

UC Berkeley

Unpublished Papers and Presentations

Title

Who's the Real Socialist Here? The socio-politics of archaeology in Europe

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1qd926t5>

Author

Tringham, Ruth

Publication Date

1986-04-01

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>

Who's the Real Socialist Here? The Socio-Politics of Archaeology in Southeast Europe

by Ruth Tringham

Dept. of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley.

Unpublished paper presented in the "Past is the Present" symposium at the 51st Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, New Orleans, La. April 1986

The Balkan peninsula of Southeast Europe is characterized by a variety of topographies and cultures, by a history of changing political boundaries, and by fierce ethnic rivalries. It is characterized by a variety of paths towards modern industrialization and urbanization.

From the point of view of the Classical Mediterranean states of Greece and Rome, the Balkan peninsula acted as a bridge between the civilized Mediterranean and the Barbarian World of temperate Europe. From the point of view of Western Europe, the Balkan peninsula played an important role as buffer zone between the Christian World and the Muslim World and, as such, was a constant witness of changing political powers during the 13-19th centuries. It was only after the first World War that the Balkan states were finally free of the political control of the Austro-Hungarian Empire on the one hand, and the Ottoman Empire on the other, after several hundred years domination by both.

In the modern period, the Balkan peninsula is characterized by a variety of economic situations of financial debt to the West or of standing trade agreement with the Soviet Union. Along with the northern part of eastern Europe, it forms one of the folds of the Iron Curtain between the Soviet Union and the capitalist states of western Europe. The socialist countries of the Balkan peninsula are by no means a simple extension of the Soviet Union, neither in terms of ideology, economics, nor politics.

This is the background to the practice of archaeology in the Balkan peninsula and the collaboration of local with foreign researchers. There is a long history of foreign archaeological activity in the Balkan peninsula, especially in its southernmost part in Greece, but it is especially with the northern part that I shall be concerned in this paper, the modern states of Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Rumania and Hungary, where in recent years there has been a history of collaboration between foreign and local scholars.

This collaboration becomes interesting to a conference, such as this, on presentism in and a critical analysis of archaeological research for several reasons. In the first place this collaboration has been with foreign scholars of the Western and Eastern "blocs" who have varying intellectual and socio-political backgrounds. Secondly, whole research teams rather than single specialists have collaborated. And finally, this collaboration has been of a very different nature from the colonial "collaboration" kind between European archaeologists and a single inspector or museum representative that has been characteristic in the Near East, Africa and other parts of the world that have been or are presently colonized or politically and economically smothered by the Europeans.

In the Balkan peninsula, the local archaeologists are highly trained and respected by their European colleagues, they come from a long tradition of archaeological investigation in their respective countries, and have very definite ideas of what it is they hope will be the outcome of their investigations. Their countries may be in financial debt or economic dependency to the more powerful industrialized countries of East and West, but they are certainly not in any colonial relationship.

A critical analysis of the aims and research which form the backdrop to these collaborative research projects is not just an interesting academic exercise, which many critical analyses turn out to be. It is an essential prerequisite for any would-be future collaborators in this area, and for the successful operation and completion of any current collaborative efforts. Since I am in the middle of such a project in Yugoslavia, I hope that this analysis will prove valuable for my own research, and that of my colleagues from both U.S. and Yugoslavia who work with me on this project, and on closely related projects. If they feel that I err in my analysis, then at least it will have provided a basis for open debate of these issues.

A Short History of Foreign Participation in the Archaeology of the Balkan Peninsula

Archaeology began in Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania and Yugoslavia in the 19th century. Participation by foreign archaeologists was rare, but their influence was strong inasmuch as the local archaeologists were trained in the great schools of archaeology of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, notably in Vienna. The importance of Austrian and German archaeology in the formation of Balkan archaeology continued right up to the Second World War, and even now, the connections are very close. Austrian and Hungarian archaeologists undertook excavations in the Balkans (for example, Hoernes (Fiala and Hoernes 1898) at Butmir in Yugoslavia, Zsofia von Torma and Marton Roska [Roska 1941] at Tordos/Turdaß in C.Rumania) in the earlier part of this century.

In the years between the two World Wars, and even earlier, a number of individuals made their intrepid way to the wild Balkans to carry out surveys of sites in such *terra incognita* as Macedonia (Heurtley 1939; Wace and Thompson 1912) or tried to make some sense of the mass of archaeological data that was being retrieved, but had not reached publication in any (for the majority of European archaeologists) intelligible language (Childe 1925, 1929; Gaul 1948). The most well-known of these and certainly the most effective - V.Gordon Childe - took his first trips to the Balkans and Danube Valley, while waiting for a job in England, having recently arrived in Europe from Australia.

Childe's syntheses of the east European data in *the Dawn of European Civilization* (1925) and *the Danube in Prehistory* (1929) brought for the first time to the attention of the English-speaking world information on the new excavations at Vinča, in Yugoslavia on the Danube river, and Karanovo in southern Bulgaria. He helped the fuller publication of these in the British journal *Antiquity*. He did not, however, participate in these excavations. It is interesting to note in this context that the original excavations of Vinca were financed by an English businessman, and provided with an English photographer (Vasić, 1932-36). Childe's role was to synthesize the data from the different Balkan countries and the varied mosaic of archaeological research along the Danube valley. He pointed out the importance of the Balkan stratified sites for establishing the basis of a relative chronology of European prehistory and

linking this, through connections with the literate or semi-literate sources of Troy, Mycenae, Crete and Egypt, to a system of absolute dating. The local Balkan archaeologists had certainly discussed the chronological significance and connections of their sites, but they had not synthesised this information in a European-wide, or even Southeast European-wide scheme. This pattern became standard for many subsequent British appearances in Balkan archaeology (Piggott 1965, Tringham 1971, Renfrew 1973, Dennell 1983, Sherratt 1972, Chapman 1980, and many others).

The American School of Prehistoric Research centered in Harvard University was the leading institution to sponsor and publish collaborative American research in the Balkans and elsewhere between the two World Wars, involving excavations of sites (Fewkes 1934, 1936; Gaul 1948). The School is and was, moreover, very much a representative of what Patterson has referred to as the International Monopoly Capitalists (Patterson 1986).

The post-second World War period saw many social, economic and political changes in the Balkan peninsula associated with the adoption of socialist organization of the countries involved, the political dominance of the Communist Party, and the close connection and interaction with the Soviet Union. In the countries with which I am dealing in this paper, it is surely not necessary to remind you that the nature of these changes was very different in each state. For example, the political and economic connections to the Soviet Union were much less close in Yugoslavia, than in Bulgaria, Rumania and Hungary. In Bulgaria, Rumania and Hungary, pre-war centralized planning and organization of archaeological research in the National Museums was transferred after the Second World War into Soviet-style centralised Academy of Sciences Institutes of Archaeology of the kind described Philip Kohl in this volume. In these latter states, outside of the capital cities archaeological activities continued to be carried out from the local museums as they had been before the second World War, but in collaboration with members of the Academy Institute of Archaeology.

In Yugoslavia, on the other hand, in keeping with the political organization of a federation of republics, archaeological research has been more decentralized. The different archaeological institutions throughout the country, be they university department, local museum, research institute or conservation institute have much greater autonomy in planning, operation and financing than in the other countries.

In all the Balkan countries after the second World War, more money was put into archaeological research by government funding than before. But some of the more obvious changes after the war are connected with the lack of "hard" currency in these countries. After the second World War, the training of archaeologists was carried out locally. That is, fewer students were able to get financial backing for foreign education, even in the Soviet Union. Competition for the government grants for foreign education was and is fierce, and rewards tend to go to those in the more "relevant" disciplines. Foreign archaeological literature has been difficult to obtain in these states since the Second World War, and the lack of "hard" currency continues to put severe limits on the breadth of exposure of the archaeologists and their students to West European and American literature. Most researchers depend on their personal contacts with archaeologists from these latter areas, and their libraries depend on the exchangeability of their local journals with foreign journals for keeping their shelves occupied.

A final way in which a lack of "hard currency" puts great limitations on the previously broad contacts of the Balkan archaeologists is the competition for funds to travel to visit archaeological collections, sites and colleagues abroad, and to participate in conferences. These restrictions are obviously sharpest where "hard currency" is essential, for example Western Europe and America. But even travel within the "eastern bloc" is neither easy nor cheap for them. Thus the conferences of UISPP in Prague in 1966 and in Beograd in 1971, to name but two, provided exceptional opportunities to overcome these difficulties.

The Prague Congress seems to have had a profound effect on the subsequent nature of collaboration of archaeologists between east and west Europe. Archaeologists from the western hemisphere were hardly involved in UISPP at this point. However, some of the American directors of future collaborative projects in the Balkan peninsula were present, including Alan McPherron and Marija Gimbutas. For many of the archaeologists from western Europe, this was their first trip behind the folds of the Iron Curtain, and they could not help but be impressed by the results of the centralised organization of archaeology in the socialist countries epitomized by the vast scale of excavation of Bylany and Mikulčice in Czechoslovakia.

In the majority of the Balkan states, outside of Greece, in the suspicious atmosphere of the post-Second World War era, it had become extremely difficult even for individuals, let alone for whole teams, from West Europe or America to participate in fieldwork, and certainly not in any planning role.

I was able, probably through luck and the good contacts of my mentor Stuart Piggott, to be able to participate in the excavations at Bylany in Czechoslovakia, in the years immediately preceding the Prague congress, but in a very lowly role. This was at that time an extremely rare phenomenon. Even rarer was the opportunity that I had, in 1967 and 1968, to participate in the excavation of Neolithic sites in the Southwestern corner of the Soviet Union, again in a lowly position of field assistant. Other archaeologists, including Robin Dennell, Olga Soffer, Linda Ellis, Judith Rasson and a few others also managed to participate in the field research of Bulgarian, European USSR, Rumanian and Hungarian archaeologists, but it is still extremely difficult. The tendency is for opportunity to be given only to individuals and then only in roles peripheral to the main planning of the research.

On the other hand, there has been collaborative participation of research teams from Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the USSR in Bulgaria. Very recently French and German teams have been carrying out field research there as well. The Soviet-Bulgarian project at Ezero in South Bulgaria 1961-71 will be discussed below.

The year of the 1966 Prague congress coincided with the availability of US funds for archaeological and other scientific research in Yugoslavia (The PL480 funds sponsored by the Smithsonian Institution). Both Yugoslav as well as American scientists were to be able to take advantage of the new source of funding. Under Yugoslav law, however, the American scientists could not do research by themselves with a single local representative. These were to be truly collaborative projects with parity of participation on both sides, a pattern of collaboration which really had no precedent in British or American foreign archaeological research, as far as I know. Thus the funds and the arrangement for collaboration which went

along with them provided the single opportunity in the Balkan peninsula at that time (and still does for the most part) for Westerners not only to participate in field research but also to plan and direct a team of researchers in a long-term project.

Two prehistoric researchers took advantage immediately of this opportunity: Marija Gimbutas from UCLA who from 1967 started the project at Obre in Bosnia (Gimbutas 1970; Benac 1973; Sterud and Sterud 1974) and Alan McPherron from University of Pittsburgh who from 1968 started the project at Divostin in Serbia (McPherron and Srejovic, in press). These prehistoric research projects both investigated Neolithic sites. Other projects followed these initial ones, at Anzabegovo in Macedonia (Gimbutas 1976), at Mokrin in northern Serbia (Foltiny 19XX; Krstic 19XX; Bankoff 1982), at Stobi in Macedonia (Wiseman and Manozisi 19XX), which used the same PL480 ("soft" Yugoslav currency) funds.

By the mid 1970s these funds were drying up, and new projects had to be funded on a different basis. The project which I carried out Selevac, for example, was funded entirely by dollar funds from the National Science Foundation (Tringham et al. 1980; Tringham and Krstic in press). American dollar funding was also used for the excavations at Kraku lu Yordan (M.Werner & B.Bartel 19XX) and Novačka Cuprija (Bankoff and Winter 198X). More recently, yet another basis of funding has been made available in the form of a contract between the United States and Yugoslav governments to match funding in Yugoslav currency for joint research projects. Thus there is even more explicit parity in the projects than before. This is the basis of my current research at Opovo, in northern Serbia (Tringham, Brukner and Voytek 1985).

I should mention the important role of the archaeologist associated with the British Academy Research Project on Early Agriculture under the direction of Eric Higgs of the University of Cambridge 1967-77. The research strategy of the archaeologists working with this project was of two kinds. The first involved survey of topography, soils, vegetation in terms of potential value of the land as an agricultural and pastoral resource, in relation to the location of sites (Higgs and Jarman 1972, 1975; Jarman, Bailey and Jarman 1985). The second was an emphasis on careful retrieval of data on the use of dietary resources, leading to innovative analyses of faunal and floral remains, and their retrieval by screening and froth flotation (Payne, 1972; Dannel 1975; Ottaway, 19XX). These projects, except for Dannel's participation in the Kazanluk project in Bulgaria, could not be said to be in any way collaborative projects with the local archaeologists.

Thus in summary, my data base for this critical analysis comprises the joint Yugoslav-American excavation projects, a joint Soviet-Bulgarian project, the British Lone Ranger presence in the Balkans, and the Balkan archaeologists themselves. I apologise for those others, particularly the Classical archaeologists, both French and American, who may feel slighted by my ignoring their presence, but perhaps by the end of this paper they will be grateful.

Traditional Questions in Balkan Archaeology

In examining the traditional questions which have dominated Balkan archaeology (traditional in the sense of characterizing the Balkan archaeologists themselves), there is much

which has been said about the aims of European archaeologists, which could also apply to the Balkan archaeologists (Sterud 1973, 1980). Thus the overriding engagement is with sorting the materials into chronological and spatial divisions, and in equating these divisions - "cultures" as they are traditionally termed - with social and ethnic units. Change and variation in the units is explained by different mechanisms of social or ethnic replacement (migration, invasion) or by the different results of contact between social/ethnic groups (diffusion, "influence"), or occasionally as the result of a natural agency, such as environmental change. The main research strategy of the archaeologist in this case is a) to be able to define diagnostic features of each "culture" and b) to be able to recognise continuity or discontinuity in these through different strata of an archaeological site or between sites. There has been an uneven challenging of this equation during the last few decades in Europe and the development of more complicated views of the past which I shall discuss below.

In the Balkans, however, the equation is still strong and healthy, thanks to the importance in the lives of the archaeologists there of two themes about the past. The first of these is a strong nationalistic feeling throughout the Balkans and an importance attached to ethnic identity in the historical and modern development of these countries (Evans and Rasson, 1984).

Ethnogenesis of the modern inhabitants, including the archaeologists themselves is an important aim of Balkan archaeologists. This question and its rationale is the theme of much of Timothy Kaiser's paper in this volume. Traditional archaeology in the Balkans is very much of the kind referred to by Trigger as "nationalistic archaeology" (Trigger 1984:358). The Institute of Thracology in Sofia and the Institute of Balcanology in Beograd both have as an important aim the study of the ethnogenesis of the various Balkan peoples through archaeology, history, linguistics and so on.

The second theme which characterizes the traditional archaeology of the Balkan peninsula is the strong role which they feel the past inhabitants played as the closest neighbors to the more advanced or civilized peoples of the East Mediterranean area and the Near East (Tringham 1974). The role is, on the one hand one of a buffer, but on the other hand, they also see their ancestors as providing a link between the Mediterranean and continental Europe, transmitting the various technological and social innovations from the civilized to the barbarian world. This gives to the Balkan peoples an important role in the history of Europe, one which has usually been ignored by all but the most enlightened European writers of history. Thus archaeologists have an important job to find those links with the Mediterranean and Near East, not only in terms of similar pottery and figurine styles, but also in terms of discovering as early as possible evidence of the innovations themselves, such as agriculture, ceramics, metal technology, ideology and a complex religious symbolism, specialist crafts, class structured society, proto-urban or even urban settlements (viz. Srejović's comparison of Lepenski Vir with Çatal Höyük, in Srejović, 1969), and writing (the reaction to finding the symbols incised on clay tablets from Tartaria, Rumania, in for example Vlassa 1963; Makkay 1969; Berciu 1967).

The questions asked by the Balkan archaeologists did not change as a result of their changing socio-political context after the second World War. They do reflect, however, the changing questions in Near Eastern archaeology since the early 1950s. For example, there was an increased search for the earliest Neolithic settlements, including aceramic Neolithic of the kind seen in the southern Balkans in Greece. Other topics for archaeological investigation have

included a search for proto-urban development in the complex centralized villages of the Late Neolithic/Eneolithic/Chalcolithic settlements; a search for the invading/migrating Indo-European speakers during the Early Bronze Age; the search for the emergence of ethnic groups such as the early historic Thracians, Illyrians, and Dacians in the pre-Roman Bronze and Iron Ages; investigation of the process of Romanization of the local ethnic groups; and finally the reconstruction of the dispersal, movements and contacts of post-Roman ethnic groups including, of course, the Slavs.

The archaeological implications of these searches or questions are important when dealing with the collaboration between the local Balkan archaeologists and archaeologists from elsewhere. Excavations are site specific, and are aimed at producing chronological sequences, with an emphasis on the deeply stratified sites, including tells. At the same time, information is needed on spatial organization within a site to provide information on settlement planning and specialized structures such as shrines, craft production areas, defensive walls and so on. It is characteristic, therefore, where funds are available, to see the large exposure of a site area through excavation in the Balkan peninsula (even the complete excavation of a site, such as the tell settlement Ovcharovo in Bulgaria [Todorova et al. 1983]), and to see a focus of careful data retrieval from closed finds such as collapsed houses, pits, and graves. Thus research excavations in the Balkans have tended to be large-scale and long-term with a large labour force generally comprising local workers supervised by a few archaeologists.

The top priority as far as data retrieval is concerned is for diagnostic artifacts, although in recent years there has been an aim to obtain a large sample of these and quantifying their frequencies. Most attention is given to those artifacts which are likely to be diagnostic of specific time/space units, including ceramics with decoration or formal characteristics, clay figurines, metal artifacts, and house forms. The large excavations of Neolithic sites at Vinča (Garašanin and Srejovic 1984), Gomolava (Brukner et al. 1980), Karanovo (Georgiev 1961), Ezero (Georgiev, Merpert, & Katiņarov 1979), Varna (Ivanov 1978), Cascioarele (Dumitrescu 197X), Ovcharovo (Todorova et al. 1983) and Golyama Delçevo (Todorova et al. 1976) are typical examples of such excavations.

As Sterud (1980) has pointed out, regional survey tends to comprise a comparison of excavated sites, or discovery of new sites with potential value for excavation, rather than any systematic reconnaissance of the surface evidence of sites and their location in relation to the surrounding topography, other sites quarries, and surface scatters.

Imperialist Archaeology in the Balkan Peninsula

There was no "Colonialist Archaeology" of the type described by Trigger (1984, 360) in the Balkans. The Ottoman Empire representatives were not interested in archaeological research, and the Austro-Hungarian masters of the North and West carried out archaeological research in the Balkans as if it was an extension of their own homeland.

On the other hand, since the first World War, and especially since the late 1960s there has been active research by representatives of "imperialist archaeology". Trigger defines "imperialist archaeology" as "world-oriented archaeology....associated with a small number of states that enjoy or have exerted political dominance over large areas of the world" (Trigger

1984: 363). The two states represented in this way in recent Balkan archaeology are the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and, to a lesser extent, Holland. As might be expected from the differing socio-political backgrounds of these two states, their imperialist archaeology manifests itself in different ways, but there are also some interesting convergences.

The principal manifestation of Imperialist Archaeology is a utilization (perhaps even exploitation) by its representatives of another country or countries as a playground for general theoretical premises, or as a testing ground to show off new techniques, both of which have been developed in the Imperialist's homeland.

The socio-politics of the archaeology of the United States of America has been the subject of a number of recent discussions, as I expect it to be in this symposium (Trigger, 1984, 366; Patterson, 1986). It should be pointed out, however, that the American archaeologists who work in the Balkans (or Europe for that matter) are not archetypal examples of what Patterson has referred to as the Core Culture of America, nor really of his International Monopoly Capitalists (Patterson, 1986). Nor are any those currently working in the Balkans expatriates of the Balkan countries, and are thus bereft of any of the nationalist archaeological sympathies which might result from such an origin. The British archaeologists in the Balkans do not form a united theoretical or socio-political front either. I think it is fair to say, however, that consciously or unconsciously all the archaeologists from the United States of America or Western Europe who work in the Balkans frame their questions and carry out their research in a way which is typical of an Imperialist Archaeology. And I must to my shame include myself in this number.

If we begin with Gordon Childe, who would probably be appalled to see himself included here, we can see that his syntheses of European prehistory came out of a long tradition of British archaeologists who synthesized the steps of world technological progress through the ages culminating in the glories of British industrialization (Lubbock, 1913; Trigger, 1984: 364). Admittedly, Childe's model of technological and cultural change is rather more sophisticated than that of his predecessors, but he nevertheless displays a typically imperialistic confidence in daring to take the materials of countless archaeologists and synthesizing them into a masterly reconstruction of the past of Europe and the Near East. As I have mentioned elsewhere, his syntheses in various volumes offer a model which was quite in keeping with that of his Balkan colleagues, except that he lifted their local studies into a much larger World System (Tringham, 1983).

Childe's syntheses set a pattern for subsequent studies on European and Balkan prehistory by British archaeologists, who crossed borders where no post-second World War east Europeans could, who had access to an international scale of information which no east European colleagues did, and who had the courage or was it arrogance to synthesize the material of countless east European colleagues which protocol and a sense of propriety prevented the east Europeans themselves from synthesizing (Piggott, 1965; Tringham, 1971; Renfrew, 1973; Sherratt, 1972). The syntheses of the U.S. researcher Marija Gimbutas should be included in this number (e.g. Gimbutas, 1956).

There are two major kinds of British archaeologists writing syntheses and carrying out research in the Balkans, a division which I think is more than intellectual. Both groups have their foundations at that bastion of the Establishment: Cambridge University. The divisions tend to be along period lines, the first being associated with the "Palaeoeconomist School", and concentrating on the earlier periods of Balkan prehistory; the second division comprises what might be called the "Social Archaeology School" and focusses on the later periods of Balkan prehistory. Both kinds of British archaeologists focused on regional rather than site-oriented archaeology, and stressed the value of systematic site surveys, locational analysis, and environmental analysis in their research strategies. This strategy has developed from a long tradition of reconnaissance in *terra incognita*, but in the Balkans and elsewhere, it was certainly encouraged by a lack of funds available to British archaeologists for large scale excavation projects abroad from the late 1960s.

The Palaeoeconomists are another name for the British Academy Early Agriculture Project. Their explanation of human behavior emphasizes the strong link between humans and nature, and the factors of long-term stresses caused by population growth and the search to find or produce enough food. They suggest that this provides a predictability and stability to human behavior transcending the "noise" of cultural responses. In their research strategy they brought such innovations to Balkan archaeology as the location of the sites in their environmental setting, the reconstruction of the potential food resources of the surrounding area, and the retrieval of data on faunal and floral materials. In the Balkans there was a restriction on their ability to carry out effective site catchment analyses and pedological and palynological surveys because of local suspicion of foreigners tramping around the countryside beyond the archaeological sites. Their most effective work was site-oriented, for example Dennell's macrofloral study in the Bulgarian excavations at Kazanluk (Dennell 1980). Similar success was obtained by the Biologisch-Archaeologisch Instituut of Groningen, Holland in their collaboration with Yugoslav archaeologists at the site of Gomolava. (van Zeist, 19XX). The aims of the latter were similar to those of the Palaeoeconomists. In fact what was being provided here by both British and Dutch were specialist analysts who could potentially go from one site to another and "take over" Balkan floral, faunal and environmental analysis. Here was a niche into which they could step, since it did not fall within the interests of the Balkan archaeologists.

Many of the Palaeoeconomists' themes of interest on humans in their ecological systems are familiar to us in the guise of the ahistorical "Core Culture studies" in the United States such as optimal foraging analyses (Patterson, 1986). Such themes include the human control of nature, the stabilizing effect of the relationship between humans and their environment in which human behavior is regulated and controlled by a rational desire for efficient use of resources, "a timeless past in which all is utility and control" (Hodder 1985). The American archaeologist in the Balkans who came closest to these studies is Alan McPherron, who directed the excavations at Divostin. McPherron was educated at Chicago in the middle of the innovative muscle flexing of the New Archaeology in the mid 1960s. His doctoral study was on the Woodland site of Juntunen (McPherron 1967).

Unlike the Palaeoeconomists and the Dutch, Alan McPherron was able to plan his research as a site-oriented project. Divostin is a Neolithic site in Yugoslavia. In fact it could have been any Neolithic site, its particular context of time and place was not important. What McPherron

was able to contribute was a research design for rigorous and systematic collection and analysis of a statistically valid sample of biological and material culture data from a Neolithic site in Europe. He introduced the Balkan archaeologists - in this case Yugoslavs - to the new technology and rigorous scientific research methodology of the American New Archaeology. This aspect has always been an important and quite conscious aim of imperialistic archaeology, and not just in the Balkan peninsula. At Divostin, a collaboration was worked out in which the American team was responsible for organizing the analysis of materials, whereas the Yugoslav team was in charge of the excavation of the site and retrieval of data in the field.

Typical of the technological innovations introduced by American, English and Dutch archaeologists - McPherron and myself among them - were those for prospecting (magnetometer; balloons), for excavating (screening, flotation), recording (photo towers, color film, Haselblad and other fancy cameras, systematic field photography), artifact analysis (computerization, microwear lithic analysis - which I brought to the Balkans via the Soviet Union - technological analysis of ceramics and metals, sourcing analysis of minerals, faunal and floral analysis, analysis of building materials), environmental reconstruction (palynology, sedimentology), and dating (Thermoluminescence [Carbon 14 dating was already introduced by the east Germans, as was archaeomagnetic dating by the Czechs]). The aim (conscious or sub-conscious) was to find a means other than financial by which the local archaeologists would become dependent on and grateful to them.

The reaction of the Balkan archaeologists was varied. In the long term, there was a partial acceptance of the innovations. With a few exceptions, however, there was a general disinterest, since the information provided would not add data to the traditional questions. The environment and its data were never accepted by the Balkan archaeologists as an overriding factor in culture change; that is, they were not more important than ethnic/cultural factors. On occasion, there was enthusiastic interest for the new techniques and data, and the westerners could enjoy a place as magician (put our artifact in your pot and do all the analyses you can). But never for very long. The answers could not sustain interest.

In general, the innovations especially those concerned with field methods were regarded as slowing down field projects without giving enough reward to justify such a sacrifice. And here is an interesting contradiction! The mass of data generated by such retrieval methods as screening and flotation, and the required retrieval of additional data on all classes of materials, including faunal remains, in statistically valid samples, slowed down the Yugoslav-American collaborative projects both in the field and in analysis and final publication. This has certainly tried the patience of our Balkan colleagues.

But it has also tried the patience of the Americans at home, where quick returns are expected and, indeed, demanded for the output of funds. Thus a 3-year funded project with possibly a couple of years of post-excavation work is thought of as a normal timespan for a field project, just like a Ph.D. dissertation. On the other hand, Yugoslav projects themselves are expected to be carried on at a much more leisurely pace overall; ten-year and fifteen-year projects are quite normal. What is the moral of that story?! Has it perhaps something to do with the quality of life?

The characteristics of the ahistorical New Archaeology which developed from the 1960s have been discussed at length, and I imagine are familiar to most people here. It suffices only to say that the aims of this kind of archaeology run entirely contrary to those of the Balkan archaeologists, and to those of most European archaeologists (the Palaeoeconomists are an exception in this case), in that in New Archaeology ethnic, cultural, or national identity are regarded as irrelevant either in prehistory or even nowadays.

The students of Marija Gimbutas, who excavated with her in Yugoslavia at Obre and Anzabegovo, and then at Sitagroi in northern Greece, could not be described as real "New Archaeologists" in the law and order sense, but they definitely regarded the Balkans as a testing ground of some general themes, for example social interaction and the emergence of craft specialization (Sterud, 1978; Sterud and Sterud 1974; Rasson, 19xx; Evans, 1978; Evans and Rasson, 1984; Skomal, 1983). What is interesting is that none of them took up Gimbutas' historical perspective, for example, her focus on the Indo-European migrations and their Old European predecessors in the Balkans. From this point of view, the questions of Marija Gimbutas were much more in line with those of Balkan archaeologists than were those of her students (Gimbutas 1982).

However, Sterud and Sterud took the bull by the horns and entered into a fierce dialogue with their Yugoslav colleague at Obre, Alojz Benac, on the question of the demonstration of discontinuity or continuity with archaeological data (Sterud and Sterud 1974). Sterud may not have realized the implications of his demonstration of discontinuity between the early and late neolithic of Bosnia, when Benac at this point was emotionally invested in demonstrating their ethnic continuity (Benac 1973). In practice, dialogue with the local Balkan archaeologists was not a characteristic of field projects under the direction of Prof. Gimbutas since by arrangement at each project, the Americans were able to excavate a separate part of the site from the Yugoslav archaeologists, each following their own strategy to suit their particular sets of questions.

An emphasis on questions of social interaction between groups, rather than on the interaction between humans and nature is a characteristic also of the second group of British archaeologists working in the Balkans. Unlike the models of the students of Gimbutas, however, the aim of these "Social Archaeologists" such as Colin Renfrew, Andrew Sherratt and John Chapman is to put socio-economic evolution into its historical context rather than to demonstrate its existence. They, nevertheless use a systemic model to express the functioning of the various parts of society and economy within a whole. Sherratt and probably Renfrew have been doing this at least since their days of discussion with David Clarke. Moreover, they stress the factors of population growth and efficient resource utilization, just as the Palaeoeconomists did. Their main divergence from the latter is in treating the Palaeoeconomists' cultural noise as a major factor in human variability. This gives their models and their investigations a focus on relations between settlements in the exchange and redistribution of non-food resources and an importance to the cultural-historical context of the prehistoric actors; it also gives their studies a certain focus (although to a much less degree, as remarked above) on social relations within the settlements.

Renfrew, Chapman and Sherratt in the Balkans have all focussed on the question of the emergence of social hierarchy in prehistoric societies in the form of established social

ranking in which a particular individual controls the group, and/or a particular settlement controls the actions and flow of resources between settlements. At the same time, in contrast to the Balkan archaeologists themselves, they are explicitly aiming to demonstrate the distance of the Balkans from the traditionally regarded centres of innovation in the Near East and the east Mediterranean area; thus they show the Balkans as being part of an autonomous European arena of social, technological and economic change. They are looking for social complexity, social control and social inequality as being a natural outgrowth of the economic growth of the late Neolithic period. Economic success is measured in terms of control of people, land and resources, and successful individuals and settlements naturally became the leaders and initiators of long-term stability. They examine European prehistory as a long trend towards the cumulative inequality and ranking of society, culminating in the proto-urban developments of later prehistory. In their excavations, survey and writing, they focus on the powerful settlements controlling resources (e.g., Melos), on elite tombs (Ochre Graves in Hungary, Varna in Bulgaria). The Balkan peninsula in the late Neolithic is seen as the first stages of this trend.

The question is, do the archaeologists interested in the growth of social inequality and leadership represent a different socio-political context from that of their countrymen, the Palaeoeconomists and from the Core Culture New Archaeologists? I would say that is definitely so. Those interested in the establishment of mechanisms of social control from the United States (Gimbutas, Evans, Bankoff) are closer to being representatives of Patterson's International Monopoly Capitalists. In the U.K., however, whereas the Palaeoeconomists represent the solid conservative farmer (at least gentlemen farmer)/yeoman class of England, Renfrew and Sherratt represent an upwardly mobile middle class, equally conservative but of a more London-based political leadership sophistication (wishfully if not in fact). Renfrew at least is fully in tune with the sentiments of his peers in their support of England at the head of a unified European Economic Community, in which rewards are given to those who control the destinies of most people and the movement of most resources, and in which rewards are given for conformist behavior and support of the *status quo*.

The sequel to this paper would be to consider a point which I have ignored except by small hints throughout: the different roles which the foreign archaeologists have in their homelands. In Britain it is common, acceptable and indeed expected to work abroad. In the Soviet Union it is unusual to work abroad, but those who do so are usually well-established figures in their field. In the United States, however, it seems to me that the position of archaeologists working abroad is more ambiguous, depending on where you work. If you work in a country which is clearly in economic or political dependence to the U.S., or where "origins" of the kind discussed by Meg Conkey and by Wobst and Keene (1984) are likely to occur, then you are likely to be accepted as a mainstream archaeologist in the United States. Europe, however, provides neither of these possibilities, which perhaps explains the apparent marginality of European archaeology in the United States, and the fact that archaeologists who work there tend to stand on the periphery of their discipline.

Are There any Marxist Archaeologists working in the Balkan Peninsula?

As I mentioned above, there is little evidence to show a sharp change in personnel amongst the archaeologists of the Balkan peninsula after the socio-political changes following the end of

the second World War. Nor is there any evidence among them for a new or growing interest in the analytical method of historical materialism in archaeology. In fact it has been pointed out that in the Soviet Union itself, a creative thinking about the possibilities of historical materialism in the analysis of preclass societies as been virtually ignored by archaeologists (Kohl, in this volume; Soffer, 198X; Tringham, 1983) and until recently by social anthropologists (Gellner, 19XX; Howe, 19XX). Archaeologists there have searched for the manifestations of the various criteria established for pre-class social formations, but never used the archaeological data to question those criteria or establish alternative processes in the transformation of society. The basically descriptive nature of Soviet archaeology has been pointed out by the above-mentioned authors, who have also noted the large-scale excavations with detailed retrieval of spatial distribution of materials, and with innovative studies on the manufacture and utilization of artifacts.

There is no reason then why we should expect any spectacular show of historical materialist virtuosity from the Soviet presence in the Balkan peninsula, either indirectly by their training of Balkan archaeologists and historians, or directly by participation of Soviet archaeologists in Balkan field projects. In fact it is probably considered quite cool by some Soviet archaeologists *not* to appear to be considering questions of social reproduction.

Trigger has referred to the Soviet archaeologists as part representatives of Imperialist Archaeology (Trigger 1984: 365). It is true that there were world prehistories written in the days of optimism for international socialist revolution between the two world wars, but in fact these were never on a European-wide scale to the same extent as those of Gordon Childe. Since the second World War, there has been very little of the syntheses of prehistory of this kind, which Trigger claims. Titov's synthesis of the Neolithic of southeast Europe was an exception in this respect (Titov, 19XX). Dolukhanov's synthesis of the palaeogeography of east Europe (including the Soviet part) is also unusual (Dolukhanov 1979). Both were done with minimal travel in the countries concerned. Most of Soviet archaeology would be more appropriately termed Nationalistic and Colonial Archaeology.

Soviet archaeology has in fact been represented in the Balkans by only one joint prehistoric project, in which participated throughout two senior archaeologists, and one or two junior ones. The two archaeologists concerned, unlike the Americans participating in joint projects, were very much mainstream figures of the archaeological Establishment in Moscow. The first, and head of the joint project at Ezero in Bulgaria, was Nicolai Merpert, for many years the Secretary (chief executive officer) of the Institute of Archaeology in Moscow, and the second - Yevgeni Çernykh - who runs the archaeometric laboratory in the Institute of Archaeology and is a senior officer of its administration and also excavated at the site of Ezero. Çernykh also carried out investigations at the Bulgarian Chalcolithic copper mines at Ai-Bunar. Both of these archaeologists have travelled extensively abroad to conferences, and Merpert has also excavated in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Merpert's interest in the Bulgarian site was that it dates to a period in the prehistory of Bulgaria when important social and economic changes were thought to have been brought about on the one hand by migrations of Indo-European speakers from the steppes of present-day southern Russia, north of the Black Sea, and on the other hand from Anatolia in the south. Whether or not we could say that ultimately he wanted to legitimise the continuing influence of

south Russia in the land of modern Bulgaria is very questionable. But there was certainly no attempt to look at the sequence at Ezero in terms of local transformation of culture (Georgiev, Merpert and Katinčarov 198). It was in fact a traditional, very well excavated and recorded Balkan excavation of a tell-sit.

Çernykh's interest in Bulgaria was rather different. His speciality was the history of metallurgy in the Soviet Union, using especially spectrographic techniques (Çernykh, 1978). In that many of the earliest copper artifacts were shown to be made of copper from the Carpathian mountains, that is outside the boundaries of present-day Soviet Union, he extended his primary study area into the Balkan peninsula, and at the same time became one of the premier workers on these materials, at least in the eastern part of the Balkan peninsula. From this point of view, his role was similar to that of some of the British and Dutch "Imperialists" with their particular technological skills. With his excavation of the Chalcolithic copper mine at Ai-Bunar (Çernykh, 1978), however, and analysis of the metal artifacts from Varna, his position became much more powerful than that of any of the Palaeoeconomists. It is interesting - but perhaps not surprising - to note that the Yugoslav archaeologists, particularly Borislav Jovanović, the excavator of the only other copper mine of this period at Rudna Glava in Yugoslavia, steadfastly refuse to collaborate with Çernykh, and prefer to go to England for their metal analyses.

What makes Çernykh interesting from the point of view of this chapter is that he is one of the few Soviet archaeologists in recent years who has actually published a theoretical paper on the factors of causality in human behavior and cultural change (Chernykh, 1982). This paper discusses the exogenous and endogenous factors in society. It is firmly based in dialectical materialism, and stresses the need for archaeologists to consider the irrational explanations as experienced from within the society in question, as well as the rational explanations as viewed from our own society. As with most historical materialist analyses in archaeology, his discussion falls down flat when it comes to deal with the material from Ezero itself.

There are two issues involved in the question as to whether there are any Marxist archaeologists in the Balkan peninsula. In most of this geographic unit we are dealing with states with strong ties to the Soviet Union so that we tend to expect the Marxist-based national ideology to be reflected in their archaeology and history. There has always been an assumption that the political and ideological leaders would have put pressure on these intellectuals dealing with the past to support the mainline ideology in their work. In some ways this has been so. It must be pointed out, however, that, after a superficial comparison of Capitalist and Socialist archaeology, more support seems to be engendered for the national ideology in capitalist countries than in socialist ones. One might conclude from this that archaeologists are more likely to be conformists ideologically in capitalist countries than in socialist ones, for one reason or another.

The second issue is that of the research methodology by which a historical materialist analysis of the transformation of social formations in prehistory may be carried out using the data base of the archaeological record. Many archaeologists in the West have discussed the nature of what they expect Marxism in archaeology to consist of. With a few exceptions (Spriggs ed., Rowlands, Tilley, Patterson, McGuire et al. they know who they are) they have been quite mistaken. Marxist ideology and the methodology of historical materialism is *much more* than

material or economic determinism. It comprises a complex study of the human relationship to the material world and the human relations with other humans through their relationship with the material world (social relations of production), and beyond that the structure and dynamic of exploitation of group by group through false realities created by ideology.

The role of the historical analyst - in our case the archaeologist - is to work through to the essence of these relationships and their transformation through time. The real role of a historical materialist is *not* to demonstrate that a prehistoric population fits into a particular stage of a unilinear scheme of socio-economic evolution.

But how is an archaeologist to investigate the transformation of the social relations of production? As with any study of social relations using archaeological data, it takes a great deal of cumulative and systematic research; it cannot be done quickly - there are no quick returns, and its results are steeped in ambiguity. This factor has certainly contributed to the lack of popularity of historical materialist analysis in archaeology.

I have pointed out elsewhere that it was much easier for Childe to be creative in his Marxist analyses of changing social formations when dealing in the Near East with written documents and the well discussed themes of the Asiatic mode of production and class formation than when discussing the prehistory of Europe (Tringham, 1983; 1985). In Europe since Childe's time, there has been recent theoretical study of the possible nature of pre-class social formations and on transformation of pre-class social formations on a European-wide or regional scale (Rowland, Kristianssen et al.; Tilley) but virtually nothing on grappling with the problem on the smaller scale of village, household, or hamlet (e.g. Tosi in Iran). It is this latter topic which forms the aim of my own research and the research of some of those who work with me (for example, Barbara Voytek, Tim Kaiser, Nerissa Russell and Mirjana Stevanović) at Opovo in Yugoslavia.

The most difficult thing is to do a critical analysis of one's own work. At the end of this paper now I shall do little more than expose my little toe. However, during the 10-year collaboration I have had with Yugoslav archaeologists at Selevac, Gomolava and Opovo, I can recognize shifts in the aims of my own archaeological enterprise which, I have no doubt, are related to my changing position vis-a-vis the United States and my collaboration in Yugoslavia.

My research at Selevac was essentially interested in investigating the changing pattern of resource use and production (in its broadest sense) in the Balkan Neolithic. This was a problem that I had spent my whole archaeological life studying in the European tradition. I tried to be a combination of American and European imperialist in bringing a broader theoretical but still historical view to the problem, at the same time insisting on the rigor of scientific logical positivism in research design of retrieval and analysis of the archaeological data, including strategies such as screening and computerized data recording. The research at Opovo, on the other hand, is attempting to look at these same questions in combination with investigating social divisions within a village in terms of units of social reproduction. Now the strategy of excavation is much more a combination of those of the Imperialists and those of the Yugoslavs as described above. How and why this transformation in my own research happened is not a mystery. It is certainly explainable (but remember: only the little toe).

The main point here, however, is that in analyzing my own aims, those of my American and English colleagues, and those of my Balkan colleagues, I believe that some of mistakes which have been made in international collaboration can be avoided. These, on the part of the foreign archaeologist, include a lack of flexibility, a lack of patience, an unwillingness to compromise for the sake of scientific integrity, a lack of willingness to recognize that one can and must learn from one's colleagues both from the First, Second and Third Worlds, and an unawareness of the exploitative and patronizing role of the Imperialists.

In spite of their variety in socio-political background and philosophies of life, the American, British, Dutch, and to a lesser extent Soviet archaeologists whom I have considered in this paper all act according to their role as representatives of powerful states in which order and control of nature by humans, and humans and by humans are the basic aim, and in which behavior which conforms to and supports the *status quo* is encouraged. In the Balkan peninsula, neither of these basic politico-philosophical aims is tolerated kindly. On the contrary, among the Balkan people the dialectic of political instability is a way of life, and the organization of the family/household unit independent of centralized social control is fiercely advocated and defended. This is especially true now in Yugoslavia, but is a characteristic, sometimes well hidden, of all Balkan countries.

This contradiction which makes it so difficult for the Great Powers of the West and East to manipulate the countries of the Balkan peninsula, is also reflected in the incompatibility of the Balkan with the Imperialist aims and strategies of research in archaeology. An interest in the irrational, in the form of attempts at palaeo-cognition and palaeopsychology, and a belief in the power of instability in the form of human migrations and invasions, is a part of every archaeologist's training and world-view in the Balkan peninsula. They view the arrival of the Imperialists, with their desire to seek a rational explanation and to demonstrate the power of science and technology with blunt skepticism. They view it for what it is: potential exploitation of the kind familiar to them in the past 500 years of their history.

An Incomplete Bibliography

Bankoff, H A, and F Winter (1982) The Morava Valley Project in Yugoslavia: Preliminary Report 1977-1980. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 9(2):149-64.

Benac, A. (1973) Obre II, a Neolithic settlement of the Butmir Group at Gornje Polje. *Wissenschaftliche Mitteilungen des Bosnisch-Herzegowinischen Landesmuseums* III(A).

Berciu, Dumitru (1967) Romania before Burebista. Volume 57. London: Thames & Hudson.

Brukner, B. (1980) Naselje Vincanske Grupe na Gomolavi (neolitski ranoeneolitski sloj). *Rad Vojvodjanskih Muzeja* 26:5-55.

Chapman, J. (1981) The Vinča Culture. Oxford: BAR International series no. 117.

Chernykh, E. (1978) Aibunar, a Balkan copper mine of the fourth millennium b.c. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 44:203-17.

Childe, V. G. (1925) *The Dawn of European Civilization*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Childe, V. G. (1929) *The Danube in Prehistory*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Dennell, R.W. (1974) Botanical Evidence for Prehistoric Crop Processing Activities. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 1:275-284.

Dennell, R. (1983) *European Economic Prehistory: A New Approach*. London: Academic Press.

Dolukhanov, P. (1979) *Ecology and Economy in Neolithic Eastern Europe*. London: Duckworth.

Dumitrescu, V. (1965) Cascioarele: A Late Neolithic Settlement on the Lower Danube. *Archaeology* 18:34-40.

Evans, R. K. (1978) Early Craft Specialization: An Example from the Balkan Chalcolithic. *In Social Archeology: Beyond Subsistence and Dating*. C.e. Redman, ed. Pp. 113-129. New York: Academic Press.

Gaul, J. H. (1948) *The Neolithic Period in Bulgaria*. Cambridge, Mass: Peabody Museum, Harvard University.

Georgiev, G. (1961) Kulturgruppen der Jungstein- und der Kupferzeit in der Ebene von Thrazien. *In L'Europe à la fin de l'age de Pierre*. J. Filip, ed. Pp. 45-100. Prague.

Georgiev, G, et al.(1979) *Ezero: Ranobronzovoto Selište*. Sofia: Arkheologicheski Institut BAN.

Gimbutas, M. (1956) *The Prehistory of Eastern Europe; Part 1 Mesolithic, Neolithic and Copper Age cultures in Russia and the Baltic Area*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Peabody Museum.

Gimbutas, Marija, ed.(1974) *Obre and its Place in Old Europe*. Sarajevo: Zemalski Museum. : Wissenschaftliche Mitteilungen des Bosnisch-Herzogowinischen Landesmuseums, Band 4 Heft A.

Gimbutas, M., ed.(1976) *Neolithic Macedonia as reflected by excavation at Anza, southeast Yugoslavia*. Los Angeles: Institute of Archaeology, UCLA.

Gimbutas, M. (1982) *The Goddesses and Gods of Old Europe*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Higgs, Eric, ed.(1972) *Papers in Economic Prehistory*. Cambridge: CUP.

Higgs, Eric, and Michael Jarman, eds.(1975) *Palaeoeconomy*. Cambridge: CUP.

Hodder, I. (1985) Postprocessual Archaeology. *In Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory*. M. Schiffer, ed. Pp. 1-26, Vol. 8. New York: Academic Press.

Ivanov, I. (1983) *Le Chalcolithique en Bulgarie et dans la Necropole de Varna. In Ancient Bulgaria.* A.G. Poulter, ed. Nottingham: University of Nottingham.

Jarman, M., H. Jarman, and G. Bailey (1985) *Early European Agriculture.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kohl, P. (1981) *Materialist approaches in prehistory.* *Annual Review of Anthropology* 10:89-118.

McPherron, Alan, and Dragoslav Srejovic, eds. 1988 *Divostin and the Neolithic of central Serbia.* Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh.

Patterson, T. (1986) *The last sixty years: toward a social history of Americanist archaeology in the United States.* *American Anthropologist* 88:7-26.

Payne, Sebastian (1972) *Partial recovery and sample bias: the results of some sieving experiments.* *In Papers in Economic Prehistory.* E. Higgs, ed. Pp. 49-64. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Piggott, S. (1965) *Ancient Europe from the beginnings of Agriculture to Classical Antiquity: a survey.* Edinburgh: University Press.

Renfrew, A.C. (1973) *Before civilization: the radiocarbon revolution and prehistoric Europe.* New York: Alfred A Knopf.

Roska, M. (1941) *Die Sammlung Zsófia von Torma.* Kolozsvár: Minerva Irodalmi és Nyomdai Műintézet R.-T.

Sherratt, A. (1972) *Socio-economic and demographic models for the Neolithic and Bronze Ages of Europe.* *In Models in Archaeology.* D. Clarke, ed. Pp. 477-541. London: Methuen.

Soffer, O. (1983) *Politics of the Paleolithic in the USSR: A Case of Paradigms Lost.* *In The Socio-Politics of Archaeology.* J.M. Gero, D.M. Lacy, and M.L. Blakey, eds. Pp. 91-106. Amherst: Department of Anthropology, University of Massachusetts.

Srejović, D. (1969) *The Roots of the Lepenski Vir culture.* X:13-22.

Sterud, E, and A-K Sterud (1974) *A quantitative analysis of the material remains-Obre.* *Wissenschaftliche Mitteilungen des Bosnisch-Herzegowinischen Landesmuseums IV(A):155-355.*

Todorova, H. (1976) *Die Aeneolithische Siedlung und Wohnung in Nordostbulgarien.* *In Simposium o Poznom Eneolitu i Ranom Bronzanom Dobu u Podunavlju.* B. Brukner, ed. Pp. 155-160. part of *Iztrazivanja #5.* Novi Sad: Institut za Istoriju, FFNS.

Todorova, H. et al., eds (1983). *Ovcharovo*. Sofia: Archaeological Institute of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences.

Trigger, B. (1984) *Alternative archaeologies: nationalist, colonialist, imperialist*. *Man* 19:355-370.

Tringham, R. (1971) *Hunters, Fishers and Farmers of Eastern Europe, 6000-3000 b.c.* London: Hutchinson University Press.

Tringham, R. (1974) The concept of 'Civilization' in European Archaeology. *In* *The Rise and Fall of Civilization*. J. Sabloff and C.C. Lamberg-Karlovsky, eds. Pp. 470-485. San Francisco, Ca.: Cummings.

Tringham, R., et al.(1980) The Early Agricultural Site of Selevac, Yugoslavia. *Archaeology* 33(2):24-32.

Tringham, R. (1983) V. Gordon Childe 25 years after: his relevance for the archaeology of the eighties. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 10(1):85-100.

Tringham, R. (1983) *The Development of the Household as the Primary Unit of Production in Neolithic and Eneolithic Southeast Europe*. 48th Annual Meeting of the Society of American Archaeology, Pittsburgh, PA, 1983.

Tringham, R. (1985) *The transformation of the unit of social reproduction in European prehistory*. 50th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, New Orleans, La, 1985.

Tringham, Ruth, and Dusan Krstic, eds.(1990) *Selevac: a Neolithic Village in Yugoslavia*. Los Angeles, CA: Institute of Archaeology, University of California, Los Angeles.

Tringham, R. , B. Brukner, and B. Voytek (1985) *The Opovo Project: a study of socio-economic change in the Balkan Neolithic*. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 12(4):425-444.

Wobst, M. and Keen, A. (1983) *Archaeology as Political Economy*. *In* *Socio-Politics of Archaeology*. J. Gero, D. Lacy, and M. Blake, eds. Pp. 79-89. Amherst: Department of Anthropology Research Report Series No. 25, University of Massachusetts.