

'unilinear evolutionists' such as Leslie White and Gordon Childe. Steward apparently thought he had introduced his term, although Kerns finds both Wittfogel and Lowie had used it previously. She sees it as ironic that Steward received more recognition for that concept than for cultural ecology, considering it was cultural ecology he was deeply committed to proselytizing. Her discussion of this apex of Steward's career is particularly illuminating for mid-twentieth-century archaeology.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.13206>

Margarita Díaz-Andreu *Historia de la Arqueología. Estudios*. Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas, 2002. 220pp. ISBN 84-7882-503-7.

Pedro Paulo A. Funari, Campinas State University, Brazil

Margarita Díaz-Andreu has an odd experience in world archaeology. She studied archaeology in her native Spain, where she got her academic degrees, both BA and PhD. She then got a postdoctoral Fleming British Council scholarship to study in Britain, at the University College London, supervised by anthropologist and archaeologist Michael Rowlands (1991–2). She followed her studies at Southampton (1992–3), returned to Spain where she got a lectureship in 1994 at Madrid University (*Universidad Complutense de Madrid*). From 1996, she is lecturer at Durham University. Díaz-Andreu has been interested for a wide variety of scholarly subjects, most of them related, in a way or another, to identity issues. A most prolific writer, she has edited several volumes and published scholarly articles in journals in several countries and in different languages. Her scholarship is fully revealed in this volume on the history of archaeology in the Iberian Peninsula. It gathers nine papers originally published in edited volumes or journals, most of them in English, now translated into Spanish. Although the book deals with Iberian archaeology, the breadth of its chapters outstrips the peninsula and reaches the discipline as a whole. Gonzalo Ruiz-Zapatero in the forward stresses the importance of Díaz-Andreu's distance (*extrañamiento*), which enables her to interpret the history of the discipline unconstrained by party allegiance and constraints.

As is often the case when papers and chapters published separately are put together, there are several issues dealt with repeatedly in the different chapters, enabling the reader to revisit them continually. For the reviewer though it is worth avoiding this jigsaw path, commenting the several issues in orderly manner starting with the main epistemological assumptions. Díaz-Andreu acknowledges that there is no neutral, value-free interpretation of the past, as all discourses have political implications. The deep interconnection between political ideologies and scientific discipline needs to be accepted by archaeologists, so that we can understand and conceptualise our own scholarly work. Unlike internalist accounts of the field, the author situates the history of archaeology in the changing social, cultural, and political-economic circumstances of the Iberian societies, considering the historical conditions that have permitted the existence of the discipline as well as the circumstances in which archaeological knowledge has been produced. Contradictions in that knowledge refract divisions in the wider society.

A second and pervasive issue in the whole volume is nationalism and the nation state, as a key identity player. Nationalism is seen as deeply embedded in the very concept of archaeology, in its institutionalisation and development, as the nation is conceived of as a natural unit of a human group. The existence of nations implies the existence of a homogeneous past. Nationalism from the late eighteenth century led nations to create citizens through education. In Spain, as in most of Europe, archaeology developed as the result of the need to find data permitting the reconstruction of the national past. From the mid nineteenth

century, cultural nationalism was grounded on two ideas: the world was split naturally into cultures and these cultures should be nation states. This essentialist approach led nation states to impose homogeneity to the newly created citizens, who should learn and adopt common customs and mores. One nation meant one language, one race and one territory. This programme was best imposed by the French state, with its comprehensive school system. Spain followed a different trajectory. The construction of a national past in Spain began in the mid-nineteenth century but, in contrast to France, dissident voices were heard in Catalonia and the Basque country. As a result, there has ever been competing nationalist archaeologies in Spain, most notably Spanish, Catalanian, Basque and to a lesser extent Galician. All the history of archaeology is seen by Díaz-Andreu through the looking glasses of different strands of nationalism.

Three issues are particularly interesting to understand how nationalism shaped and shapes archaeology in Spain: Islamic archaeology, the four-decade long dictatorship of Franco, and post-dictatorial nationalisms. The Iberian Peninsula has witnessed Muslim presence for more than seven hundred years (711–1492). And yet, there has been a failure to incorporate Spain's Islamic past into the nationalist discourse and in the archaeological practice. In the nineteenth century several intellectuals defended the importance of Arab legacy for Spain, even if they were a minority. The result of the Spanish Civil War (1936–9) brought the previous liberal tradition to an end. The Arab past was once again relegated to the status of the non-Spanish. In contrast to the depressed state of Islamic archaeology, the interest in 'Germanic' Visigoths rose. The revival of Islamic archaeology depended on the decline of the dictatorship and the freedom leading to the expression of repressed nationalisms. Andalusian, Balearic and Valencian nationalisms tended to use the Islamic past to express their opposition to Spanish or Catalan nationalist pretensions.

The Spanish Civil War is interpreted as a fight over two different ways of understanding Spain as a nation state. Republicans interpreted Spain as a multi-cultural unit, in a way following the tradition of the Spanish Empire from the Middle Ages, with the emphasis in local identities and rules, the so-called *fueros*. Others, such as General Francisco Franco, viewed the country as a single and homogeneous unit and the dictatorship tried to impose this latter standpoint between 1936 and 1975. At the end of the Civil War archaeology had a clear political role, as Julio Martínez Santa-Olalla, a leading fascist party member, was put in charge of the reorganisation of the discipline. Research on Spain under the Romans and under the Visigoths was encouraged. Romans unified for the first time the Peninsula, supposedly imposed a single language and culture and introduced Catholicism. The Visigoths were praised as Aryan unifiers. The defeat of fascism in Germany and Italy resulted in a gradual decline of the political use of archaeology in Spain, transforming archaeology into a positivist endeavour. The goals of archaeology were to become the finding of remains and artefacts through the impartial, meticulous, and exhaustive observation and description. It is interesting to note that under Latin American dictatorships, control of the discipline also led to an emphasis in fact finding and a discourse of political 'neutrality', even when archaeologists were by definition loyal to the regime (otherwise, as was the case in Spain and in Latin America, they were exiled). At the end of the dictatorial period, young archaeologists were beginning to challenge the official line.

The democratic constitution established in 1978 devolved power to seventeen regions, but only five of them are considered nationalist or proto-nationalist (Catalonia, Basque country, Galicia, Andalusia, Valencia and Canary Islands). Díaz-Andreu considers that Autonomous communities (as the largely independent regions are called) are interested in the promotion of a nationalist agenda, stressing nationalist issues and subjects. Scholarly archaeology is thus of little interest, so much so that Catalonia, between 1981 and 1991 published only 15% of

excavation reports. Díaz-Andreu sees the growth of contract and rescue archaeology in this light. The use of local languages in the archaeological publications, due to the enforcement of official policies in this direction, contributes to an inward-looking character of regional archaeology.

Several other issues are also raised, always related by the author to the building of identities. The role of women in the development of archaeology in Spain is explored, as most museum archaeologists are women, almost half of all archaeologists in the country are women and they author more than a third of all scholarly papers. Gordon Childe's presence in Iberian archaeology is analysed as a way to examine critically what is meant by academic influence. It is argued that academic friendships work at many more levels than the theoretical one. In particular the study reveals how academic networks work in practice and how international relationships may be exploited for particular academics' own advancement. Imperialism is another recurrent subject, as the possession of foreign lands concurred to the identity of Spaniards in different periods and ways. The loss of Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Philippines in 1898 is time and again seen as a defining moment for Spanish archaeology, as she considers the demise of Empire as a decisive factor in strengthening regional nationalisms in Spain.

The strength of Díaz-Andreu's account of the history of archaeology in the Iberian Peninsula is her concern with a rational explanation for the trajectory of the discipline. The discipline is read, from the late Middle Ages until the present day through the lenses of identity building, particularly through the forging of nation state identity. It is not the only way of studying the subject, as she admits, but it has the great virtue of enabling the author to relate apparently unrelated subjects, such as indigenous rights and gender issues. Even though her subject, almost by definition, is the history of archaeology within the limits of a nation state, Spain, the historian of science has the opportunity to draw a series of general conclusions, useful for the study of the history of archaeology elsewhere. First and foremost, there is no pure or neutral archaeology. As any other scientific endeavour, as put Pascal Acot (1999: 63), it is produced in given cultural conditions, in a given social project, implicitly or explicitly, and so neutrality is illusory. Internalist accounts are unable to comprehensively explain the discipline. As a consequence, the political implications of archaeology cannot be left aside, as if the neutral accumulation of archaeological 'data' were possible. The production of archaeological knowledge is a dialectical process and it is shaped by what the world is and by who the archaeologists and the diverse peoples they study are and were (Patterson 2001: x). Politics are not always explicit, consequential or even contested in the world of everyday conduct. This is particularly true within consensual or imposed doxa, as during dictatorial periods. Archaeology in those periods can carry apparently no political connotations because there are no other alternatives (Silliman 2001: 194).

Last but not least, Díaz-Andreu reminds us how much archaeology has to gain as a result of a critical inquiry about the history of the discipline. *Cui bono*, 'who benefits' from archaeological practice and theory, from archaeological discourse? What are the interests behind archaeological fieldwork, data collection, museum handling of remains and all the rest? Who were benefited and who were excluded? Serious questions, whose answers depend on a critical approach to the history of the discipline, so that we can understand single issues as part of a much broader historical context. Díaz-Andreu gives the readers such an opportunity.

Acknowledgments

I owe thanks to Thomas Patterson and Stephen Silliman. The ideas are my own and I am therefore solely responsible for them.

References

- Acot, P. 1999, *L'Histoire des Sciences*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France.
- Patterson, T. 2001, *A Social History of Anthropology in the United States*, Oxford and New York, Berg.
- Silliman, S. 2001, 'Agency, practical politics and the archaeology of culture contact', *Journal of Social Archaeology*, No. 1, pp. 190–209.

VII. Forthcoming conferences

Histories of Archaeology. Archives, Ancestors, Practices.

A major international conference on the history of archaeology will be held in Göteborg, Sweden, on June 17–19, 2004. Organised by the EC funded AREA network ([Archives of European Archaeology www.area-archives.org](http://www.area-archives.org)) this conference will promote the latest directions and advances in the field. The histories of archaeology explored here will move beyond more traditional regional or chronological frameworks, and encourage thematic and problem-oriented historical approaches which will shed new light on the scientific, cultural and ideological contexts of archaeology.

Themes include –

- Sources and methods for the history of archaeology,*
- Archaeological practices,*
- Questions of identity,*
- Visualising archaeology.*

Five successive sessions are planned, each lasting half a day and including some 5–7 speakers, both established scholars and emergent researchers. English is the recommended language of communication.

Information on venues, accommodation, fees, etc. will soon be available, as well as an online registration form for speakers and attendants.

Proposals for papers or posters, to be sent by Email to the conference organisers, should include:

- Title of the presentation:
- Name of author(s):
- Affiliation:
- Email:
- Postal address:
- Relevant session:
- Keywords (4–6):
- Abstract (c.300 words): (please notify the organisers if you wish to use another language)

The scientific committee will evaluate these proposals together with the session organisers.