest dissemination of archaeological knowledge to the interested public? Do we need to introduce fundamental changes to applied archaeology program or can significant restructuring take place within the existing structure?

With the fundamental socioeconomic transformation that countries around the world are undergoing, a shift in scientific theory, especially within the social sciences, as well as changes in the organization of science should be expected. Therefore, I propose to analyze the following groups of problems:

- Recent transformations in the socioeconomic sphere impact all the social sciences archaeology included. What impact will they make on the theory and practice of archaeology worldwide?
- It can be expected that the new economic conditions will force a structural change in archaeology and the new structural context will influence research designs and archaeological practice. What are current research topics and how projects are financed? Will new social settings also create a specific public awareness of how the taxpayers' money is spent?; how then is a current model of archaeology perceived by professionals and by the public? New socioeconomic conditions also require a change in the organization of archaeology, especially in the former Eastern Europe where expensive institutions like the national Academies of Sciences in many cases duplicate the work conducted at university departments and museums.
- Because of the global political change after 1990, more scholars than ever before can benefit from international contacts and ideas are being freely exchange. How is this situation perceived by scholars locally?

Historians of archaeological thoughts see changes differently depending on their accepted outlooks. My interests relate to the scope of changes observable in Eastern Europe after 1990. Archaeology there, as well as the rest of the social sciences, is changing due to systemic, socioeconomic transformation these countries are undergoing. Hopefully, my conclusions regarding this region will contribute to better defining and understanding the causes of changes in a global scale.

My preliminary assumption regarding archaeology in Eastern Europe was that despite new political and economic settings, in terms of theoretical concepts the traditional ideas prevail, while organization and practice of archaeology certainly requires major changes. As demonstrated (Kubik 1994; Hann 1993; Tarrow 1994), there are diverse versions of socialism that emerged during the 1960s and 1970s in Eastern Europe. If we suppose that all these versions somehow influenced the scientific paradigm in any way, there must be diverse versions of scientific approaches recognizable in those areas.<sup>20</sup> Intellectual diversity is an issue to be discussed here. Similar notion could be read in Gordiejew's (1995:794–796) review of the three abovementioned authors, as well as another significant characteristic of today's anthropology, and that is the making of what do we know about it, how do we create our knowledge, and how do we interpret it, hoping to explain a phenomenon. There are claims made by Eastern European scholars (cf. Kuna and Venclova 1995:7–10) that certain elements of processual archaeology, postprocessual archaeology, and many other shades of archaeological theory and methodology followed in the West were independently used and coherently presented by Eastern European archaeologists. It is interesting, however, to read in this context that most archaeologists in Eastern Europe favored the typological-chronological paradigm over any other more theoretical currents.

Although the socioeconomic and political changes observable in Eastern Europe seem to have been inevitable, they have not been introduced by archaeologists. Archaeologists act in this case like innocent bystanders, for they do not initiate socioeconomic changes. Obviously, a systemic change concerns alterations in all aspects of social life including the practice of science, but the scope of changes varies and depends on economic conditions of the country. Let us consider systemic changes that have lately taken place in some western European countries. Those that have taken place in Spain or Portugal in the 1980s, as an effect of the collapse of the right wing dictatorships, are not of the same scope as those in Britain after Thatcherism (Collis 1995:82), and certainly of different scale than those we observe in Eastern Europe. Furthermore, I argue that we are going to see more changes as Europe will adjust to common standards in politics and economy. These changes will be caused by new legislation on the heritage protection, with new aims, nature, and power structure.

John Collis (1995) argued that archaeologists must be clear about their methodology and its implications and in control of the use that is made of archaeological data and have a clear idea about what it is they are trying to achieve in studies of the past. These inevitably lead us on to the political and social implications of what we are doing. This we must confront head-on, and we cannot ignore what is going on politically around us, both in the narrowest sense of the word (pertaining to specific political beliefs and parties) or in the widest sense (that which is of concern to the citizen of any state). We must also understand the power structures which lie

---

<sup>20</sup>Recently, I participated in a meeting of scholars from Russia, Ukraine, Poland, USA, England, and my observation provides evidence to argue that, for instance, the Marxian paradigm was, and still is, understood differently in those countries, and therefore there are various scientific accounts being produced by scholars operating under similar circumstances.

behind the teaching, practice, and dissemination of archaeology, within archaeology itself, and within society in general, to ensure healthy debate and discussion and to prevent individuals and interest groups from exerting undue influence on the detriment of our science. Kristian Kristiansen (1993:19) wrote that:

If one is personally or politically committed, this naturally colors what one sees, whereas those who are without such commitment as a rule are without insight into this type of problem and therefore act uncritically, merely as tools of tradition.

As it is unlikely that the developing countries will match the center in its economic status, it is also unlikely that developing countries will develop their own scientific theories that match the centers. I also doubt that the centers will be clearly distinguished from the rest. Ideas will infiltrate as they always do, but will be more carefully applied to local conditions. Locally followed theories and practices will change, but unevenly, with some regions progressing faster (for instance Russia or archaeology in South America) than others. But I do not consider scientific progress to be similar to infrastructural change. Infrastructure is expenditure on costly activities that cannot be attributed to a single producer.

Another problem with archaeology becoming sustainable relates to decommodification<sup>21</sup> of social policies in general. Theorists of capitalism have long ridiculed decommodification, arguing that it is illusory, that it goes against some presumed innate social psychology of humankind, that it is inefficient, and that it guarantees lack of economic growth and therefore of poverty. All of this is false. If we look at one major institution of the modern world – universities – we realize that, at least up to 20 years ago, no one questioned that they should be run as nonprofit institutions, without shareholders or profit takers. And it would be hard to argue seriously that, for that reason, they have been inefficient, unreceptive to technological advances, incapable of attracting competent personnel to run them, or unable to perform the basic services for which they were created. And to address that seriously, we must first of all comprehend with some clarity the historical development of our present system, appreciate its structural dilemmas today, and open our mind to radical alternatives for the future. And we must do all this, not merely academically but practically, that is, living in the present and concerned with the immediate needs of people as well as longer-run transformations.

## Conclusion

At times of globalization and global impact of commerce, politics, and environmental stress on culture, it might be interesting to see what sort of impact those stressors made on anthropology and archaeology. This book is an attempt to “globalize”

---

<sup>21</sup> People and their labor are commodified as labor is major commodity in the market; decommodification is about governments reducing people's reliance on market for their well-being (stronger governmental interventions, see Esping-Andersen 1990 and critical discussions by Bamba 2006 and Scruggs and Allen 2006).

archaeology in a sense that archaeologists from around the world will learn about each other and their work. They will learn about their key interests and outlooks on subjects that might be researched by a larger group. Because these topics are usually published in foreign languages, many do not learn about them due to linguistic restrictions. An issue that may have been specifically local will become global. After all, although archaeologists act locally, they often impact a site or landscape that is a part of a global human patrimony. We all have the right to take part in this discussion.

## References

- Anderson-Levitt, K. M. 2004 Reading lessons in Guinea, France, and the United States: Local meanings of global culture? *Comparative Education Review*, 48, 229–252.
- Appadurai, A. 2001 The globalization of archaeology and heritage: a discussion with Arjun Appadurai, *Journal of Social Archaeology* Vol 1(1): 35–49
- Arnold, B. 1990 The past as propaganda: totalitarian archaeology in Nazi Germany *Antiquity* 64:464–478.
- Arnold, B. 1992 The past as propaganda: How Hitler's archaeologists distorted European prehistory to justify racist and territorial goals. *Archaeology* July/August pp. 30–37.
- Auduze, F. and A. Leroi-Gourhan 1981 France: a continental insularity, *World Archaeology* 13.2, pp. 170–189.
- Arnove, R.F. 1980 Comparative Education and World-systems Analysis. *Comparative Education Review* 24.1, pp. 48–62.
- 2009 World-Systems Analysis and Comparative education in the Age of Globalization. R. Cowen and A. M. Kazamias eds, *International Handbook of Comparative Education*, pp. 101–119. New York: Springer.
- Bambra, C. 2006 Research Note: Decommodification and the worlds of welfare revisited. *Journal of European Social Policy* 16:1, 73–80.
- Bar-Yosef, Ofer and Amihai Mazar 1982 Israeli archaeology, *World Archaeology* 13.3, pp. 310–325.
- Barnett, V. 1998 *Kondratiev and the Dynamics of Economic Development*. London: Macmillan.
- Barr, N. (ed.) 1994 *Labor Markets and Social Policy in Central and Eastern Europe: The Transition and Beyond*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Blackhawk, N. 2006. *Violence over the Land: Indians and Empires in the Early American West*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Blij, Harm de 2008 *The Power of Place: Geography, Destiny, and Globalization's Rough Landscape*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bulkin, V.A., L. S. Klejn, and G.S. Lebedev 1982 Attainments and problems of Soviet archeology. *World Archaeology* 13.3, pp. 272–295.
- Bursche A., and T. Tylor 1991 A Panorama of Polish Archaeology. *Antiquity*, vol. 65:583–92.
- Chakrabarti, Dilip, K. 1982 The development of archaeology in the Indian subcontinent, *World Archaeology* 13.3, pp. 226–343.
- Chang, K.C., 1981 Archaeology and Chinese historiography, *World Archaeology* 13.2, pp. 156–169.
- Chang, K.C. 1980 "Archaeology," in Leo A. Orleans (ed.), *Science in Contemporary China*, pp. 496–507. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Chase-Dunn, Christopher and Peter Grimes 1995 World-Systems Analysis. *Annual Review of Sociology*. Vol. 21 p. 387–417.
- Chazan, M. 2007 *World Prehistory and Archaeology: pathways through time*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

- Chesko, S. V. 1998 *Kto oni i otkuda*. Moscow: Russian Academy of Sciences.
- Chiot, Daniel and Thomas D. Hall 1982 World-System Theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*. Vol. 8 pp. 81–106.
- Clayton, T. 1998 Beyond mystification: Reconnecting world-system theory for comparative education. *Comparative Education Review*, 42, 479–496.
- Collingwood, R.G. 1933 *An Essay on Philosophical Method*. Oxford: Clarendon
- Collis, J. 1995 Celts, Power and Politics: Whither Czech Archaeology? In *Whither Archaeology? Papers in Honour of Evzen Neustupny*, M. Kuna and N. Venclova (eds.), pp. 82–92. Praha: Institute of Archaeology, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic.
- Cottle, T. J. 2002 *Social class, poverty, and education: Policy and practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Record.
- Devezas, T. 2006 *Kondratieff Waves, Warfare and World Security*. Amsterdam: IOS Press
- Edwards, R. and Usher, R. 2000 *Globalisation and pedagogy: Space, place and identity*. London: Routledge.
- Esping-Andersen, G. 1990 *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Fabian, J. Dilemmas of Critical Anthropology. In *Constructing Knowledge: Authority and Critique in Social Science*, L. Nencel and P. Pels eds, London: Sage Publications.
- Fisher, Len 2009 *The Perfect Swarm. The Science of Complexity in Everyday Life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Foucault, M. 1971 L'ordre du Discours: Leçon Inaugural au Collège de France, Paris: Gallimard. English translation by I. McLeod 1981, The order of discourse, in *Untying the Text: a Post-structural Reader*, R. Young editor, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Fowler, D. D. 1986 Conserving American Archaeological Resources. In *American Archaeology Past and Future*, D. Meltzer, D. D. Fowler, J. Sabloff eds. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Fowler, D. D. 1987 Uses of the past: archaeology in the service of the state. *American Antiquity* 52:229–48.
- Frank, G. 1969 *Capitalism and underdevelopment in Latin America*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Friedman, Th. L. 2005 *The World is Flat. A Brief History of the Twenty-first Century*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Goldfrank, Walter L. 2000 Paradigm Regained? The Rules of Wallerstein's World-System Method. *Journal of World-Systems Research*. Vol. 6. N. 2 pp. 150–195
- Glyn, Daniel and Colin Renfrew 1988 *The Idea of Prehistory*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press (new edition).
- Godsen, Ch, 2004 *Archaeology and Colonialism. Cultural Contact from 5000 BC to the Present*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Gordiejew, P. 1995 On the Theory and Practice of Socialism. In *American Anthropologist*, vol. 97, (4), December 1995, pp. 794–796.
- Grewal, David, Singh 2008 *Network Power: The Social Dynamics of Globalization*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Grinin, L.; Munck, V. C. de; Korotayev, A. 2006 *History and mathematics: Analyzing and Modeling Global Development*. Moscow: URSS.
- Guston, David, H., 2000 *Between Politics and Science. Assuring the integrity and Productivity of Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hann, C.M. ed. 1993 *Socialism: Ideals, Ideologies, and the Local Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Hall, T. D. 1989. *Social Change in the Southwest, 1350–1880*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Hall, T. D. 2006. [Re]peripheralization, [re]incorporation, frontiers, and nonstate societies: continuities and discontinuities in globalization processes. In *Globalization and Global History* (eds B. K. Gills and W. R. Thompson). London: Routledge, pp. 96–113.
- Harris, M. 1968 *The Rise of Anthropological Theory*. London: Rutledge and Kegan Paul.

- Held, David, Anthony McGrew, David Goldblatt, and Jonathan perraton 1999 *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hobart, 1993 Introduction: the growth of ignorance. In M. Hobart, ed., *An Anthropological Critique of Development. The Growth of Ignorance*. London: Routledge.
- Hodder, I. ed. 1991 *Archaeological Theory in Europe. The last Three Decades*. London: Routledge.
- 2001 ed. *Archaeological Theory Today*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Ikawa-Smith, F. 1982 Co-traditions in Japanese archaeology, *World Archaeology* 13.3, pp. 269–309.
- Johnson, M.H. 1999 *Archaeological Theory: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kardulias, P.N. 2007 Negotiation and incorporation on the margins of world-systems: examples from Cyprus and North America. *Journal of World-Systems Research*, 13(1):55–82
- Kardulias, P. N. and Hall, T. D. 2007 A world-systems view of human migration past and present: providing a general model for understanding the movement of people. Forum on Public Policy. Available at: <http://www.forumonpublicpolicy.com/archivesum07/kardulias.pdf>.
- Kardulias, P.N. and Hall, Thomas D. 2008 Archaeology and world-systems analysis', *World Archaeology*, 40: 4, 572–583
- Keohane Robert and Joseph Nye, 2000 *Power and Interdependence*. 3rd edition. New York: Longman.
- Klejn, Lev S. 1997 Das Phänomen der sowjetischen Archäologie. Geschichte, Schulen, Protagonisten [The phenomenon of Soviet archaeology. History, schools and protagonists]. Frankfurt/M.
- 2001 *Metaarchaeology* (Acta Archaeologica, Kabenhavn, vol. 72:1, supplementa vol. III). Blackwell/Munksgaard.
- 2004 *Vvedenie v teoreticheskuyu arkeologiyu, Metaarkheologiya [Introduction to theoretical archaeology, Metaarchaeology (russ.)]* St. Petersburg: Belveder.
- 2006 Neither theory nor archaeology: a critique of Johnson. *Antiquity* 80, 308:415–424.
- Klindt-Jansen, O. 1975 *A History of Scandinavian Archaeology*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Kobylinski, Zbigniew 1991 Theory in Polish archaeology 1960–90: searching for paradigms. In: I. Hodder (ed.) *Archaeological Theory in Europe. The last three decades*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kohl, P., L. and C. Fawcett 1995 *Nationalism, Politics, and the Practice of Archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kristiansen, K. The strength of the past and its great might; an essay on the use of the past. *Journal of European Archaeology* 1, pp. 3–32.
- Kroeber, Alfred, L. 1948 *Anthropology*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Kubik, Jan 1994 *The Power of Symbols against the Symbols of Power: The Rise of Solidarity and the Fall of State Socialism in Poland*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Kuna, M., Venclová, N. (eds) 1995 *Whither archaeology? Papers in honour of Evžen Neustupný*, Praha: Institute of Archaeology.
- Lamberg-Karlovsky, C.C., 2002 Archaeology and Language. The Indo-Iranians. *Current Anthropology* Volume 43, Number 1, February 2002, pp. 63–88.
- Lapadi, S. and C. Long 2010 *Heritage and Globalisation (Key issues in Cultural Heritage)*, London: Routledge.
- Lech, J. 1997–1998 Between captivity and freedom: Polish archaeology in the 20th century. *Archaeologia Polona*, 35–36, Special theme: Archaeology in the 20th century: ideas-people-research.
- Leeuw, S., E. van der 1981 Information flows, flow structures and the explanation of change in human institutions. In S. E. van der Leuw ed., *Archaeological Approaches to the Study of Complexity*, Amsterdam, University of Amsterdam Press pp. 230–312.
- Lorenzo, J. L., 1981 Archaeology south of the Rio Grande, *World Archaeology* 13.2, pp. 190–208.
- Lozny, L., R., 1995 *Where Do We Search for Paradigms? Theoretical Concepts in Polish Archaeology during the Last Fifty Years*. Paper presented at the The 60th SAA Annual

- Meeting, Minneapolis, MN, symposium organizer, *Alternative Archaeology: Beyond the Anglo-American Paradigm*.
- Lozny, L.R., 2002 Far outside, looking in. Polish archaeologists and looking-glass self. *Archaeologia Polona* vol. 40:2002 Special theme: Polish archaeology in an international context, pp. 137–148
- Marciniak, Arkadiusz and Włodzimierz Rączkowski 1991 The Development of Archaeological Theory in Poland under Conditions of Isolation. In: *World Archaeological Bulletin*, no. 5 February 1991, pp. 57–65.
- Masry, A. H., 1981 Traditions of archaeological research in the Near East. *World Archaeology* 13: 222–239
- Medvedev, A. P. 1999 “Avestan ‘Yima’s Town’ in historical and archaeological 1999perspective,” in *Complex societies of Central Eurasia in III-II Millennia b.c.* Edited by G. Zdanovich, pp. 285–87. Chelyabinsk: Chelyabinsk University Press.
- Meyer, J. W. and Hannan, M. T. 1979 Introduction. In J. W. Meyer and M. T. Hannan (Eds.), *National development and the world-system: Educational, economic, and political change, 1950–1970* (pp. 3–16). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Meyer, J. W., Boli, J., Thomas, G. M., and Ramirez, F. O. 1997 World society and the nation-state. *American Journal of Sociology*, 103, 144–181.
- Moberg, C.-A. 1982 From artefacts to timetables to maps (to mankind?): regional traditions in archaeological research in Scandinavia. *World Archaeology* 13.2, pp. 209–221.
- Murray, T., and J. P. White 1981 Cambridge in the bush? Archeology in Australia and New Guinea, *World Archaeology* 13.2, pp. 255–263.
- Neustupny, Evzen 1991 Recent theoretical achievements in prehistoric archaeology in Czechoslovakia. In: I. Hodder (ed.) *Archaeological Theory in Europe. The last three decades*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Nye, Joseph; Robert Keohane 1977 *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company
- Palubiucka Anna and Stanisław Tabaczynski 1986 Społeczeństwo i kultura jako przedmiot badań archeologicznych. In: *Teoria i praktyka badań archeologicznych*, Witold Hensel, Giuseppe Donato, and Stanisław Tabaczynski eds, vol. 1 *Przesłanki metodologiczne*, pp. 57–183. Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, Gdańsk, Łódź: Ossolineum Press.
- Ringold, D. 1999 Social Policy in Postcommunist Europe: Legacies and Transition. In *Left Parties and Social Policy in Postcommunist Europe*. Ed by Linda J. Cook, Mitchel A. Orenstein and Marilyn Rueschemeyer, pp. 11–46. Westview Press.
- Rorty, R. 1980 *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Scruggs, L. and J. Allen 2006 Welfare-state de commodification in 18 OECD countries: a replication and revision, *Journal of European Social Policy*, Vol. 16, No. 1, 55–72.
- Shanks, M and Ch. Tilley 1987 *Re-Constructing Archaeology: Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shnirelman, V. A 1995 Alternative prehistory. *Journal of European Archaeology* 3(2):1–20.
- Spring, J. 2009 *Globalization of Education. An Introduction*. New York: Routledge.
- Steward, Julian, 1972 *Theory of culture change. The methodology of multilineal evolution*. 2nd edition. Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
- Tarrow, S. 1994 *Power in Movement. Social Movements, Collective Action and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trigger, B. 2006 *A History of Archaeological Thought*, 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1984 Alternative Archaeologies: nationalist, colonialist, imperialist, *Man* 19.3, pp. 355–370.
- 1989 *A History of Archaeological Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trigger, B. G. and Glover, I. (eds) 1981b Regional traditions of archaeological research I. *World Archaeology*, 13(2).
- 1982 Regional traditions of archaeological research II. *World Archaeology*, 13(3).
- Waterbalk, T.H. 1981 Archaeology in the Netherlands: delta archaeology. *World Archaeology* 13.2, pp. 240–254.

- Salmon, A. 1982 Theoretical landscapes: on a cross-cultural conception of knowledge, in *Semantic Anthropology* D.J. Parkin ed. London: Academic.
- Skocpol, T. 1977 Wallerstein's World Capitalist System: A Theoretical and Historical Critique. *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 82. N. 5. 1075–1090.
- Wallerstein, I. 1974 *The Modern World-System I*, Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century. New York: Academic Press.
- 1993 The Timespace of World-System Analysis: A Philosophical Essay. *Historical Geography* 23.172:5–22.
- 2004a After Developmentalism and Globalization, What? Keynote address at conference, "Development Challenges for the 21st Century," Cornell University, Oct. 1, 2004. *Social Forces*, March 2005, 83(3):1, pp. 321–336.
- 2004b *World-Systems Analysis. An Introduction*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- WAC5 2003 Session entitled: Archaeology and Globalization: Challenges in Education and Training for the Twenty-first Century.
- Willems, W. and M. H. van den Dries, eds 2007 *Quality Management in Archaeology*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Wolf, Eric, R., 1999 Anthropology among the powers. *Social Anthropology* 7:121–134.
- 2001 *Pathways of Power: Building an Anthropology of the Modern World*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Comparative Archaeologies

A Sociological View of the Science of the Past

Lozny, L.R. (Ed.)

2011, XVI, 852 p., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-1-4419-8224-7