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INTRODUCTION

Stephen A. Mrozowski, James A. Delle, & Robert Paynter

Over the past decade historical archaeology, like many of the social sciences, has felt the impact of postmodernism. The intellectual popularity of poststructuralism and deconstructionism, coupled with a growing disquiet with scientific positivism, has shaken the philosophical foundations of historical archaeology to the core. The beginnings of this dilemma were evident in the presentations made at the 1987 plenary session of the Society for Historical Archaeology in Savannah (Honerkamp 1988). Marking the twentieth anniversary of the society’s founding, the plenary sought to take the pulse of the field at a time when the session’s organizer, Nick Honerkamp, suggested it had entered a phase of normal science. His goal was to jump-start the discipline out of its complacency with the field’s accepted epistemologies. These coalesced around four general paradigms: historical archaeology as a supplement to American history, a scientific positivism engaged with pattern recognition and explanation, a structuralist method for interpreting culture, and a vaguely populist concern with the general theme of the American experience. The overwhelming sense of inadequacy expressed by many of the session’s participants confirmed Honerkamp’s suspicions concerning these paradigms. More importantly, the session presaged a dissatisfaction among other archaeologists that resulted in their calling for a shift from scientific to more contextual epistemologies (for example, Hodder 1986; Shanks and Tilley 1987a, 1987b).

More than a decade removed from the 1987 plenary the field continues to feel the pains of disciplinary growth. Some practitioners in the early 21st cen-
tury continue to adhere rather closely to one of the four research agendas discussed in 1987 and would probably disagree with our sense that these research strategies have run out their string. In part, this is because aspects of these paradigms fit well with the needs of cultural resource management reflecting the omnipresent division of labor within the discipline between CRM and the academy (see Patterson 1999). Indeed, and from a self-critical position, the restlessness with paradigms represented in this collection undoubtedly stems in part from the imperatives of career development within the academy.

Some of the pressures for paradigm change come from neighboring disciplines. For example, history has increasingly turned to anthropology for theoretical inspiration (for example, Isaac 1982; Hunt 1989; Kirch 1992; Revel 1995; Morgan 1998). Anthropology has itself experienced a period of self-examination that has revolved around an unease with the positivist program of social science. In its place, a number of authors have advocated a return to history (for example, Sahlins 1981, 1985, 1992; Comaroff and Comaroff 1991, 1997; Schneider 1995, Schneider and Rapp 1995). This concern for history has been joined with a continuing struggle to link global processes with practices at the local scale (for example, Wolf 1982; Marcus and Fisher 1986; Harvey 1996). The final and perhaps most important development in the social sciences as a whole has been the growing number of theoretical and empirical studies that focus on the role of race, class, and gender in structuring social practices and ideologies.

The chapters in this volume reflect these streams of change. Although we advance no singular research agenda, the authors in this volume accept as a given the importance of history to shaping cultural consciousness. Each recognizes the need to situate local experiences in contexts that illuminate global connections as well as the emergence of the central lines that divide the social formations of the modern and historical world: race, class, and gender. These papers confront, some explicitly, others implicitly, the abstract qualities of race, class, and gender as analytical constructs by examining particular histories and their material manifestations. In the process their aim is to recast one or more of these abstractions into the realities that shaped lives in the past and continue to influence our work in the present. A second, equally important goal is to advance the position that race, class, and gender are intertwined and inseparable. In order to situate the volume, this introduction will examine issues of history and global process, how the chapters confront the evidentiary quality of material culture, and how together they provide an essential commentary on race, class, and gender.

MATERIALITY, EVIDENCE, AND CONTEXT

Archaeology's place in the social sciences is defined by the discipline's focus on the relationship of material culture to other realms of human existence. One of the most important developments in archaeological method and theory has in fact been the investigation of the relationship between material culture and the social and ideological domains of culture. In 1962 Binford offered a critique of the then prevailing pessimism about archaeology's ability to read the past from objects. This pessimistic approach suggested that material culture worked best as evidence of energy-processing relations, such as subsistence, but less so as one climbed the ladder of inference through social relations toward ideology (for example, Hawkes 1954). Binford instead argued that artifacts functioned on a variety of levels, as technological aids, social instruments, and ideological symbols. To Binford (1962) archaeology suffered from a lack of theory rather than any deficiency in the evidence.

One of the success stories of the paradigmatic changes that took place after the appearance of Binford's 1962 article has been the ability of some archaeologists to link stylistic attributes of artifacts to various forms of social relations based on kin (Deetz 1965; Hill 1970; Longacre 1970; Tilley 1984), ethnicity (for example, Wobst 1977; Plog 1980), gender (Hodder 1984; Conkey and Spector 1984; Gero and Conkey 1991; Seifert 1991), and the state (Wright and Johnson 1975; Wright 1977; Renfrew and Cherry 1986; Patterson and Gailey 1987)—in sum demonstrating the relationship between the material and the social. With the growth of post-processual archaeologies, symbolic and ideological relations have received increasing attention in areas such as Paleolithic art (Conkey 1989) and state ideologies (Kus 1983, 1986; Conrad and Demarest 1984; Leone 1995). While processual and post-processual approaches may differ in their definitions of the appropriate metaphor for understanding the past, both agree that the central focus of archaeological practice is linking the material to the social.

Historical archaeology has emerged as a significant voice in such discussions especially those surrounding the importance of the material domain to the construction of social relations. Examples include examinations of exchange relations (Adams 1977; Schuyler 1980; Miller 1991), artifact patterning (South 1977), architectural style (Glassie 1975; Deetz 1977; Johnson 1993), status (Spencer-Wood 1987), senses of self (Shackel 1993; Leone 1995), class (Beaudry 1989; McGuire 1991; Wurth 1991), race (Singleton 1988, 1995; Orser 1990; Ferguson 1992; Hall 1992; Schrire 1995), and gender (Mrozowski 1984, 1988; Spencer-Wood 1987, 1996; Seifert 1991; Little 1994; Scott 1994). While
earlier engagements with structuralism (Glassie 1975; Deetz 1977) and
systematics (South 1977) have continued (see Yentsch 1991, 1994; Johnson 1993; Seifert 1991), an increasing number of scholars have begun to recognize and accept that historical archaeology, more than any other field of archaeological inquiry, is concerned with the construction of knowledge about ourselves, our social and historical contexts, and the material shape and direction of our world. As such, whether or not consensus is reached on defining the goals of historical archaeology, the field is concerned with understanding how capitalism has emerged and remains the driving force behind colonization and the growth of the modern world (for example, Delle 1998, Leone 1982, 1988, 1995; Shackel 1993, 1996; Beaudry 1989; McGuire 1991; Orser 1990, 1996). As a field concerned with understanding the material dimensions of capitalism, historical archaeology must examine how material culture relates to the social categories constructed within the capitalist system, particularly race, class, and gender.

The essays in this volume analyze the material construction of these capitalist social relations. Each of the authors accepts that capitalism is a dominating force in shaping cultural consciousness and practice; however, it is not our goal to advocate any singular view of capitalism or how it should be analyzed, but rather to explore its manifestations in a variety of cultural and temporal contexts. In so doing we hope to avoid the pitfalls of examining issues such as white supremacy or the exploitation of labor through the wage system in the abstract, choosing instead case studies that allow the reader to witness their impact in concrete form.

**RACE, CLASS, AND GENDER AND THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF CAPITALISM**

Any consideration of class, race, or gender in colonial and postcolonial societies must begin with the forces of capitalism, a political economy dominated by individuals skilled in the practice of accumulating capital. These capitalists came to eclipse the tributary or kin relations that governed exchange in most premodern economies (Wolf 1982, 73–100). In their place, new social relations developed between those whose wealth provided the means to control entire sectors of an economy and those whose labor or skill was their chief commodity. Played out on a global arena over centuries, studies of the origins and transformation of capitalism have been central points of debate in European historiography for close to a century (for example, Pirenne 1925, 1936; Bloch 1939; Dobb 1946; Slicher van Bath 1963; Braudel 1981, 1984; Wallerstein 1974a, 1980; Weber 1970; Revel 1995). The view supported by many European historians since Pirenne (1925, 1936) has been that the unbridled cupidity of the merchant class, their fixation on accumulation, and their activities in money lending beginning in the twelfth century have all the essential earmarks of capitalism. This period of economic expansion also gave rise to what many conceive as the spirit of capitalism, a characteristic that Weber (1970) attributed to the Protestant Reformation and the work ethic it engendered (see also MacFarlane 1987, 135). Braudel (1984, 57) has championed this position as well. He states quite clearly that “I am therefore in agreement with Marx who wrote (though he later went back on this) that European capitalism—indeed he even says capitalist production—began in thirteenth-century Italy” (Braudel 1984, 57).

For Immanuel Wallerstein (1974b) and earlier Maurice Dobb (1946) it is the sixteenth century and the emergence of a world economy (to use Wallerstein’s term) that signals the debut of capitalism. For Wallerstein capitalist relations began to assert their dominance in the early sixteenth century, when plantations using slave labor were established at the same time that European military technology was providing the tools to plunder the New World of its treasures and raw materials (Wallerstein 1974a). Combined with the growth of commercial agriculture in northwest Europe and a burgeoning class of merchants realizing fortunes through an expanding world market, the essential elements were in place for capitalism’s meteoric rise to global dominance (Wallerstein 1974a, 1974b, 67–129). Several labels have been attached to this period of economic change, mercantile capitalism and agricultural capitalism being the two most widely used.

Wolf raises some important questions concerning how we should define capitalism. Evoking Marx, Wolf argues that “the capitalist mode of production came into being when monetary wealth was enabled to buy labor power” (1982, 77). He further clarifies this view by stating the following:

*Wealth in the hands of holders of wealth is not capital until it controls means of production, buys labor power, and puts it to work, continuously expanding surpluses by intensifying productivity through an ever-rising curve of technological inputs. To this end capitalism must lay hold of production, must invade the productive process and ceaselessly alter the conditions of production themselves. . . . Only where wealth has laid hold of the conditions of production in the ways specified can*
we speak of the existence or dominance of a capitalist mode. There is no such thing as mercantile or merchant capitalism, therefore. There is only mercantile wealth. Capitalism, to be capitalism, must be capitalism-in-production. (emphasis added, 78-79)

Historical archaeologists would appear to be well positioned to examine, if not answer, some of the central questions concerning the history and growth of capitalism. Why then have their efforts been so limited until recently? Part of the reason may be in the lack of a historiographic tradition in the United States that focuses on capitalism; historians in the United States have only recently turned their attention to issues dealing explicitly with capitalist social relations (for example, Clark 1990; Kulikoff 1992). This may explain why early efforts in historical archaeology focused on cultural issues pertaining to the growth of Anglo-American society (for example, Noël Hume 1963, 1969; Deetz 1977). Even now, historical archaeology has contributed little to the debate concerning the emergence of capitalism in the New World. Orser (1996, 76–81) is one of the few to explicitly focus on the transition from a noncapitalist to a capitalist world and in the process argue that historical archaeology has a unique perspective on the issue.

An archaeology of capitalism offers historical archaeology two major analytical advantages over that provided by either structural or systemic approaches. The first concerns capitalism as context. The history of capitalism has been punctuated by periods when social, economic, and political forces have converged to create crisis. These crises result in cyclical waves of prosperity and depression during which social boundaries become more rigid, a process often manifest in material distinctions. In a world of tense colonial competition on a global scale, the periods of capitalist expansion and contraction provide some basis for examining changing social relations over time (see Paynter 1988). The Long Sixteenth Century, for example, a period of economic growth that lasted from the late fifteenth to the early seventeenth century, was followed by an equally long period of prolonged crisis. This period of depression and conflict, known as the Long Seventeenth Century, was felt in Europe, the Western Hemisphere, and southeast Asia. It was the beginning of the industrial revolution that kindled an unprecedented growth in productive capacity that fueled a new cycle of capitalist expansion that lasted until the later stages of the twentieth century.

This kind of periodicity can be used to frame or reframe explanations put forward by historical archaeologists. It can also place the colonization of the New World, Africa, and Asia in a broad global perspective. Leone (1982, 1988) has, for example, provided an alternative explanation for the spread of Glassie’s (1975) and Deetz’s (1977) Georgian order by suggesting it was a reaction to just such a crisis. He argues that between 1730 and 1765 Maryland’s social elite adopted landscapes and material culture that reinforced their belief in natural law. Feeling the sting of alienation from both the working classes in the Chesapeake and what they perceived as their social brethren in England, they sought to convince people that a rational social order based on nature was possible and that those with such access to its laws were its natural leaders (Leone 1988, 250).

Examining the discursive use of material culture to mediate social tensions is but one example of the manner in which historical archaeology can contribute to a greater understanding of capitalism’s changing face. Another is to explore the meaning of constructs like race, class, and gender in concrete contexts that involved real actors in politically charged social arenas like prerevolutionary colonial America. The essays in this volume attempt to move beyond the reification of constructs like race, class, and gender in an attempt to understand them as forces in the lives of those in the past. In doing so they seek to explore race, class, and gender building on new ideas being developed in the social sciences as a whole. Over the past decade the importance of race, class, and gender have occupied many in the social sciences. From a review of this work it soon becomes apparent that the precise meaning of each concept is open to interpretation, a discourse that can help frame the essays presented in this volume.

Class
E. P. Thompson’s use of the word “making” in his famous The Making of the English Working Class (1963) attracted attention to the creative process involved in people’s construction of their own identity. Members of the English working class came to view themselves as such through the ideological struggles that punctuated the transition to industrial capitalism during the late eighteenth to mid-nineteenth century. The rhetoric that characterized these struggles was central to the dialectic that shaped the formation of class lines in Britain (Thompson 1963, 55–76, 350–400). One of the lessons of Thompson’s treatise is the fluid nature of class, its changing face and repeated recasting as part of the greater dialectic of social relations. It is a lesson that historical archaeology is just now learning (see for example the articles in Wurst and Fitts 1999).
As historical archaeologists began intensifying their efforts to understand the changing character of capitalism, notions of class served as the baseline for material comparisons. Leone (1982, 1984) was one of the first to expressly examine class relations and, more importantly, the issue of ideology (also see Paynter 1988). Using the dominant ideology thesis of Althusser (1971), Leone (1984) characterized social discourse in eighteenth-century Maryland from the perspective of the elite. Leone’s study prompted several important questions concerning the need for archaeologists to recognize the existence of multiple materialities and multiple meanings (see Hodder 1986, 66–67; Beaudry et al. 1991, 156–67; Hall 1992, 382; Leone 1994, 223). Beaudry et al. (1991) explored the issue of multivocality in their study of Lowell mill workers. The interpretive approach they employed sought to give voice to the workers and their attempts to construct their own cultural identities. Orser (1996, 160–82) went on to criticize both the “inside-out” approach of Beaudry et al. (1991) as well as the “top-down” perspective employed by Leone (1984) in calling for a more dialectical approach that gives voice to all those involved in the discourse.

If historical archaeologists are to contribute to the intellectual discourse concerning the meaning of class, then we must emphasize our strength, the study of the material world in all its complexity. This is particularly true given the dialectical relationship that links the growth of class consciousness with the production of its material trappings. If we accept that class can seem contradictory (see Wright 1993, 29), this merely reinforces our understanding of its multivocality and the multifaceted character of its material expression. Architecture, dress, table settings, food, and landscapes all served as vehicles for class identity in the broader social arena. Indeed it is the rich texture of this material domain that affords us the opportunity to explore the labyrinth of class formation and its nexus with other social divides like race and gender. Developing a new appreciation for the convergence of class, race, and gender in configuring the colonial and postcolonial worlds is one of the central concerns of this volume.

**Gender**

The archaeological exploration of gender involves several theoretical and methodological questions. It is not enough to acknowledge gender as a fundamental social construct; archaeologists must also identify its material signature and understand its widespread variability over space and time (Gero and Conkey 1991). These methodological issues notwithstanding, there have been several advancements in the development of gender-related research in the social sciences. The first is the recognition that sex, gender and sexuality connote different things. As a result biological reproduction (sex), social production and reproduction along sexual lines (gender), and carnal relations between individuals (sexuality) are no longer viewed as biologically determined (Bleier 1984; Moore 1988; Ferguson 1989; Kryder-Reid 1994; Scott 1994). In its place is a much broader, more nuanced conceptualization of sex, gender, and sexuality that moves beyond the dichotomous view long so paramount in Western ideology (Moore 1988; Morgen 1989; Walby 1990; Wylie 1991; Wall 1994, this volume).

Another of the more interesting developments in gender-related research has been the growing examination of patriarchy as a social force. Born of the same cultural traditions that bred racism and a disdain for the working class, this patriarchy encompassed both the ideology and practices that saw men “dominate, oppress and exploit women” (Walby 1990, 20). Within a colonial context it helped justify the enslavement of Africans and Native Americans. In later form it set the tenor for the social relations of industrial production. One of its most central features is a belief in male superiority that was part of a larger perception that saw male/female–culture/nature dichotomies as the product of natural law. In the fullness of daily discourse this divide was omnipresent but not omnipotent in its influence. Indeed one of the most distinctive characteristics of the modern period was the collision of European notions of class and gender with the issue of race that erupted as a product of colonialism (see McClintock 1995). Another feature was a class-influenced notion of separate spheres in which women were to be the arbiters of the domestic domain while men were to deal with the political and economic dimensions of public life (Cott 1977; Mies 1986; Amott and Matthaei 1991; Kowaleski-Wallace 1997).

These notions of male superiority and separate spheres were also mainstays of much that has been written concerning gender and colonialism. More recently, however, these rather static perceptions of gender have been replaced by a new appreciation for the manner in which race, class, and gender are intertwined (I. Scott 1988; E. Scott 1994; McClintock 1995; Kowaleski-Wallace 1997). One of the goals of this new literature has been to broaden the notion of gender beyond that of merely women. This is the chief reason why notions of separate spheres has been rejected, because it perpetuates the idea of
women living in isolation (see Scott 1988, 32). A second and perhaps larger goal has been to understand the very different experiences that colonial women (white women) had from the women of color who were being colonized. This acknowledgment has come in large measure as a response to women of color who have criticized white feminists and their notions of gender and inequality (hooks 1982; Amos and Parmer 1984; Mohanty 1988). It has also emerged as the product of studies conducted by anthropologists and historians who have examined colonization and its impact on the postcolonial world (for example, Callaway 1987; Comaroff 1997; Comaroff and Comaroff 1991, 1997; McClintock 1995). In Imperial Leather Anne McClintock provides a powerful examination of race, class, and sexuality during the nineteenth century (1995). She argues that “imperialism cannot be fully understood without a theory of gender power. Gender power was not a superficial patina of empire, an ephemeral gloss over the more decisive mechanics of class or race. Rather gender dynamics were, from the outset, fundamental to the securing and maintenance of the imperial enterprise” (1995, 7). McClintock does not, however, argue for the dominance of gender over class or race as the central force in imperialism. Instead she echoes the writing of other scholars who have advocated the view we advance in this book: race, class, and gender are intertwined realities that helped shape the modern world.

One way of highlighting this interconnectedness is to examine gender dynamics in a wide array of contexts that include looking as much at questions surrounding whiteness as those relating to women of color. Although this presents methodological challenges, it nevertheless points the way for a new direction in archaeological research. For example, it means examining women and men of various classes and races simultaneously and not in isolation. It also means reexamining our epistemological assumptions concerning processes such as colonization. Different histories, different geographies, and different cultures have resulted in a mosaiclike colonial landscape that requires a more nuanced reconsideration. The same is true for the various forms of capitalist production. As we noted at the outset, any consideration of race, class, and gender must begin with an understanding that capitalism and colonialism were not monolithic structures. The men and women who participated in the events of the past five hundred years were actors in an ever-changing drama that saw their identities forged through interactions with others. Race, class, and gender were three of the divides that intersected to shape those identities.

Stephan A. Mrozowski, James A. Delle, and Robert Paynter

Introduction
until recently, been primarily concerned with excavating sites associated with whites. There have, of course, been notable exceptions (for example, Ascher and Fairbanks 1971; Baker 1978; Deetz 1977:138–54; Fairbanks 1974; Mullins 1999), but for a great deal of the history of the field, historical archaeologists, largely driven by professional interests and accepted conventions, failed to see the significance of African American or Native American sites to the metahistory of our continent. Some interpret this phenomenon as a further extension of white control not only over the present but also over the construction of the past (see Blakey 1997; Franklin 1997). Happily, in recent years an ever-increasing number of scholars have recognized the significance of sites associated with historically oppressed groups. However, while places like Fort Mosé and the African Burial Ground are now widely accepted as having archaeological “significance,” historical archaeologists must continually struggle against historically constructed, racist barriers to our understanding of non-European pasts (McGuire 1992; Franklin 1997; Trigger 1989; see Leone and Potter 1992 for a deconstruction of the concept of archaeological significance).

As should be evident by the chapters in this volume, historical archaeologists have begun not only to recognize that the construction of racial identities was part of the wider process of establishing and rationalizing the inequalities inherent in capitalism, but also that our daily action, including the practice of archaeology, is embedded in the very system that created the structures of race and racism. Historical archaeologists confronting the issue of race must recognize the existence of twin phenomena: the racist construction of inequality in the past and the prevalence of racist thinking in the present.

THE CHAPTERS IN THIS VOLUME
Each of the essays in part 1 of this volume address the dynamics of the racial system that emerged from European colonialism. Chapters 1 and 3 address the racial dynamics of the preservation and interpretation of the archaeological record. In chapter 1 Theresa Singleton and Mark Bograd, by reflecting on a recent museum exhibit they curated, argue that certain archaeological methodologies, such as typologizing and correlating specific types of artifacts to specific ethnic groups, in fact contribute more to the artificial definition of ethnic groups than to our understanding of the complex social dynamics that existed between European colonists, enslaved Africans, and indigenous Native Americans. In chapter 3, Bill Fawcett and Walter Lewelling confront the issue of why, in northern Utah, homesteads that belonged to Shoshoni who converted to Mormonism have been destroyed and forgotten, while white Mormon homesteads have been preserved as monuments to the pioneer past. To them, the answer lies in the relationship between both implicitly and explicitly racist interpretations of history and the construction of what is “archaeologically significant” to the construction of the past. This relationship has resulted in a collective amnesia about the material history of Shoshoni who converted to Mormonism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Chapters 2 and 4 address the familiar theme of slavery in the North American Southeast. Paul Shackel and David Larsen explore how the racist practice of African slavery was manifested in the early industrial era in Harpers Ferry, Virginia, while Terry Epperson explores how landscapes were used to reinforce the racial hierarchy that existed on tobacco plantations owned by Thomas Jefferson and George Mason. The concluding chapter of this section, chapter 5 by Warren Perry, explores the archaeology of the color line in colonial southern Africa through a reconsideration of what is known as the Mfecane/Difaqane and its aftermath.

The global order that has emerged in the modern world is based not only on racial hierarchies, but also on institutionalized inequities between members of the two generally recognized genders. The dynamics of gender, as they were experienced in New York City, South America, and the Caribbean, are addressed in part 2 of the volume. In chapter 6 Diana Wall explores the relationships that existed among material culture—especially tablewares—domesticity, and gender negotiation in nineteenth-century New York City. In examining the archaeological records of two houses belonging to one woman, Ross Jamieson explores in chapter 7 the dynamics of elite definitions of gender in colonial Ecuador. In chapter 8, James Delle analyzes historic treatises, vital records, and architectural remains of coffee plantations to discuss how gender was negotiated among enslaved laborers on coffee plantations in nineteenth-century Jamaica.

Each of the essays in part 3 explores the Western world’s transition to industrial capitalism, focusing particularly on the dynamics of class analysis. In the same manner that the chapters in parts 1 and 2 help refine notions of race and gender, so too do the essays in this part of the book examine the active role material culture has played in the cultural construction and expression of class differences. As each of the three essays demonstrates, class-consciousness was a powerful force in people’s lives that sometimes took subtle
form. In other instances, class differences were more overt, often the result of planning or resistance. In chapter 9, Patricia Mangan examines the manner in which the transition to capitalism can be read in the built environment of eighteenth-century Catalonia. Chapter 10 by Michael Nassaney and Marjorie Abel provides a compelling example of how factory workers resisted the structures of industrial work by routinely discarding mistakes at the Russell Cutlery in western Massachusetts. In chapter 11, Stephen Mrozowski explores the subtle character of class differences in the company-controlled city of Lowell, Massachusetts. As the first planned industrial city in the United States, Lowell provides the perfect medium for comparing the public expressions of class differences embodied in company-supplied housing with the more fluid character of cultural identity readable in various classes of material culture.

This third section is followed by a summary essay by Tom Patterson in which he further contextualizes the case studies presented in this volume. In this essay Patterson once again stresses the importance of constructs like race, gender, and class for a global historical archaeology.

As historical archaeology has matured over the past two decades, the field’s practitioners have begun to move from being consumers of social theory to producers. As the essays in this volume demonstrate, historical archaeologists continue to contribute to the theoretical development of archaeology as a whole by helping to enliven and reconfigure notions such as race, gender, and class. In considering that material culture—whether expressed as buildings, portable artifacts, or landscapes—is itself an active agent in the negotiation of social difference, historical archaeologists can contribute both to defining and dismantling the lines that divide.

NOTE
1. Braudel does not provide a citation for his reference to Marx; however, we assume he is referring to Marx’s early positions concerning the history of capitalism, outlined in The German Ideology with those put forth in Capital (see Tuck 1978, 180).
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