

development and indigenous rights, but only recently have historical archaeologists come to link a concern for human rights with their research. A number of engaged, socially active archaeologists have striven to illustrate how powerful nations have used colonial and imperial power to appropriate and use indigenous history. This realization has led to more collaborative projects with Native peoples around the globe.

Looking Forward. Historical archaeology is exploding as a field of study within the larger world of professional archaeology. Once, far too many archaeologists thought it was not respectable to study old gunflints, iron horseshoes, and glass medicine bottles. They believed that these artifacts and the people who had produced, bought, and used them were the exclusive subject for historians. Today, by accepting that written history leaves a great deal unsaid, historical archaeology is a growing force in the interpretation of global history. Without question, practicing historical archaeologists—those working now and those who will be working in the future—will discover important new sites and develop innovative insights about sites and peoples we think we already know well. New university programs are constantly being created in institutions of higher education around the world, and historical archaeology is destined to become one of the world's most well-known fields of archaeological study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Deetz, James. *In Small Things Forgotten: An Archaeology of Early American Life*, 1996.
- Delle, James A., Stephen A. Mrozowski, and Robert Paynter, eds. *Lines That Divide: Historical Archaeologies of Race, Class, and Gender*, 2000.
- Falk, Lisa, ed. *Historical Archaeology in Global Perspective*, 1991.
- Funari, Padro Paulo A., Martin Hall, and Siân Jones, eds. *Historical Archaeology: Back from the Edge*, 1999.
- Hall, Martin, and Stephen W. Silliman, eds. *Historical Archaeology*, 2006.
- Hicks, Dan, and Mary C. Beaudry, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Historical Archaeology*, 2006.

Lawrence, Susan, ed. *Archaeologies of the British: Explorations of Identity in Great Britain and Its Colonies, 1600–1945*, 2003.

Little, Barbara J. *Historical Archaeology: Why the Past Matters*, 2007.

Majewski, Teresita, and David Gaimster, eds. *International Handbook of Historical Archaeology*, 2009.

Noël Hume, Ivor. *Historical Archaeology*, 1972.

Orser, Charles E., Jr. *Historical Archaeology*, 2d ed., 2004.

Orser, Charles E., Jr. *A Historical Archaeology of the Modern World*, 1996.

South, Stanley. *Method and Theory in Historical Archaeology*, 1977.

Charles E. Orser, Jr.

HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

Historical materialism's main objective is to carry out research into the ways that society (re)produces itself. Based on a dialectical approach to materialism, Marx and Engels's initial proposal relates a way of understanding the world with a way to act in it, both practically and theoretically. As a holistic approach to social reality, later authors have interpreted this as a philosophy (e.g., A. Labriola, G. V. Plekhanov), a sociology (e.g., N. I. Bukharin, H. Lefèbvre), and a science of history (e.g., L. Althusser), as it provides conceptual tools for grasping critical knowledge of historically developed societies. This knowledge is considered crucial for the development of emancipating politics of the social being which free him or her of economic, political, and family exploitation as well as ideological alienation.

Historical materialism is not a closed theoretical and methodological body, something diametrically opposed to dialectical approaches. The main works on which the original proposal of historical materialism are constructed (the majority of which are in manuscript form) are *The Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts*, *German Ideology*, and *Grundrisse der Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie* (Outlines of the Critique of Political Economy), especially its introduction, all written by Karl Marx, as well as *Anti-Dühring* (*Herrn Eugen Dührings Umwälzung der*

Wissenschaft) from Friedrich Engels. Without these texts it would be difficult to comprehend the core theory that finally allowed Marx to analyze the specific workings of a socioeconomic system—capitalism—in his principal work, *Capital*. For the study of societies preceding capitalism, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* from Engels is also of interest, as well as certain chapters of *Grundrisse* (see the E. Hobsbawm compilation).

The Development of Historical Materialism.

The starting point for a materialist concept of history is the rejection of preeminent ideas, in the first instance of the idea of God as a vehicle of realism. Consciousness, thoughts, and beliefs are considered the results of specific material conditions in the human mind and not the active subjects of history. With Marx and Engels, historical investigation goes from being a naturalist and non-critical discourse concerning political and religious events and the types of government in different periods, to becoming an analysis of the material conditions in which societies develop. With this approach, historical materialism releases the “idealist” dialectic of Hegel and his pantheistic and humanistic essence, becoming a critical and potentially revolutionary method of tackling reality capable of overcoming epistemologically both positivism as well as empiricism (e.g., V. I. Lenin). This materialist dialectic forces a critical evaluation of the object observed and its observer so that explanations can be objective (adjusted to the object) but never from a static perspective (absolute truth). The degree of adjustment (*Übereinstimmung*) between any explanation of the world we may propose and the objective nature of perceived things comes as a result of social action under given historical conditions.

At the heart of this historical theory are human beings, social and global in their abilities to create and transform reality. This ability comes from their work and social activities, within natural and social constraints, given that human beings are unable to live without the collaboration of others. Beyond this it is not possible to generalize or propose universal historical laws. Strictly speaking, materialist

dialectic forces an analysis of material conditions and the organization of each historical formation as a specific reality and in turn, an understanding of the economical, political, and ideological structures shared with other societies. From the outset, historical materialism was capable of analyzing historical situations that had not been taken on by Marx and Engels. Classic studies are those dedicated to the development of capitalism in rural societies (K. Kautski; V. I. Lenin), colonialism (R. Luxemburg), and even about art and social life (G. V. Plekhanov, G. Luckács), an analysis that reaches us today under the auspices of global capitalism, center-periphery theories, or contemporary relational esthetics.

The development of historical materialism in the twentieth century has generated and inspired a great variety of approaches and schools of thought. This is owed in part to the fact that very significant theoretical writings by Marx and Engels were unknown before the Second World War, when the political development of Marxist-inspired “Real Socialism” was already established. As the complete writings became known, the full depth of their dialectical and critical thinking, particularly of Marx, became evident. Hence, theoretical and historical approaches, which go from the most determinist positions where production forces or technology play a central, explanatory role, to strongly subjectivist approaches that, on the contrary, highlight individual actions as the main force in historical change, have been included in the field of historical materialism.

At present, the terms historical materialism and Marxism are applied in the social sciences to almost any critical proposal with the structures of power, be they imaginary or real, past or present. In order to clarify this, it seems indispensable to remember which conceptual and practical pillars have convened to become historical materialism.

The Approach to History. Given that history unfolds for historical materialism in an interplay between natural appropriation and social expropriation, what seems relevant is to investigate the ways that this dialectic is produced. The cycles of

reproduction imply a constant transformation of the social matter formed by men, women, and objects, in successive *production–consumption* processes, until the complete exhaustion of their social value. While production, as an abstract concept, is always a social action, given its aims and context, its dialectical opposite, consumption, is an act of individual appropriation, an existential necessity of each member of society. Through consumption, new needs are created, which immediately produce the motivation for production. The responsibility for overcoming the opposition between social production and individual consumption falls to *distribution*. Gifts, tributes, theft, or commodity exchanges are particular historical forms of organizing individuals' share in production. Yet the social laws that enforce a given system of distribution are only the consequence of a previous organization of production, and in particular of the distribution of labor objects (e.g., natural resources) and labor means (e.g., tools) in society. Consequently, individual needs and desires are not denied by Marx, but they are placed in relationship to production and the distribution of the means of production. Ultimately, this means searching for the economic as well as political and ideological structures responsible for the generation of material *wealth* and *surplus*.

While all societies produce wealth, the key question addressed by historical materialism is which economic, political, and ideological strategies exist or have existed that allow the transformation of this wealth into surplus. "Surplus" can be defined as the share of production that does not revert in any form to the group or individual that has generated it. As such, it must be distinguished sharply from a mere increase of production, or over-production (*Überschuss*). Surplus appears when the appropriation of the material result of labor is socially restricted and becomes the *private property* of an individual, group, and, in certain cases, *class*. The institutionalization of surplus as property is the consequence of a previous appropriation of one or several of the factors of production (labor force, objects, or means). Finally, the emergence of the *State* is an institution created by the dominant

class in order to protect its strategies of surplus production and its private property through mechanisms of physical and psychical coercion. In sum, historical materialism asks for the historical formation of societies in order to uncover the existing economic, political, and ideological reasons of exploitation and alienation.

The Approach to Archaeology. As can be expected, the initial definition of historical materialism in archaeology occurred in the Soviet Union after the foundation of the first state inspired by Marxism. However, the Stalinist reformulation of historical materialism led to an economic determinism embedded within a cultural historical framework, and was implemented by the State Academy for the History of Material Culture. One of the main contributions of the technological approach in Soviet archaeology was the *traceological* or "functional analysis" of archaeological artifacts, developed by S. A. Semenov and his group in the 1930s. Functional analysis was conceived as a strictly archaeological method of grasping the relevance of human work and technology in the development of production and society, in opposition to the typological and cultural historical view that formed the mainstream of Soviet archaeology.

After the reforms of Nikita Khrushchev in 1956, a wider archaeological debate started, which, from the 1970s onwards, incorporated the Western influences of Neo-Marxism, the "analytical archaeology" of D. Clarke and Anglo-Saxon "processual" archaeology. Particularly, the "Poznan philosophical school" initiated an epistemological discussion on the relationship between culture and historical processes along these lines, while other approaches continued to focus on the forces of production, rather than to explain the social relation of production. "The History of Prehistoric Society," edited by H. Grünert, is a good example of mainstream archaeology in the Eastern bloc immediately before the fall of the Berlin Wall.

Generally, the Marxist production of Eastern European origin has only been valued in the West when it came from critical or dissident Soviet

archaeologists, among whom L. Klejn stands out, although his Marxism is as much of a hybrid or more than that of the Western pioneer V. G. Childe. Since his first trip to the USSR in 1935, Childe worked on Marxist criteria, although his knowledge of the work of Marx was not significant until 1945. In a certain way, historical materialism was added to the other three influences that marked his writings during different phases of his life: cultural history, diffusionism, and functionalism. Childe initiated a determining characteristic of many Neo-Marxist archaeologists, which consists of using the work of Marx as if it were an ontology or doctrinal perspectivism together with an eclectic epistemology, which is sometimes contradictory to the dialectical materialism of Marx.

A long Marxist tradition in archaeology has existed in Latin America since the 1920s and 1930s. In 1975, a group of Latin American archaeologists presented a program called "Towards a Social Archaeology," whose ultimate aim is to put archaeology at the service of society and social change. Many authors working in the framework of social archaeology have explored the different historical categories of historical materialism. This tends to be rather different from their practice, which leans more towards traditional or processual archaeology.

Social archaeology has also been influential in Spanish archaeology. A different path has been followed since the 1970s by a group of archaeologists from the Universtat Autònoma of Barcelona, carrying out a reappraisal of the original premises of historical materialism and Marxism and exploring their value for archaeological research. Historical materialism is understood as a system of relational concepts to analyze social organization, rather than a closed set of categories to classify them. Interpretative theories as well as archaeological methodologies, ranging from specific excavation techniques to artifact recording, continue to be put into practice within the frame of interdisciplinary archaeological research projects.

Apart from the precursory works of Childe, historical materialism found its way into the English-speaking archaeology during the course of the 1970s

through French structural Marxism, mainly through the works of Althusser, Terray, and Godelier. This was combined with a systemic methodology in the interpretation of social organizations, not very different from processual archaeology, and at the expense of dialectical thinking. In the last decades, also due to the influence of post-structuralism, the focus has turned more towards the discussion of social agency and the role of ideology both in the development of past societies and in their present explanations.

In general, historical materialism, or what is understood as such, has influenced and continues to be a source of inspiration for many archaeologists in the world, although often undergoing a process of simplification of the original proposal and disregarding the epistemological requirements of a corresponding and critical archaeological practice.

[See also Childe, V. Gordon; Marxist Theory; Russia.]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Althusser, L. "Matérialisme Historique et Matérialisme Dialectique." *Cahiers Marxistes-Léninistes* 11 (1966).
- Bate, L. F. *El Proceso de Investigación en Arqueología*, 1998.
- Bernbeck, R., and R. H. McGuire, eds. *Ideologies in Archaeology*, 2011.
- Castro, P., S. Gili, V. Lull, R. Micó, C. Rihuete, R. Risch, and M. E. Sanahuja. "Teoría de la Producción de la Vida Social: Un Análisis de los Mecanismos de Explotación en el Sudeste Peninsular (c. 3000–1550 cal ANE)." *Boletín de Antropología Americana* 33 (1998): 25–77.
- Engels, F. *Der Ursprung der Familie, des Privateigentums und des Staats*, 1884.
- Friedman, J., and M. J. Rowlands, eds. *The Evolution of Social Systems*, 1978.
- Grünert, H., ed. *Geschichte der Urgesellschaft*, 1989.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. *Karl Marx: Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations*, 1964.
- Klejn, L. *La Arqueología Soviética: Historia y Teoría de una Escuela Desconocida*, 1993.
- Luckács, G. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Ästhetik*, 1954.
- Lull, V. *Los objetos distinguidos: La Arqueología como excusa*, 2007.
- Lull, V. and Micó, R. *Archaeology of the Origin of the State: The Theories*, 2011.
- Lumbreras, L.G. *La Arqueología como Ciencia Social*, 1974.

Luxemburg, R. *Die Akkumulation des Kapitals. Ein Beitrag zur ökonomischen Erklärung des Imperialismus*, 1913.

Marx, K. (1857–1858). *Grundrisse: Introduction to the Critique of Political Economy*, 1973.

Marx, K., and F. Engels (1845–1846). *Die Deutsche Ideologie*, 1958.

Montané, J. *Marxismo y Arqueología*, 1980.

Semenov, S. A., 1957. *Prehistoric Technology. An Experimental Study of the Oldest Tools and Artefacts from Traces of Manufacture and Wear*, 1964.

Vicente Lull, Rafael Micó, Cristina Rihuete Herrada, and Roberto Risch

HISTORY OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTIONS

The key difference between previous archaeological traditions and institutionalized archaeology is the funding of activities related to archaeology by state bodies or by organized groups. Institutionalization encompasses museums, learned societies, legislation, state offices for the management of archaeology, the teaching of archaeology, and, most recently, commercial archaeology. If we widen its definition it would also include institutions that manage heritage tourism.

Learned associations were the earliest institutionalized archaeological bodies. In the early modern era the then-emerging interest in antiquities was discussed in institutions of wider scope first in Italy such as the Academia Platonica (1438) and the Academy in Naples (1442). Later, archaeology became the focus of similar institutions elsewhere in Europe and the colonized world, the Royal Society in England (1662) being one of the earliest examples. In the eighteenth century, when the growth of scholarly and scientific societies became linked with rationality, sociability, and patriotism, more specifically archaeological associations were founded, including the Society of Antiquaries of London (1707) and the Accademia Pontificia Romana di Archeologia (1740). Specialization continued throughout the nineteenth century with an explosion of different societies for all kinds of archaeology worldwide, such as the Tankikai or Oddity Addicts Club in Japan (1824–25), the British Archaeological Association (1843), and the

Society of Biblical Archaeology (1870). Archaeology's connection to other fields such as anthropology, geology, and physical anthropology led to the inclusion of debates on the past in the associations of these other specialities, something that is still relatively common. In the second half of the nineteenth century, specific associations were created to organize international congresses.

Museums appeared in the eighteenth century, although they had roots in the century-old tradition of the cabinets of curiosities and in the increasingly specialized collections belonging to the monarchy, the church, and the aristocracy. In the eighteenth century the perception of the need to educate the public led to some of heretofore private collections being made public. The collection of the British Museum (1753) was among the earliest. Some of the royal collections, such as that of the Louvre (1792), were transformed into public museums by the end of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The earliest museums with antiquities included mainly collections related to the so-called Great Civilizations, which were defined by their monumental architecture. Some of these museums were created outside Europe in countries such as Mexico (1825), Peru (1826), and Chile (1838). The interest in the Great Civilizations encouraged the opening of museums in parts of the colonial world including Egypt (Cairo, 1835), Algeria (Algiers, Cher-cell, and Constantine in 1838, 1840, and 1852).

In addition to institutions displaying the remains of the Great Civilizations, a second major group of museums in the early period of institutionalization comprised those with national, nonmonumental antiquities. The earliest of these was the Museum of French Monuments (1793–1816), which inspired the establishment of others, such as the National Museum in Budapest (1802), the Museum of Nordic Antiquities in Denmark, and several in Central Europe, including the Vaterländisches Museum in Prague (1818). From the second half of the nineteenth century the increase in interest in the remains of the local, regional, and national past led to the opening of smaller museums. There also were some new private museums with antiquities and the founding