

This article was downloaded by: [Western Michigan University]

On: 07 July 2015, At: 06:50

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: 5 Howick Place, London, SW1P 1WG



## Reviews in Anthropology

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/grva20>

## Toward a Collective Historical Archaeology

LouAnn Wurst

Published online: 06 Jul 2015.



CrossMark

[Click for updates](#)

To cite this article: LouAnn Wurst (2015) Toward a Collective Historical Archaeology, *Reviews in Anthropology*, 44:2, 118-138, DOI: [10.1080/00938157.2015.1029833](https://doi.org/10.1080/00938157.2015.1029833)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00938157.2015.1029833>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms &

Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

## Toward a Collective Historical Archaeology

LOUANN WURST

Delle, James A., Mark W. Hauser, and Douglas V. Armstrong, eds. 2011. *Out of Many, One People: The Historical Archaeology of Colonial Jamaica*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Saitta, Dean J. 2007. *The Archaeology of Collective Action*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

Shackel, Paul A. 2009. *The Archaeology of American Labor and Working Class Life*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

*In this paper, I begin with ideas of difference and try to weave together aspects of our disciplinary structure, contemporary theoretical critique, and research agendas to show how our emphasis on difference, multiplicity, and individual identity makes it difficult to comprehend all that we share and constrains our political action to only local concerns. Instead, the kind of archaeological research that I envision focuses on commonalities through questions of labor, class and capitalism geared toward developing an understanding of all that we as people share.*

**KEYWORDS** *capitalism, collective, difference, historical archaeology, labor*

### INTRODUCTION

At first glance, the three books that are the inspiration for this review essay have little in common save that they all stem from the sub-discipline of historical archaeology. They engage different contexts, different goals, and

---

Address correspondence to Louann Wurst, Department of Anthropology, Western Michigan University, 1903 W. Michigan Ave., Kalamazoo, MI 49008, USA. E-mail: [louann.wurst@wmich.edu](mailto:louann.wurst@wmich.edu)

Color versions of one or more of the figures in the article can be found online at [www.tandfonline.com/grva](http://www.tandfonline.com/grva).

different audiences. In fact, when describing this assignment to colleagues, the typical response was that this is a strange or weird compilation. Let me briefly introduce each book before proceeding.

Delle, Hauser, and Armstrong's (2011) edited volume compiles a number of papers that present the current state of the art of historical archaeological work in Jamaica. The volume is divided into three temporal/conceptual parts: the archaeology of the early colonial period, the archaeology of the plantation system, and the archaeology of Jamaican society. While one could argue that the entire volume is about Jamaican society, this last section seems like a catch-all of papers that did not fit clearly into the other two. But since they include a paper on colonial economies (Hauser) and another on slave market economies (Reeves), I am not sure why this vague section was needed. This muddiness in organization means that any larger aims for the volume are hard to see. The book is about Jamaica, and that's just fine. The book is framed for an audience of Jamaicans as well as other historical archaeologists. Yet, all of the articles read as very standard academic works, so I suspect that the goal of having them for the Jamaican people may be more theory than practice.

The other two books, Saitta (2007) and Shackel (2009), were published in the same series, the *American Experience in Archaeological Perspective*, edited by Michael Nassaney for the University Press of Florida. The volumes in this series present comprehensive overviews of significant themes in the development of the modern world that underscore the contributions that archaeology has made to the study of American history and culture. In his contribution to the series, Shackel (2009) presents an overview of working-class archaeology by focusing on labor in industrial contexts. He presents this work thematically, beginning with a world systems perspective and the development of industrial capitalism, and discussing topics such as the industrial landscape and surveillance technologies, workers' housing, resistance, memory, and commemoration. Along the way, he synthesizes the results from some of the best-known archaeological projects such as Lowell, Harper's Ferry, and Ludlow. Shackel's (2009:1) ultimate goal is to correct our common views of industrial sites, where "the study of the machine usually takes precedence over the study of people." The text is clearly written and geared toward a student audience.

Saitta (2007) takes a different tack by focusing on a single site, specifically addressing the archaeology of the Ludlow tent camp and associated towns. His goal is to offer a corrective to the overwhelming emphasis on individual agency in contemporary thought by making a case for collective action. Saitta's (2007:5) guiding questions focus on how archaeologists have analyzed collective action given race-, gender-, and class-based power differentials and how past examples of collective action help further agendas for contemporary social change. He develops a pragmatic philosophical approach to knowledge as constructed and contextual in order to highlight cases where people have acted collectively, summarizing examples of race, gender, class, and elite collective action. Saitta follows these introductory

chapters with detailed analysis of collective action evident in the Colorado Coalfields, past and present. Given his political goals, it is not surprising that this book is clear, well-written, and engaging; his audience is “scholars, students and citizens who see archaeology as both a source of historical truth and a commentary on the contemporary human condition” (Saitta 2007:xvii).

These short summaries of the books under review hit at the many differences between them: they engage in different topics, contexts, and approaches, and target diverse audiences. And while Saitta’s goal is to get to the collective behind the differences, I found myself fixating on the idea of difference. In many ways, the differences among these books mirror the patterns of differences in historical archaeology itself or in any other academic discipline. We have become so specialized, even within the sub-discipline of historical archaeology, that we may not typically read each of these books (Orser 2010). Since my work focuses so much on later northern American contexts, I would probably not have read a book on colonial Jamaica if it were not part of this review. Indeed, *my* first response was that this was a strange collection.

And yet, certain themes and issues resonate throughout and tie in to larger discourses. I found myself thinking a lot about ideas of collectivity and unity. These ideas are given in Saitta’s *Archaeology of Collective Action*, and the sentiments of Delle, Hauser, and Armstrong’s title *Out of Many, One People*. The three themes I want particularly to address are labor, class, and capitalism, and how they impact ideas of difference and collectivity. Even though they are very different, at root all three of these books are about labor. Indeed, one could easily argue that all historical archaeology is fundamentally about labor and the social relations of labor that we can call the class structure of the capitalist system even though we almost never refer to our work in this way. Rather, we divide and carve out myriad niches and specialties. In this paper, I begin with this idea of difference and use it to reflect on why thinking about similarity is so difficult. What does this imply for a collective ethos? What might an alternative look like? My hope is that pulling on these loose threads and weaving them together may help us think past the identity crisis that seems to characterize contemporary historical archaeology (Dawdy 2009).

## VIVE LA DIFFERENCE

My framing question is whether we can even have a collective ethos with all the specialties and sub-specialties that characterize modern archaeology in general, as well as the narrower approach of historical archaeology. Diversity in research specialization, framing concepts, questions, and expertise seems to be the watchword of the day. In the sub-discipline of historical archaeology itself, we have archaeologies of gender, labor, plantations, race, industry, mines, identity, ethnicity, capitalism, African diaspora, consumption,

landscape, and class, to name just a few. We have created an increasingly fractured discipline, divided into silos that emphasize plurality. And in all of this frenzied activity, the *sturm und drang* of theoretical wrangling, any commonality is barely noticed. In other words, I worry that we focus so much on difference, and that so little of this work refers to the broader structural inequalities that produce the difference itself, and I wonder if the potential to bind so many people together across these identity category boundaries lies in understanding these broader structural inequalities.

It seems plausible to begin exploring this emphasis on difference by pondering the very existence of archaeology and anthropology as separate academic disciplines, indeed, the existence of disciplines themselves. Wallerstein (2000:183) has noted that the boundaries within the social sciences and between the social and natural sciences and humanities were developed over the period from 1850 to 1945 (see also Wolf 1982:9–17). The history of this contested development in anthropology and archaeology in the United States has already been articulated (Patterson 1999, 2001, 2002). As Wallerstein (2000:170) notes, the existence of these disciplines “presumes the ‘naturalness’ of the process, and . . . that these sectors have ‘boundaries,’ and the boundaries that have come into existence are self-evident or at least inherent in the nature of things.” Ollman (2000) discusses the same process for political science, and contemporary arguments about the real or supposed holism of anthropology figure in the same processes (Harkin 2010).

This disciplinary proliferation and glorification of difference can also be seen in the general post-modern war on totality. Dissatisfaction with modernist ideas that supported and reproduced exploitative political and colonial regimes, and justified gender, ethnic, and racial inequality, led to the rejection of any kind of universal or totalizing conceptual or theoretical approach including economic or material determinism or evolutionary approaches (Ebert and Zavarzadeh 2008; Trigger 1995; McGuire and Wurst 2002). Instead of a single unifying approach, a multiplicity of theories and foci has proliferated in the wasteland created by the supposed death of modernism. This idea is clearly expressed in Bintliff and Pearce’s (2011) book *The Death of Archaeological Theory?* The authors in this volume largely argue that what has died is not archaeological theory itself, but any notion that a unified paradigm or “spurious consensus” exists to structure the discipline (Pluciennik 2011:44). Instead of a single totalizing or monolithic theory, they argue for an eclectic, à la carte, or bricolage approach that multiplies differences (Pearce 2011:85). The theoretical war on totality has sacrificed structure to the supremacy of the individual level of analysis: through agency, practice, and identity.

All of these instances of difference, in disciplines, research contexts, theories, and concepts can easily be linked to the profusion of difference that suffuses every aspect of our contemporary world. We celebrate the difference that multicultural openness has allowed. And yet, the most important

question—what this emphasis on difference and division does to us and how it impacts the way that we look at the world—is seldom asked. Wolf (1982) makes the point that the structure of disciplines and specialties makes it difficult to see *connections*. Disciplines' natural and self-evident boundaries circumscribe what we can see, and make it harder to see commonalities, similarities, and larger connections (Wurst and Novinger 2011). This “classifying mind,” as Bernbeck and McGuire (2011:4–6) call it, consists of “the surgical dismembering of a continuous world into separate entities” that figure into all discourses of power and function ideologically.

Others have argued that the proliferation of difference and the war on totality plays an ideological role to conceal the true contradictions of advanced capitalist societies (Larrain 1995; Eagleton 1996; Zavarzadeh 1995; Ebert and Zavarzadeh 2008; Hickel and Kahn 2012; Wurst and McGuire 1999). By emphasizing subjectivity, discontinuity, and difference, these theories conceal the elements of shared humanity and exploitation that exist in modern society (Larrain 1995). By denying any sense of totality, the universal, and objective reality, emphasis on difference alone provides no ground on which to act in order to change existing social relations (Eagleton 1996; Ebert 1995:128). Harvey (2000:94) claims that to turn our back on universals at this stage in our history, however fraught or even tainted, “is to turn our back on all manner of prospects for progressive political action.” Apple and Whitty (2002:80) suggest that rather than reflecting a real change in the nature of society, “analyses that celebrate fragmentation and the atomization of decision making” may be “replacing one oppressive master narrative with another”; specifically, the Western master narrative of technological progress is being replaced by ideas of the free market (see also Goodman and Saltman 2002; Michaels 2006). These critiques show that our emphasis on difference may provide the illusion of inclusion and transformation without actually challenging the underlying structures of inequality. We can see the same factors involved in the current archaeological focus on political engagement and public archaeology.

## DIFFERENCE AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL PRAXIS

Of course it is true that most archaeologists, like anthropologists in general, care very deeply about the world they live in and this has found expression politically in a focus on the local level working with descendant communities. Many archaeologists have embraced the fact that archaeology is always implicated in politics (Wurst and Mrozowski 2014; Atalay et al. 2014; Hamilaikis and Duke 2008; McGuire 2008; Habu, Fawcett, and Matsunaga 2008; Wood 2002; Meskell 1998; Kohl and Fawcett 1995; Schmidt and Patterson 1995; Trigger 1984, 1989) at the same time that they reject any possibility of objectively recreating the past. Within the context of the explosion of difference, multiple

perspectives and identities, and loss of any sense of universal or totalizing ideas, we have asked the question of what archaeology is for, and most answers revolve around some utility for the present. Because of the suspicion of grand narratives, archaeologists have focused their attention on the local at the same moment that archaeology faced serious challenges from indigenous and descendent communities. These factors caused a major shift toward public archaeology, which attempts to mediate scholarship with practice.

Challenges posed globally by indigenous peoples and descendant communities have forced archaeologists to face a larger network of social relations in the context of their research. U.S. archaeologists have certainly risen to the challenge since the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) was passed in 1990 and the African Burial Ground galvanized descendant communities in New York in 1991. Since then, archaeologists have scrambled to engage various descendant communities in dialogues that seek to move beyond archaeology's colonial heritage and instead engage in community or collaborative work. Collaborating with descendant communities is rapidly becoming the norm in archaeology. Notable examples of these kinds of public, collaborative projects include Carol McDavid's (2002, 2010) work at the Levi Jordan Plantation, the New Philadelphia Community Archaeology Project (Shackel 2011), and, of course, the African Burial Ground (LaRoche and Blakey 1997). This scholarship goes beyond just educating the public to including them in the practice of archaeology. Collaboration engages publics in the definition of archaeological agendas, the doing of research, and in the interpretation of archaeological results (Silliman and Ferguson 2010; Atalay 2006; Stottman 2010; Mullins 2011). Each social group contributes different resources, skills, knowledge, authority, or interests, and these distinctive qualities are combined into shared goals and practices. Long-term commitments, by their very nature, bridge private and professional lives since a long-term commitment inevitably leads the scholar to assist in community interests beyond archaeology and the archaeologist's needs.

While I strongly support these exciting developments, we need to be cautious since simply being aware of multiple interests in the past and collaborating with community groups risks ignoring the larger, political context of archaeology, a danger that becomes increasingly common from a "theory is dead" vantage point. Stottman (2010:8) contrasts public and applied archaeology, where public stakeholders collaborate with archaeologists, with an activist archaeology. In his view, "archaeologists can do more than collaborate with communities and the public, they can use archaeology to *affect change within an activist agenda*" (Stottman 2010:8). The question that archaeologists often fail to answer is just what kind of change they want and how archaeology can actually fit into it. Because of this, a great deal of public, engaged, or collaborative archaeology runs the risk of falling into the trap of a gullible sentimentality, where a naïve desire to do good replaces



critical analysis of substance, means, and ends (Little 2010:158). While archaeologists have become more comfortable with the idea that our work is always political, we have not been as clear in defining what that political agenda is or should be. As Little (2010:158) makes clear, “We must be vigilant and continually self-critical and questioning about the types of changes we advocate.” And this reminds us that without a clear political agenda, our best-intentioned activist archaeologies can easily descend into sentimentality and the self-delusion that we are engaged in change while accomplishing little more than supporting the status quo or our own egos (Wurst 2012; Wurst, O’Donovan, and McGuire 2012).

While the smaller scale or local level may be a more effective and satisfying solution to the theoretical dilemmas stemming from our reluctance to engage with broader totalities, the danger is that community archaeologies risk losing sight of the broader structural factors shaping those local experiences through the emphasis on local differences. In our well-intentioned attempt to make our scholarship useful, to do something in the face of the increased oppression and inequalities of contemporary capitalism, we have narrowed and circumscribed the possibilities for our own agency and ability to act exclusively to the local level. The unforeseen consequence of this positioning lies in concealing the elements of shared humanity and exploitation that exist in modern society. In this sense, academics are as politically paralyzed waiting for the next grand theory or final vantage point to interpret social life (McLaren 2008:124) as they are by eclectically mixing theoretical bits together.

And this is why I would make a distinction between the ideas of collaboration that constrain contemporary archaeological practice to the local level and striving for a collective ethos that I see reflected in several of the books that inspired this essay. The kind of archaeological research that I envision, geared toward developing this collective ethos, can be summarized by one of my favorite David Harvey (2000:245) quotes: “We know a great deal about what divides people but nowhere near enough about what we have in common.” How do we recognize the broader structures of inequality and oppression that produce the very differences that influence our perception? How do we address these structures without falling into the old theoretical trap of a single totalizing explanation that is so vehemently rejected by the validity of different standpoints? One obvious way forward may be to think about labor and class.

### LABOR, CLASS, AND CAPITALISM IN HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGY

One aspect that all the books considered here share is a commitment to use archaeological data and contexts to understand the experience of work and

labor. I was particularly grateful that someone, anyone, was talking about work. It seems that the more our attention becomes focused on concepts of individual agency, meaning, subjectivity, and consumption, the less attention we pay to questions of work, labor, class, and the economy. This truism belies the explosion in archaeologies of difference. As Roseberry (1996) suggests, the emphasis on differences has been accompanied by a narrowing of options: labor, work, and class are often part of our “excluded past” (Wurst 1999, 2002, 2006).

In fact, Bauman (1992) and others have argued that consumption has replaced work as the central focus of individual identities (Lodziak 2002:22–23; Ebert and Zavarzedah 2008), implying that in our modern world, work has become irrelevant. Work has become just a necessary evil to underwrite our ludic pursuits. But there is a grave danger in denying work since the post-modern focus on individual identity and consumption mystifies the essential relationship between production and consumption. As Lodziak (2002:69) states, “Consumption, rather than being an arena of freedom, constitutes a field of dependence by virtue of the alienation of labor.” The fact that we objectify production as separate from consumption, work from home, and work from leisure, is evidence of our alienated nature in capitalist society. As Marx (1964:125) said, labor’s “alien character is clearly shown by the fact that as soon as there is no physical or other compulsion it is avoided like the plague.” Our modern denial of work and our obsession with consumption and leisure are clear indications of this process.

Instead of seeing labor as just another difference, another aspect of individual identities (embraced or denied), we could recognize the fact that it is work that makes us human—to deny work is to deny our very essence. According to Marx and Engels (1970:42), humans “distinguish themselves from animals as soon as they begin to produce their means of subsistence.” Free conscious activity is an exclusively human characteristic that “distinguishes the worst architect from the best of bees” (Marx 1967:174). Work has both a social and a material basis; the worker relates to the natural world through the object of his or her labor and through it to other human beings (Sayers 2003:108). Thus, denying the importance of work alienates us from our own humanity as well as from the products of our labor. Separating production from consumption or home from work obscures an important part of capitalism’s inner secret.

Stephen Silliman (2006) has already made the argument that a focus on labor has the potential to unify our endeavors and move beyond the atomization of difference, and it is worth considering his points in more detail. Silliman suggests that labor occupies a central place in historical archaeology even though it is seldom referred to as such. This includes labor that is “colonized, enforced, controlled, exploited, indebted, hierarchical, unequally distributed, often rigidly structured, and simultaneously global and local. Such labor forms the crux of colonialism, mercantilism, capitalism,

and class” (Silliman 2006:147). It is clear that historical archaeologists do not tend to think about labor as an overarching concept that unifies all of our work. For this reason, Silliman suggests that the first step requires dismantling the artificial divide that focuses on difference in historical archaeological subject populations (Native Americans, African and Chinese diasporas, ethnic groups, etc.) and research contexts (plantations, work camps, industrial contexts, urban settings, etc.) in order to mend the disjuncture. Key aspects for this include thinking about labor as the social relations that comprise an entire system rather than seeing it as the exclusive domain of the economy in a narrow sense or limited to obvious workplaces such as factories, mines, and mills (Silliman 2006:148). According to Silliman (2006:149), the question that historical archaeologists need to ask is what they might learn from material culture using a labor framework that they would not have considered otherwise.

Silliman’s article provides important arguments for a focus on labor. But we need to be careful: this is not labor as another element of difference (although labor certainly can and has been approached this way); it is a perspective that allows us to think about how a shared experience of labor can help us build a sense of commonality—a collective ethos about the modern capitalist world. People’s experiences regarding labor, class, and production in the capitalist world may provide a powerful way to conceptualize commonality in all the times and places where historical archaeologists work.

### COMMONALITY IN HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGY

So what could historical archaeology look like if we concentrated on global similarities in the social relations of labor in capitalism? While most overviews detailing capitalism elicit images of capitalists (twisting greasy mustaches) and workers (noble but dirty) in single business or factory environments, it is just as important that we think about how these processes can be seen in many aspects of life in a capitalist context. To understand this, we need to move beyond our common sense of American or British factory production, to ingrate all aspects of commodity production that factor into the primitive accumulation of global capital, including Jamaican sugar, South African diamonds, Indonesian rice, and hay from upstate New York. Integrating all of these global contexts to a larger whole moves the impetus of historical archaeology beyond just fleshing out the local or proclaiming even more unsatisfying global statements. This is Chuck Orser’s (2010: 119–120) point when he claims that a central question for historical archaeology is whether archaeologists can conceptualize extra-site interactions and connections in innovative ways. I would suggest that doing this requires us to move beyond thinking exclusively of difference and thinking instead about the “unity of the diverse.”

One way forward may be for archaeologists to finally embrace the commonality in historic contexts. We seem to spend so much time arguing for the unique and unusual in all the diverse sites and contexts we work, but what strikes me the most is the similarity in their social relations. I'm not just talking about finding Staffordshire transfer print ceramics around the globe, but the detailed studies of the mines and lumber camps that were shut when raw materials became exhausted, the mills and factories that closed as competition shifted capital elsewhere and they could no longer compete profitably, and the abandoned houses and towns that result from the loss of jobs that represent the dispossession of labor (Wurst 2015).

One of the clearest and most unsettling contexts to see this commonality is in the labor struggles (and their results) in the coal mines in both the Eastern and Western United States. Dean Saitta's (2007) book *The Archaeology of Collective Action* focuses on the long-term archaeological project at the Ludlow Massacre Site and associated company town of Berwind. Saitta and his colleagues of the Ludlow Collective have used this approach to build an archaeology of political action in their study of Colorado's 1913–1914 Coalfield Strike. Their goal is to gain a richer and more systematic understanding of the everyday lived experience of the Colorado miners and their families (McGuire 2014; Larkin and McGuire 2009; Wood 2002). They frame the excavations themselves as a form of political action since they focus attention on the events of 1913–1914, making them news again, and raising public awareness of the class basis of American history. The project has also worked directly with the United Mine Workers to build educational programs that include interpretive displays at the site, teachers' institutes to educate public school teachers, a traveling display, public talks, and websites. Contemporary strikers have assisted the project's excavations as the archaeologists educate the general public about labor's struggles in the United States.

The power of the Ludlow case, illuminated through the spotlight of the archaeological project, is obvious if for no other reason than that it is so widely cited and summarized in other historical archaeology publications (including Shackel 2009). And yet, I think that the Ludlow case becomes even more powerful and important when it is lined up next to other projects that deal with similar cases (see McGuire 2014). For example, Nida (2013) describes the Battle of Blair Mountain in 1921 and other cases of class warfare that were its predecessors in the coal fields of West Virginia, and Roller (2013) highlights the 1897 Lattimer Massacre in the Pennsylvania coal fields near Hazelton. What is so striking about reading these cases together is how similar they are. The scripts narrating these events could have been penned by the same hand. Their juxtaposed commonality forces us to ask several questions: What are the conditions of labor in the late 19th and early 20th centuries that resulted in such widespread class struggle? Was this struggle limited to coal production (the context of all of these examples) or was it just as widespread in other industries and productive regimes?

Investigating these questions changes the dialogue from issues relating to Ludlow, Blair Mountain, or Lattimer in isolation and the identities of the workers as individuals, toward questions about the organization of labor, class struggle, and capitalism.

This perspective invites comparison with production in other mining contexts in the American West or Michigan's Upper Peninsula (Hardesty 2010; Cowie 2011). This list could be easily expanded, especially if global contexts and other types of the raw material extraction that fueled capitalism are added. And yet, exploring questions of labor, class, and capitalism in mining contexts or other industries is not surprising—these issues have been the mainstay of historical and industrial archaeology for decades. This common-sense equation is clear in Shackel's (2009) book. The title *American Labor and Working-Class Life* leads us to expect a broad treatment, and yet the only context that he covers is industrial labor, leaving our common-sense expectations unchallenged.

We can add an unexpected and therefore more radical context exploring these issues as articulated throughout the Delle, Hauser, and Armstrong volume, which highlights relations of labor and capitalism in Jamaica's plantation production system. The connections are clearly articulated in their recognition that sugar production, the cornerstone of Jamaica's economy, was crucial to the development of capitalism itself, and that slavery was the primary organizing principle of labor (Hauser et al. 2011:8). All of the articles in this volume follow from this thread—some making stronger, some weaker, contributions. Let me highlight a few cases: Woodward uses World Systems Theory to investigate labor strategies and models of production at an early 16th-century sugar mill; Brown explores how taverns played an important role in the formation of the colonial merchant class; Armstrong argues that the basic economic model of the plantation encouraged some independence in food production, and suggests that this made owning slaves less expensive for planters since they represent goods and services that the estate managers did not have to supply to sustain their labor force; Reeves compares two plantations based on sugar and coffee production to explore how each crop's varying labor demands impacted household production; and finally, Kelly and colleagues (2011) highlight planters' use of indentured servants from East India to supplement dwindling labor supply while keeping wages low for former slaves, demonstrating how formerly enslaved laborers remained caught in the social and economic web of servitude, repressive wage labor, and inability to gain access to land and resources.

In all of these individual case studies we see how a focus on labor integrates multiple facets of our archaeological contexts, emphasizes the commonalities in the experiences of working people, and leads inexorably to a greater understanding of the structures of capitalism. I felt that this was even more powerful and poignant since plantation archaeology,

focusing largely on racial differences and agricultural production, is not the usual context to see such blatant discussions about the capitalist world (cf. Croucher and Weiss 2011; Croucher 2015). And yet, as Marx (1981:189) states, “whether the commodities are the product of production based on slavery, the product of peasants, of a community, of state production . . . etc.—as commodities and money they confront the money and commodities in which industrial capital presents itself . . . . The character of the process of production from which they originate is immaterial.” This helps us to see that plantations in Jamaica share essential features with the extraction of coal in Colorado, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia. Focusing our energies on understanding the social relations of commodity production—emphasizing labor, property, and class—is an important way to integrate our field. Framed in this way, we can see that the conditions of the slaves in Jamaica producing sugar and the workers at Ludlow mining coal are based on the same laws of motion of the capitalist system (Ollman 2014). The workers’ struggles in both of these examples stem from the same capitalist imperative to increase surplus value.

The real power of these examples lies in providing concrete, empirical cases where people were able to forge a sense of commonality in struggle against capitalism despite real differences among them. The workers at Ludlow were able to create class consciousness despite attempts by the company to divide them along ethnic, racial, and gendered lines. This emphasis on “divide and conquer” is a common capitalist strategy to divide the working classes. Inspiration is also to be found in the archaeological studies of maroon communities that resisted colonial and capitalist domination and “forged new cultures and identities and developed solidarity out of diversity” (Goucher and Agorsah 2011:145). Examples like these help point the way toward solving Harvey’s (2000:245) imperative to learn about what people have in common.

### SOLIDARITY FOREVER: TOWARD A COLLECTIVE ETHOS

In the discussion above, I’ve tried to suggest what a concrete/empirical investigation of these commonalities might look like in terms of the actual archaeological contexts where we work. However, we still need to address the theoretical basis of the war on totality and the glorification of difference that characterizes much of contemporary historical archaeology. In the remainder of this paper, I want to consider in more detail why thinking about commonality is so difficult and offer a few suggestions about how we might move past this.

First, I think it is important to recognize that difference is typically contrasted with homogeneity, framed largely as an either–or, mutually exclusive dichotomy. Since the opposite of difference is sameness, any notion of

collective seems absurd (I note here that one reviewer commented that “the world is not and has never been a place of commonality”). I found myself thinking about how this gets wrapped up in anti-Soviet cold war/Maoist ideologies, where we (in the West) equate individuality and difference with freedom, in opposition to stultifying sameness and lack of individuality. If this were the only way to conceive of the relation between difference and commonality, I would agree. Conceived this way, we are provided a Hobson’s choice between difference that often takes the form of sterile identity politics that can be seen as providing the ideological justification for Western, white male supremacy, and the totalizing, universalizing sameness that does the exact same thing! In other words, the problem is not really difference or collective per se, but the fact that we tend to think of them as either–or choices that are seldom brought together.

One way to think through this relation may be to situate our understandings of difference within a larger global structural context. Increasingly, archaeologists have tried to resolve these issues by focusing on ideas of structural violence (Bernbeck 2008; Starzmann 2010). Marxists have long argued that the very logic of capitalism—its inner workings—is fraught with violence and jeopardizes our ability to realize our own humanity. Žižek (2008) calls this systemic or objective violence “the often catastrophic consequences of the smooth functioning of our economic and political systems”; the violence inherent in the normal state of things. Bernbeck (2008:397) suggests that archaeological theory that privileges agency over structures “universalizes a view of the world in which anonymous forces do not exist” and that the “conditions of possibility of structural violence are denied.” He cautions that we ourselves need to reflect how our discipline and theory is implicated in legitimizing violent global structures of inequality. Recognizing that all oppressed “others” experience the catastrophic consequences of structural violence may provide a basis for commonality without losing or minimizing the importance of identity-based collective action.

Another way forward may be to use a philosophy of internal relations to focus on the unity of the diverse (McNally 2013, 2015; Ollman 2015). McNally (2015:132) develops these ideas based on his critical stance of both the (abstract) universalism that sees class as totalizing and the bad (abstract) particularism of personal-identity theorists. His goal is to recast the debate dialectically “by theorizing the reciprocal inter-constitution of the one and the many (and of identity and difference).” While our common tendency is to see different forms of social oppression (race, gender, class, colonized, etc.) as discrete and separate, a philosophy of internal relations would posit that all of these social relations are internally related and come into being in and through each other: “these different social forms can be analytically distinguished, just as they are distinguished in experience; but this should not entail the error of imagining that they actually exist as discrete ‘things’” (McNally 2015:143). Universality always exists in relation to particularity,

and solidarity and common goals do not have to derive from shared essential, basal identities. Instead, we need to emphasize contexts where people with different relationships to each other and different identities really did find solidarity and act: real struggles, real relations, and real cases. I saw aspects of this in all of the books reviewed here. But we still have a great deal of work to do to highlight what we have in common as Harvey (2000:245) suggested.

In this paper, I began with ideas of difference and tried to weave together aspects of our disciplinary structure and research agendas to show how our emphasis on difference, multiplicity, and individual identity makes it difficult to comprehend all that we share. This is especially true given the war on totality that posits that no single theory can integrate our field and that any attempts to do so are pernicious. Even though we have become more comfortable with the idea that archaeology is always political and that we all want to make a difference in the world, this framing constrains our actions to only local action—working solely with local communities to address particularistic concerns. These particular actions are important, but in and of themselves, they are not enough.

Shackel (2013) has recently suggested that our action in the world should be about “reversing the narrative” by including those who have been excluded from our histories. He argues that “if we appreciate human differences and accept that each group may have a different past and a different narrative about it, perhaps we can learn to appreciate diversity” (Shackel 2013:9). And while this is true, I do not think that our goal should simply be to change the narrative or to just appreciate diversity. Roby and Starzmann (2014:4) argue that “the goal is not to expose the vulnerabilities of marginalized people—to mine their stories—but to uncover how people are made vulnerable in the first place and to explain the mechanism used to render power largely invisible.” Studying marginalized people, the mainstay of self-congratulatory historical archaeology, cannot in itself be radical or emancipatory without equally serious consideration of the structural inequalities that are part of the inner constitution of social differences themselves. I share Roby and Starzmann’s (2014:4) discomfort “that many contemporary archaeology projects leave unscathed those who implement or profit from techniques of power” (see also Bernbeck and Pollock 2007). To again use Roby and Starzmann’s words, “the production of marginalized subjectivities...cannot be decoupled from concrete practices of capitalist exploitation” (Roby and Starzmann 2014:4). By recognizing commonalities, our sympathies can transform from the horror of slavery and the Ludlow Massacre as particular events or institutions, to the horror of the systemic violence of capitalism itself (Zizek 2008). If historical archaeology would reverse the narrative, emphasizing labor and class in capitalism, we could focus on learning what we all have in common. Maybe then historical archaeology could finally actually be socially relevant as a discipline.



## REFERENCES CITED

- Apple, Michael W., and Geoff Whitty  
 2002 Structuring the Postmodern in Education Policy. *In* *Marxism against Postmodernism in Educational Theory*. D. Hill, P. McLaren, M. Cole and G. Rikowski, eds. Pp. 67–87. Lanham: Lexington Books.
- Armstrong, Douglas V.  
 2011 Reflections on Seville: Rediscovering the African Jamaican Settlements at Seville Plantation, St. Ann's Bay. *In* *Out of Many, One People: The Historical Archaeology of Colonial Jamaica*. J. A. Delle, M. W. Hauser and D. V. Armstrong, eds. Pp. 77–101. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Atalay, Sonya  
 2006 Indigenous Archaeology as Decolonializing Practice. *American Indian Quarterly* 30(3–4):280–310.
- Atalay, Sonya, et al, eds.  
 2014 *Transforming Archaeology: Activist Practices and Prospects*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Bauman, Zygmunt  
 1992 *Intimations of Postmodernity*. London: Routledge.
- Bernbeck, Reinhard  
 2008 Structural Violence in Archaeology. *Archaeologies* 4(3):390–413.
- Bernbeck, Reinhard, and Randall H. McGuire  
 2011 Ideology and Archaeology: Between Imagination and Relational Practice. *In* *Ideologies in Archaeology*. R. Bernbeck and R. H. McGuire, eds. Pp. 1–12. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Bernbeck, Reinhard, and Susan Pollock  
 2007 “Grab, Wo Du Stehst!” An Archaeology of Perpetrators. *In* *Archaeology and Capitalism: From Ethics to Politics*. Y. Hamilakis and P. Duke, eds. Pp. 217–233. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Bintliff, John, and Mark Pearce, eds.  
 2011 *The Death of Archaeological Theory?*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Brown, Maureen J.  
 2011 Evidence for Port Royal's British Colonial Merchant Class as Reflected in the New Street Tavern Site Assemblage. *In* *Out of Many, One People: The Historical Archaeology of Colonial Jamaica*. J. A. Delle, M. W. Hauser, and D. V. Armstrong, eds. Pp. 56–73. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Cowie, Sarah  
 2011 *The Plurality of Power: An Archaeology of Industrial Capitalism*. New York: Springer.
- Croucher, Sarah  
 2015 *Capitalism and Cloves: An Archaeology of Plantation Life in Nineteenth-Century Zanzibar*. New York: Springer.
- Croucher, Sarah K., and Lindsay Weiss, eds.  
 2011 *The Archaeology of Capitalism in Colonial Contexts: Postcolonial Historical Archaeologies*. New York: Springer.

- Dawdy, Shannon  
2009 Millennial Archaeology: Locating the Discipline in the Age of Insecurity. *Archaeological Dialogues* 16(2):131–142.
- Delle, James A., Mark W. Hauser, and Douglas V. Armstrong, eds.  
2011 *Out of Many, One People: The Historical Archaeology of Colonial Jamaica*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Eagleton, Terry  
1996 *The Illusion of Postmodernism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ebert, Teresa L.  
1995 (Untimely) Critiques for a Red Feminism. *In* Post-Ality: Marxism and Postmodernism. M. U. Zavarzadeh, T. L. Ebert and D. Morton, eds. Pp. 113–149. Transformations. Washington, DC: Maisonneuve Press.
- Ebert, Teresa L., and Mas'ud Zavarzadeh  
2008 *Class in Culture*. Boulder: Paradigm.
- Goodman, Robin Truth, and Kenneth J. Saltman  
2002 *Strangelove: Or How We Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Market*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Goucher, Candice, and Kofi Agorsah  
2011 Excavating the Roots of Resistance: The Significance of Maroons in Jamaican Archaeology. *In* *Out of Many, One People: The Historical Archaeology of Colonial Jamaica* J. A. Delle, M. W. Hauser, and D. V. Armstrong, eds. Pp. 144–160. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Habu, Junko, Clare Fawcett, and John M. Matsunaga, eds.  
2008 *Evaluating Multiple Narratives*. New York: Springer.
- Hamilakis, Yannis, and Philip Duke, eds.  
2008 *Archaeology and Capitalism*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Hardesty, Donald L.  
2010 *Mining Archaeology in the American West: A View from the Silver State*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press and the Society for Historical Archaeology.
- Harkin, Michael E.  
2010 Uncommon Ground: Holism and the Future of Anthropology. *Reviews in Anthropology* 39:25–45.
- Harvey, David  
2000 *Spaces of Hope*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hauser, Mark W., James A. Delle, and Douglas V. Armstrong  
2011 Introduction: Historical Archaeology in Jamaica. *In* *Out of Many, One People: The Historical Archaeology of Colonial Jamaica*. J. A. Delle, M. W. Hauser, and D. V. Armstrong, eds. Pp. 1–20. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Hickel, Jason, and Arsalan Kahn  
2012 The Culture of Capitalism and the Crisis of Critique. *Anthropological Quarterly* 85(1):203–227.
- Kelly, Kenneth G., Mark W. Hauser, and Douglas V. Armstrong  
2011 Identity and Opportunity in Post-Slavery Jamaica. *In* *Out of Many, One People: The Historical Archaeology of Colonial Jamaica*. J. A. Delle, M. W. Hauser, and D. V. Armstrong, eds. Pp. 243–257. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

- Kohl, Philip L., and Clare Fawcett, eds.  
1995 *Nationalism, Politics, and the Practice of Archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Larkin, Karin, and Randall H. McGuire, eds.  
2009 *The Archaeology of Class War: The Colorado Coalfield Strike of 1913–1914*. Boulder: University Press of Colorado.
- LaRoche, Cheryl J., and Michael L. Blakey  
1997 Seizing Intellectual Power: The Dialogue of the New York African Burial Ground. *Historical Archaeology* 31(3):84–106.
- Larrain, Jorge  
1995 Identity, the Other, and Postmodernism. *In Post-Ality: Marxism and Postmodernism*. M. U. Zavarzadeh, T. L. Ebert, and D. Morton, eds. Pp. 217–289. Transformations. Washington, DC: Maisonneuve Press.
- Little, Barbara J.  
2010 Epilogue: Changing the World with Archaeology. *In Archaeologists as Activists: Can Archaeology Change the World?* M. J. Stottman, ed. Pp. 154–158. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Lodziak, Conrad  
2002 *The Myth of Consumerism*. London: Pluto Press.
- Marx, Karl  
1964 *Karl Marx: Early Writings*. T. B. Bottomore, trans. New York: McGraw Hill.  
1967 *Capital*, vol. 1. New York: International.  
1981 *Capital*, vol. 2. New York: Vintage Books.
- Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels  
1970 *The German Ideology*. New York: International.
- McDavid, Carol  
2002 Archaeologies that Hurt: Descendants that Matter: A Pragmatic Approach to Collaboration in the Public Interpretation of African-American Archaeology. *World Archaeology* 34(2):303–314.  
2010 Public Archaeology, Activism, and Racism: Rethinking the Heritage “Product.” *In Archaeologists as Activists: Can Archaeology Change the World?* M. J. Stottman, ed. Pp. 36–47. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- McGuire, Randall H.  
2008 *Archaeology as Political Action*. Berkeley: University of California Press.  
2014 Won With Blood: Archaeology and Labor’s Struggle. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 18(2):259–271.
- McGuire, Randall H., and LouAnn Wurst  
2002 Struggling with the Past. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 6(2):85–94.
- McLaren, Peter  
2008 This Fist Called My Hearth: Public Pedagogy in the Belly of the Beast. *In Practicing Public Scholarship: Experiences and Possibilities Beyond the Academy*. K. Mitchell, ed. Pp. 122–131. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- McNally, David  
2013 “Unity of the Diverse”: Working-Class Formations and Popular Uprisings from Cochabamba to Cairo. *In Marxism and Social Movements*. Colin Barker, ed. Pp. 401–423. Boston: Brill.

- 2015 The Dialectics of Unity and Difference in the Constitution of Wage-Labour: On Internal Relations and Working-Class Formation. *Capital and Class* 39(1):131–146. Meskell, Lynn, ed.
- 1998 *Archaeology Under Fire: Nationalism, Politics and Heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East*. London: Routledge.
- Michaels, Walter Benn
- 2006 *The Trouble With Diversity: How We Learned to Love Identity and Ignore Inequality*. New York: Metropolitan.
- Mullins, Paul R.
- 2011 Practicing Anthropology and the Politics of Engagement: 2010 Year in Review. *American Anthropologist* 113(2):235–245.
- Nida, Brandon
- 2013 Demystifying the Hidden Hand: Capital and the State at Blair Mountain. *Historical Archaeology* 47(3):52–68.
- Ollman, Bertell
- 2000 What Is Political Science? What Should It Be? *New Political Science* 22(4):553–562.
- 2014 Historical Archaeology, Dialectical Materialism, or UFUG Studies? *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 18(2):361–373.
- 2015 Marxism and the Philosophy of Internal Relations; or, How to Replace the Mysterious “Paradox” with “Contradictions” that Can Be Studied and Resolved. *Capital and Class* 39(1): 7–23.
- Orser, Charles E.
- 2010 Twenty-First-Century Historical Archaeology. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 18:111–150.
- Patterson, Thomas C.
- 1999 The Political Economy of Archaeology in the United States. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 28:155–174.
- 2001 *A Social History of Anthropology in the United States*. Oxford: Berg.
- 2002 *Toward a Social History of Archaeology in the United States*. Belmont, CA: Wadson Thomas Learning.
- Pearce, Mark
- 2011 Have Rumours of the “Death of Theory” been Exaggerated?. *In The Death of Archaeological Theory?* J. Bintliff and M. Pearce, eds. Pp. 80–89. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Pluciennik, Mark
- 2011 Theory, Fashion, Culture. *In The Death of Archaeological Theory?* J. Bintliff and M. Pearce, eds. Pp. 31–47. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Reeves, Matthew
- 2011 Household Market Activities among Early Nineteenth-Century Jamaican Slaves. *In Out of Many, One People: The Historical Archaeology of Colonial Jamaica*. J. A. Delle, M. W. Hauser, and D. V. Armstrong, eds. Pp. 183–210. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Roby, John R., and Maria Theresia Starzmann
- 2014 Techniques of Power and Archaeologies of the Contemporary Past. Paper presented at the Annual Society for Historical Archaeology Conference, Quebec City, Canada, January 8–12.

- Roller, Michael P.  
2013 *Rewriting Narratives of Labor Violence: A Transnational Perspective of the Lattimer Massacre*. *Historical Archaeology* 47(3):109–123.
- Roseberry, William  
1996 *The Rise of Yuppy Coffees and the Reimagination of Class in the United States*. *American Anthropologist* 98(4):762–775.
- Saitta, Dean J.  
2007 *The Archaeology of Collective Action*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- Sayers, Sean  
2003 *Creative Activity and Alienation in Hegel and Marx*. *Historical Materialism* 11(1):107–128.
- Schmidt, Peter R., and Thomas C. Patterson, eds.  
1995 *Making Alternative Histories: The Practice of Archaeology and History in Non-Western Settings*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Shackel, Paul A.  
2009 *The Archaeology of American Labor and Working Class Life*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.  
2011 *New Philadelphia: An Archaeology of Race in the Heartland*. Berkeley: University of California Press.  
2013 *Changing the Past for the Present and the Future*. *Historical Archaeology* 47(3):1–11.
- Silliman, Stephen W.  
2006 *Struggling with Labor, Working with Identities*. In *Historical Archaeology*. M. Hall and S. W. Silliman, eds. Pp. 147–166. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Silliman, Stephen W., and T. J. Ferguson  
2010 *Consultation and Collaboration with Descendent Communities*. In *Voices in American Archaeology*. W. Ashmore, D. T. Lippert and B. J. Mills, eds. Pp. 48–72. Washington, DC: SAA Press.
- Starzmann, Maria Theresia  
2010 *Structural Violence as Political Experience in Palestine: An Archaeology of the Past in the Present*. *Present Pasts* 2(1):126–141.
- Stottman, M. Jay, ed.  
2010 *Archaeologists as Activists: Can Archaeology Change the World?* Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Trigger, Bruce G.  
1984 *Alternative Archaeologies: Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist*. *Man* 19: 355–370.  
1989 *A History of Archaeology Thought*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.  
1995 *Archaeology and the Integrated Circus*. *Critique of Anthropology* 15:319–335.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel  
2000 *What Are We Bounding, and Whom, When We Bound Social Research*. In *The Essential Wallerstein*. Pp. 170–184. New York: New Press.
- Wolf, Eric R.  
1982 *Europe and the People without History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Wood, Margaret C.  
2002 Moving Toward Transformative Democratic Action through Archaeology. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 6(3):187–198.
- Woodward, Robyn P.  
2011 Feudalism or Capitalism? The Archaeology of the Early Sixteenth-Century Spanish Sugar Industry. *In* *Out of Many, One People: The Historical Archaeology of Colonial Jamaica* J. A. Delle, M. W. Hauser, and D. V. Armstrong, eds. Pp. 23–40. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Wurst, LouAnn  
1999 Internalizing Class in Historical Archaeology. *Historical Archaeology* 33(1):7–21.  
2002 Mobilizing Social Labor in Nineteenth-Century Rural America: A Power Play in Three Acts. *In* *The Dynamics of Power*. M. O'Donovan, ed. Pp. 88–104. Carbondale: Center for Archaeological Investigations and Southern Illinois University.  
2006 A Class All Its Own: Explorations of Class Formation and Conflict. *In* *Historical Archaeology*. M. Hall and S. W. Silliman, eds. Pp. 190–206. Malden, MA: Blackwell.  
2012 Critical Historical Archaeology. *In* *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*: Springer.  
2015 The Historical Archaeology of Capitalist Dispossession. *Capital and Class* 39(1):33–49.
- Wurst, LouAnn, and Randall H. McGuire  
1999 Immaculate Consumption: A Critique of the “Shop till you Drop” School of Human Behavior. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 3(3): 191–199.
- Wurst, LouAnn, and Stephen A. Mrozowski  
2014 Toward an Archaeology of the Future. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 18(2):210–223.
- Wurst, LouAnn, and Sue Novinger  
2011 Hidden Boundaries: Archaeology, Education, and Ideology in the United States. *In* *Ideologies in Archaeology*. R. Bernbeck and R. H. McGuire, eds. Pp. 254–269. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Wurst, LouAnn, Maria, O'Donovan, and Randall H. McGuire  
2012 Theoretical Dyspepsia: the Role of Marxism in Contemporary Archaeology. Paper presented in the symposium *Everywhere and nowhere: Taking the pulse of Marxist archaeology*, organized by Jerimy Cunningham and Robert Chapman for the Society for American Archaeology meetings, Memphis, TN, 2012.
- Zavarzadeh, Mas'ud  
1995 Post-Ality: The (Dis)Simulations of Cybercapitalism. *In* *Post-Ality: Marxism and Postmodernism*. M. U. Zavarzadeh, T. L. Ebert and D. Morton, eds. Pp. 1–75. Transformations. Washington, DC: Maisonneuve Press.
- Zizek, Slavoj  
2008 Violence. New York: Picador.



*LOUANN WURST received her PhD in Anthropology from Binghamton University and is currently Professor and Chair of the Anthropology Department at Western Michigan University. Her research focuses on the historical archaeology of class, labor, ideology, and gender in the northeastern United States. She is currently working on a project in the Finger Lakes National Forest in New York State to examine the capitalist transformations of agricultural production. She is the author of *Historical Archaeology as Capitalist Dispossession (Capital and Class, 2015)* and co-editor with Stephen Mrozowski of a special issue titled *Studying History Backwards* (International Journal of Historical Archaeology, 2014).*