

# ON POWER, ORGANISATION AND PARADIGM IN ROMANIAN ARCHAEOLOGY BEFORE AND AFTER 1989\*

NONA PALINCAȘ

« Les obstacles à la connaissance sont souvent des obstacles sociologiques. »  
(P. Bourdieu, *Questions de sociologie* 1984: 53)

“Theory is critical practice.”  
(M. Shanks, C. Tilley, *Re-Constructing Archaeology*, 1987: 28)

\*

**Abstract.** This article aims to explain **the lack of creativity** in Romanian archaeological research (it has produced nothing new and seems incapable of assimilating new developments from other countries, while researchers see themselves as better archaeologists than those who work outside the research community, but with no specific role to play in this field) and its **unproductiveness** (there are very few respectable specialist publications and the age at which first major papers are published is too high). The underlying idea of this article is that the principal cause of this situation is not a lack of individual initiative, talent, hard work or financial resources, but the power relations at play and the type of organisation of work they imply. Contrary to the generally accepted idea that different forms of power generate different forms of knowledge, this article provides an analysis of how certain power relations can shrink (stunt) knowledge to the point of destruction, at the same time destroying those institutions whose declared goal is the production of knowledge.

This is an archaeology paper and therefore also deals with the role of materiality (buildings and contemporary objects, archaeological digs and archaeological materials) in the construction of interhuman relationships.

---

\* This study owes a great deal to those people who provided me with information: Prof. Alexandru Vulpe, Prof. Alexandru Suceveanu, Dr. Silvia Marinescu-Bîlcu, Dr. Alexandru Niculescu, Dr. Monica Mărgineanu-Cârstoiu, Dr. Eugen Nicolae, Dr. Christian F. Schuster, Alexandru Dragoman, Florian Matei-Popescu and Iuliana Barnea. I have given their academic titles in the text to provide a better picture of the relationship between source and information. **All the persons cited here either read this paper before it was published or were informed that their names would be used and the context in which they would appear. Where someone asked not to be cited I have eliminated not only their names but also any corresponding information.**

Particular thanks are also due those people who provided me with useful feedback after reading the manuscript: Prof. Alexandru Vulpe, Dr. Alexandru Niculescu, Prof. Alexandru Barnea, Dr. Radu Harhoiu, Dr. Monica Mărgineanu-Cârstoiu, Dr. Oana Damina, Sorin Oanță-Marghitu, Alexandru Dragoman, Florian Matei-Popescu, Iuliana Barnea, Dr. (med.) Rita Anghel.

I could not have written this paper without the experience I gained while working at western universities (Zürich, Heidelberg, Berlin, Vienna and, in the first place, Stanford) during stages made possible by the financial support received from some of those institutions as well as a series of foundations, among which the DAAD and the New Europe College made the largest contributions.

I would like to thank all those mentioned above.

## ON PREVIOUS ANALYSES

Previous works on the development of archaeology in Romania were written in a report-like format: *Muzeul Național de Antichități – Institutul de Arheologie. 65 de ani după Vasile Pârvan* (Alexandrescu 1993), *The avatars of a paradigm: a short history of Romanian archaeology* (Gheorghiu, Schuster 2002), *Din istoria arheologiei românești pe baza unor documente de arhivă* (Păunescu 2003) and *Istoricii și Securitatea* (Opriș 2004), *170 années d'archéologie en Roumanie* (Suceveanu 2004-2005) etc. These studies only serve to rephrase and recount the contents of existing documents, albeit with differences in quality and length. For these authors, the document speaks for itself, and nothing of importance exists beyond it.

One notable exception is the work entitled *Evoluția gândirii teoretice în arheologia din România. Concepte și modele aplicate în preistorie* (Anghelinu 2003), which has the merit of having captured the disciplinary nature of the professional community of archaeologists in Romania (*Ibid.*: 239-245). However, this community is presented as one that has eluded the influence of central political power and has produced scientific work for the use of the community itself: “There was an obvious lack of dialogue between the official model of cultural and historical dynamics and the model embraced and applied by archaeologists. At the moment, it would be difficult to say what exactly has led to this attitude by practitioners: a subversive impulse, a lack of ideological efficiency in the system, or simply the particular conservatism of an elitist community.” (*Ibid.*: 244)<sup>1</sup> In my opinion, as expressed throughout this article, things are quite the opposite.

None of the aforementioned works deals with the relationship between the institutions involved in archaeological practice and their production. This paper will therefore analyse this relationship by means of a *case study*: the practice and research results at the Vasile Parvan Institute of Archaeology in Bucharest (IAB). I chose this because it is the most representative institution for Romanian archaeology in terms of its size (it is currently the largest of the three institutions in this field<sup>2</sup> in Romania), its large number of specialists of (central) European renown and young researchers who have studied abroad, and its journals with Europe-wide circulation (admittedly they no longer appear as regularly as they used to). Established as a research institute in 1956, the IAB can be used to analyse the situation before and after 1989. One other advantage of this choice is my personal familiarity with this institution from my experience there as a researcher (initially as a research assistant and currently as senior researcher).

## THE INTERNAL DISPUTE

This analysis comes at a time of internal dispute over how archaeology is being practised by the institute and across the country. It began in an informal environment, as a discussion held “over a beer” or “over coffee”, before moving to the debates held at the New Europe College (NEC).<sup>3</sup> It was only afterwards that the issue became part of the official discussions at the IAB and, to a lesser extent, the

---

<sup>1</sup> My work had already been written at the time M. Anghelinu's book was published. I saw no reason to make any references to it (although some of the ideas contained in this paper are at times similar to those in M. Anghelinu's text, they also appear in other works). I would like to add that my view is even less optimistic than that expressed by M. Anghelinu with regard to the progress made by Romanian archaeology since the end of World War II.

I was initially very eager to read Monica Heintz's work *Etica muncii la românii de azi* (2005). It was, however, a big disappointment: in my opinion, the concepts used in her analysis are not adequate, it contains too many irrelevant examples and my general impression was that her work did not improve my understanding of the world I live in.

<sup>2</sup> Similar institutes can be found in Cluj and Iași.

<sup>3</sup> The NEC held a round-table discussion in October 2001 (Workshop no. 2 of the SocialSciencesNet) coordinated by Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, Paris, and funded by the European Commission. Its topic was entitled Archaeology & Cultural and Social Anthropology: Unity and Diversity of Scientific Cultures and of Their Organization between East and West. The event also included three talks on the state of archaeological research in Romania. The NEC also debated the situation of historical and archaeological research in the Romanian Academy institutes (in a seminar entitled Romanian Historical Research: European Models and the System Crisis, on June 26, 2002).

Vasile Pârvan Archaeology Seminar at Bucharest University<sup>4</sup> (which were precisely the institutions where it should have started in the first place). As the issue was dealt with only infrequently within the academic framework, it again ended up being discussed “over beer”, which acted as an alternative to an institution (in this case, the Institute of Archaeology in Bucharest) that did not function the way we would like it to.

Of course, colleagues discuss work matters on an informal basis the world over. But in this case it is my feeling that the discussion has already reached the level of neurosis.<sup>5</sup> It is not simply the result of a wish to relax (as in the western case) or to pass the time (the western impression); rather, it stems from a need to clarify what is happening to us and why, despite our best efforts, the results are never what we had hoped for.

**The participants** in the dispute can generally be split into two categories. The first category is that of a **traditionalist group**, made up of *active* supporters of over 50 years of age, who support the idea that “archaeology = culture-history”, and *passive* members of various ages, who can not imagine how things could be any different. The second category, smaller in size, with members aged between 27 to 50, campaigns for “*a different kind of archaeology*”, being convinced that *almost* anything would be better than the type of archaeology advocated by the traditionalists. As with any dispute that last a long time, the different positions have undergone changes: the number of people opposed to culture-history has increased, while the traditionalists have moderated their intransigence and nuanced their positions.

**The position of the reformists:** western archaeology works can be put into three categories. The first deals with strictly technical aspects and aims to improve the means by which information is retrieved from objects and their archaeological contexts. This category includes everything from *field archaeology* to the more specialised branch of *archaeometry*.

The second category deals with *archaeological theory*, the rules used to interpret information. Its main branches are processualism (with its more recent developments: behavioural, cognitive and neo-evolutionary archaeology), and post-processualism (with its own directions).

The third category is that of applied research and uses the results of the first two categories in order to use the information retrieved from various archaeological sites and to raise new questions which then become research topics in the first two categories.

The overall results are given in works such as the following:

- *Climate change and the adoption of agriculture in north-west Europe* (Bonsall et al. 2002);
- *Ancient tuberculosis and lipid chemistry: odd bedfellows!* (Redman et al. 2002)
- *Bark capes, arrowheads and Concorde: on social representations of technology* (Lemonnier 1989);
- *Bronze Age Economics. The Beginnings of Political Economies* (Earle 2002);
- *Time, Culture and Identity. An interpretive archaeology* (Thomas 1996);
- *Engendering Archaeology* (Gero, Conkey 1991);
- *Archaeologies of social life: age, sex, class et cetera in ancient Egypt* (Meskell 1999).
- *The Archaeology of Ethnicity. Construction of identities in the past and present* (Jones 1997).
- *Archaeological Theory Today* (Hodder 2000).

This list of titles is both short and unsystematic. It manages, nonetheless, to demonstrate that in the world of contemporary archaeology, researching the past is no longer a goal in itself and that the investigation of human social life in the past is not confined to coordinating the time and space of the

---

<sup>4</sup> This discussion took place during a seminar on higher education in archaeology held in April 2002 and financed by the World Bank (the participants came from Great Britain, Germany, Austria, Poland, Serbia and Slovenia).

<sup>5</sup> In many societies alcohol plays an important role in social life (for an “archaeological” example, see Arnold 1999). Discussing matters “over beer” is pre-war Romanian tradition celebrated, among others, in Caragiale’s writing. In my opinion, however, most of these discussions held “over beer” can be better compared to that in the Soviet world, as described by Krassikov: the alcohol “entertains, puts to sleep an agitated conscience [...] it does away with the feeling of inferiority and obliterates the ‘I’. In an environment in which the human being means nothing, alcohol gives man the illusion of his own importance” (*non vidi, apud* Besançon 1992: 105 [translation by Samuel W. F. Onn and Cristina Mateescu]).

objects which it left behind. On the contrary, *the purpose of archaeology is to study the role of materiality in social life, both in the past and in the present.*

### **How does archaeology in Romania compare with elsewhere?**

In the strictly technical area, Romania lacks any kind of research capacity whatsoever. Research labs are few and far between. The small amount of more complex equipment available in Romania (none of which is at the IAB) has been acquired using European grants – however, in most research areas there are no specialists trained to use them efficiently. No one thinks about *research* programmes, and while it is true that they are very expensive, it is also true that their results can also be applied in different fields, other than archaeology.

Paradoxically, the situation is equally bad in the field of archaeological theory, despite its being incomparably less expensive than archaeometry. None of the leading trends in world archaeology today are reflected in Romanian archaeology, nor has a position been adopted with regard to them. There have only been a few studies in archaeological theory (the first were financed by the NEC: Niculescu 2000; 2001 and 2004; Palincaş 2005), and these do not belong to the category of *fundamental* research, since they only discuss other people's results in the field. And as far as the sociology of research is concerned, this has been entirely neglected in Romania.

Consequently, all our efforts fall into the third category, that of applied research, but here again standards are rather modest. There are only a few applications of various techniques (usually dating, more rarely site prospection techniques) – their number is equal to the number of programmes funded by the west.<sup>6</sup> The Academy's institutes generally lack a basic technical foundation, to the point where investigations that elsewhere are considered routine here become the exception. Though some progress has been made (interdisciplinary research outside the IAB has increased in sophistication), generally speaking, archaeology throughout the country looks to the western European practice of the 1970s as its goal (Palincaş 2003: 30).

What, then, has archaeological research produced in the last decade? The answer is: articles about single items (*An axe found in ...*, *A silex piece discovered in ...*), or about several artefacts grouped together arbitrarily (*Hunting in the Neolithic in county ...*) or less arbitrarily (*Weapons of the type ...*, *Fibulas of the type ...*), site monographs (*The necropolis in ...*; *The settlement in ...*), or culture monographs.

Description and chronology of artefacts are the only areas in which an acceptable level has been achieved. These also exist in western archaeology, but only represent a starting point, and are by no means an ultimate goal of research. Beyond this, however, there are no further similarities between Romanian and western archaeology: the conceptual tools used in Romanian studies are outdated; narrative history is the only ideal that seems able to compete with artefact description.<sup>7</sup> Generally speaking, the concerns and methods of Romanian archaeology have remained the same for the last 50 years.

---

<sup>6</sup> E.g.: 1. In case of radiocarbon dating: the programmes covering the Palaeolithic and Mesolithic periods in Romania were chiefly funded by Northern Illinois University and the Radiocarbon Dating Laboratory in Groningen (Păunescu 1984: 235, note 1; Păunescu 1993: 10); more recent data were financed by the Lund University Laboratory (Olariu *et al.* 2002; Păunescu, Alexandrescu 1997: 22); the Pre- and Protohistory Institute in Heidelberg made the largest contribution to the programmes covering the Neo-Eneolithic period (Mantu 1995: 214) and the Department of Pre- and Protohistory of Zurich University, the Prehistoric Archaeology Institutes in Vienna and Berlin, the Radiocarbon Dating Laboratory in Lyon (Palincaş 1996: 284; *eadem*, 2004-2005: 64, note 28; Kacsó 2004: 60) for the Bronze Age, respectively. 2. For thermoluminescence dating, the only available analysis in Romania in the field of archaeology was funded by the French partners (Alexandrescu *et al.* 2004). 3. The dendrochronology measurements were financed by the Dendrochronology Laboratory of VIAS (Vienna Institute for Archaeological Science) (work in progress).

While this list is not complete, it makes few omissions and has the merit of highlighting the small number of analyses and the complete lack of any Romanian financing in the field.

<sup>7</sup> And there are also clichés (it is said about the makers of ceramics that, "Some made more beautiful ceramics, while others, less skilled or without experience, made less beautiful ceramics" [Diaconu 2000: 492]) and ridiculous comments ("Besides whistles, lurs and rattles, other noise-generating instruments were also used to make music, including drums, ocarina, sistrum etc." [Schuster, Popa 2000: 121]).

**The reaction of the traditionalists:** Criticism of excavation methods was eventually accepted in principle, after being violently rejected at first. The issue of interdisciplinary studies also triggered a similar reaction, ranging from stating their supposed uselessness (“Why do we need archaeozoologists and archaeobotanists, if texts can tell us what the people used to eat?”) to agreeing that they have some usefulness (determining the gender and age of human skeletons and animal species has been welcomed),<sup>8</sup> while all the time emphasising that “there is no need to overdo it”, at least not given the current state of underfunding.

The point on which the two groups can never agree is the *need for theoretical archaeology*. The traditionalists are convinced that the correct method is based on the study of the material (hence the quasi-general use of the expression “the *evaluation* of the archaeological material”<sup>9</sup>), which shields us from influence and a loss of our “objectivity”; the most important thing is to publish the results of excavations (the IAB has already gathered tonnes of artefacts and tens of thousands of pages of plans and note books), leaving theories (if we must be so fond of them) for later; and that theorising is the preoccupation of those who are not capable of conducting proper excavations and processing the archaeological evidence.

In a nutshell, the traditionalists are saying: “Why don’t you do it differently? You are free to try,” and, “Don’t just give us ideas about how to analyse the situation, tell us instead what *concrete* things we should do!”<sup>10</sup>

This paper takes this dispute as its starting point. As I see it, there are a number of contradictions between what the traditionalists say and the state of archaeological practice in Romania:

1. If the material is said to be everything in Romanian archaeology, it is hard to find an explanation for the situation where:

- innovations in excavation techniques are minor and only achieved on an individual level (the few innovations that have been seen came from foreign archaeologists digging in Romania);
- restoration and preservation standards are disastrously low (the laboratories are badly equipped and no one seems to care; we do not even make the small improvements that are possible with the small amount of money available – e.g. the substances used for gluing ceramics have not changed in decades, restoration and preservation records are not always kept etc.);
- storage facilities are overburdened with unprocessed material, gathered over decades of excavations;
- storage conditions are catastrophically poor in far too many instances, and
- finding specific materials means wading through the entire chaos of the storage system.

This situation is characteristic for the whole country, with the exception of a number of museums in the provinces which have smaller amounts of material. Thus, it is *not the archaeological material* – even in the most traditional sense of the word (ceramics, stone, clay, metal, or animal bone and antler objects etc.)<sup>11</sup> – that is *the real goal of Romanian archaeological research*.

2. If lack of money is the cause of the current state of degradation, why then have we not at least made those changes which do *not* require a lot of money? It is cheaper, for example, to employ an archaeobotanist, archaeozoologist or anthropologist than it is an archaeologist, because, though they receive a similar salary, they do not require money for their own excavations. Why, then, did it take 13 years to appoint one of each of these (and only on a temporary basis) in an institution like the IAB, which employs 58 researchers (both full and part time)?<sup>12</sup>

<sup>8</sup> The fact that culture historians basically welcome the technical and interdisciplinary developments in archaeology has also been noticed in other countries (Hodder 1991b: 14).

<sup>9</sup> This use of language implies that there is only one way of evaluating the archaeological material. The same applies to the topics of doctoral theses, such as “The late Bronze and early Hallstatt periods in the Argeş river basin” (N. Palincaş, defended in 1999); “The Aurignacian in Transylvania” (R. Dobrescu, defended in 2004) etc. to name but a few.

<sup>10</sup> Prof. A. Vulpe, Dr. R. Harhoiu etc.

<sup>11</sup> Romanian archaeology does not regard osteologic and botanical remains, sediments etc. as archaeological material (Palincaş 2003: 29).

<sup>12</sup> The attitude towards these studies is found generally in Romania: while the few available archaeozoologists are in high demand, not one of the graduates of a 2-year masters programme run between 2000-2003 at the Biology Faculty of Iaşi University found employment in their field (dr. Luminiţa Bejenariu, a talk on the prospects of inter-disciplinarity in Romanian archaeology, Târgovişte 2004).

If archaeological theory is one of the least expensive archaeological fields, why is it so underdeveloped? Many important theoretical works in archaeology are not available in Romania, but there are many that are: the article in which David Clarke draws attention to the fact that “metaphysical systems are not systems of observations but invented systems of concepts without which we cannot think” (Clarke, 1973:12) has been on the shelves of the IAB library for more than 30 years, yet it only seems to appeal to a minority; and the same is true of anthropology and archaeology journals from the United States, Great Britain and Scandinavia.

3. How is it, then, that those same people who claim that everything (*sic!*) depends on the personality of the individual are prepared to appoint almost anybody to a research position, with little thought or sense of remorse, based on the idea that “there is room for everybody in archaeology<sup>13</sup>”?

4. Why are we not able to provide an alternative to traditional interpretation? We are told we have “complete freedom” and, up to a point, this is true:<sup>14</sup> we are free to choose from a range of subjects, to establish (individually) contacts in Romania and abroad, and to establish flexible working hours. But why, for example, has freedom not affected archaeology in the same way that it has affected the press? Why does the press in Romania now look completely different, compared with before 1989, while archaeology has remained the same? Could it be that freedom is not enough? Or is this a special kind of freedom, different from what we need? Are we who spend most of our lives in the institute to blame, given that for many of us, our “free” time has been given over to working time, and our working space has extended into our private, domestic space, but despite all this, what we do seems to be insufficient and, at any rate, not what we wish for?

5. If all our work is routine and repetitive, why then does a researcher publish his or her first book so late in life, at the age of 40 at the youngest? This is a later age than the age of those who revolutionised archaeology – e.g. Lewis Binford was only 32 years old when he founded processualism, and Ian Hodder was 33 when he started post-processualism.

What is preventing us from doing what we believe to be really important? I was able to understand what this was, and how it influences us, during two ordinary conversations – one with the director of the institute, and the other with one of the institute’s guards:

Some time, late in the autumn, when the weather had turned really cold and the offices needed to be heated, the IAB director told me: “They’ll start making the fire tomorrow, between 5 and 7 am. Be sure to come to work earlier, to make the most of the heat.” (I would normally come to work sometime between 9 and 9.30, but by coming in earlier I could keep watch on the fire and prevent the office from becoming cold again). In a conversation with the night guard, I was told: “We should make the fire later, between 6 and 8.30, because otherwise at 9, when the researchers come to work, their offices are cold again. The cleaning women are not allowed to watch the fire, but it could be arranged for the night guards to stay later in winter. But what can we do if the management doesn’t want to ...”

I had known for some time that the management was trying to convince us to come to work earlier, and I understood that the heating arrangements were being used, whether consciously or not, as a disciplinary method. Thus it did not take me long to understand that the primary goal of research in the institute was discipline. It is precisely this *organisation of research as an organisation of disciplining* that I intend to analyse in this paper.

## THE THEORETICAL BASIS OF THE ANALYSIS

This text is largely based on Michel Foucault’s book *Surveiller et punir. Naissance de la prison* (1975), a number of works by Pierre Bourdieu - *La distinction* (1979), *Le sens pratique* (1980), *Questions*

<sup>13</sup> This statement was made by Prof. M. Babeş, but the idea is widespread.

<sup>14</sup> This is true only up to a point, because not every research project is approved by the IAB’s scientific council. For example, in a single year, two of my project proposals were rejected, one dealing with the archaeology of the human body and the second with the sociology of research (in fact this very study). I was told that my topics did not correspond with the institute’s programme, but that I was free, however, to work on them, along side my project.

*de sociologie* (1984), *Réponses* (together with Wacquant; 1992) – and two of Katherine Verdery's works on socialist Romania: *National Ideology under Socialism* (1991) and *What was socialism and what comes next?* (1996).

I initially thought I could organise my analysis according to the sequence of work phases, from excavation to the publication of a book or article. However, on realising that some of the phases share common organisational principles and characteristics, I decided to start my analysis with the *technology of disciplining*. Of relevance to this case are two social spaces that continue on from each other: the intra-institutional space of the IAB and the extra-institutional space to which the IAB is subordinated, the latter being represented in turn under the communist regime by the Romanian Academy, then by the former Academy of Social and Political Sciences together with Bucharest University, and, since 1990, by the Romanian Academy.

**The extra-institutional framework** establishes the conditions and limits within which the activity of the IAB is organised and carried out, including: (1) the budget and its structure (allocations for salaries, excavations, travel expenses, and, not accidentally in last position, running costs in terms of the maintenance of buildings and equipment used in the research process); and (2) the *number* of jobs (whose organisation structure is approved at the request of the institute). A series of general requirements related to the IAB's production is also established at an extra-institutional level. This has always been approached quantitatively, in terms of controlling the *presence or absence* of projects and *the number of* publications, but not the topics or quality of the works. Before 1989, like in any other socialist institution or enterprise, control was exercised by the hierarchically superior body, subordinated in turn to the Romanian Communist Party. After 1989, the Romanian Communist Party disappeared, but the way in which work results were controlled was retained, albeit in a more flexible manner.

Understandably, both the IAB and the institutions above it act in accordance with the law, mainly the *Labour Code* and *The Statute of Research and Development Staff*.

**The intra-institutional framework** can be analysed from the perspective of the logic of the field of production of symbolic goods proposed by Bourdieu (1979: 249-287 and especially pp. 275-278; idem 1980: 112; idem 1984: 113-120; Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992: 71-90) and the resources (the means of production) necessary to this production.

The main condition for the existence of a field of production<sup>15</sup> is that all its members agree that what they are doing is important, meaningful and should exist. In our case, the field of production is based on the idea that it is important and self evident that the material traces of the past be investigated. Those who belong to this field must distinguish themselves from each other in order to achieve individuality, which is the very requirement of their existence as authors. In justifying their differences, authors present their positions as a defence of or a return to the true spirit of discipline which the others – their opponents – have betrayed. Bourdieu regarded this internal competition as the source of the new. *The success of the new* is ensured by *the need for the new* which exists, in society, outside the field of production of symbolic goods: in order to counterbalance emulation, which promotes a levelling of both taste and of the goods consumed, the people at the top of the social pyramid are constantly seeking differentiation, thus turning themselves into the principal consumers of *the new* produced by the internal dynamics of the fields of production of symbolic goods. The success of an author therefore depends on whether he or she<sup>16</sup> can produce something that is different from the others and, most of all, different from what has been done before (Bourdieu 1979: 275-278; idem 1984: 114-116; 161-172; Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992: 75-78, 83-84).

However, intra-professional competition is not free, as it might be understood from the description above: fields come with their own power structures, and production requires means of production. In order to analyse these, I will draw on some classic Marxist concepts.

<sup>15</sup> Although Bourdieu often uses the image of the “game” to facilitate a first understanding of the notion [Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992: 73-75], he chose the term “field” to suggest the battlefield [Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992: 77-78].

<sup>16</sup> The reader will note that ‘he or she’ is used as a rule through the text. There are though some cases when only ‘he’ was used: these are no omissions, but situations where I couldn't imagine a ‘she’.

**Labour** is the main component of the means of production of symbolic goods. In the case of the IAB, this is made up of a number of people with various qualifications – researchers, auxiliary research staff (restorers, draughtspersons, assistants editors), administrative and service staff – and, as a rule, both under the socialist and the post-socialist system, these were permanently employed. Since what is important in research is the type and level of qualifications, I will limit the discussion of labour to the concept of *specific capital* (Bourdieu 1984: 114; Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992: 73-75). This is *professional and symbolic*.<sup>17</sup> By *professional capital* I mean *the sum of a person's theoretical knowledge, practical skills and experience*. This is objectified in, and can be deduced from, professional results: diplomas, excavations, works published, participation in conferences, discussion of other people's talks etc. (Bourdieu 1980: 215). Professional capital can be considered either at a global (that of the entire institute) or at an individual level. *Symbolic capital refers to professional prestige, professional credibility (i.e. that part of professional capital that is recognised socially) as well as all the elements from the field of social prestige that are not derived directly from professional capital*. The most important aspects of this include the power to influence the course of events (Bourdieu 1980: 203-204), position in the professional and administrative hierarchy, age, and the extent to which various persons feel indebted to the possessor of symbolic capital over services and favours. Like professional capital, symbolic capital can be individual or collective, though only the former (individual) is relevant to this analysis. Professional capital is important “on its own” only under extreme circumstances,<sup>18</sup> which never occur in archaeological practice. In most cases, when it comes to social relationships (including production relationships), what counts *de facto* is the symbolic capital. Given that a part of any symbolic capital originates from professional capital, the latter can be defended by the means of the former. This can lead to situations in which the possessor of a large amount of symbolic capital is the *possessor of totally devalued professional capital*, without the latter being challenged as a result.

**The means of production in archaeology** consist of the *raw materials* – the material and site records resulting from excavations – and *means of labour* – publications, day-to-day materials and tools, equipment and general maintenance costs.

In terms of organisation and management, a system in which the competition is based on research results aims to use professional capital, symbolic capital and means of production to obtain production of the highest quality and quantity. The future funding of the producing institution – and therefore the resumption of the production process – depends on the success of its products (publications). The first condition for this success is quality, which in the small, closed market of archaeology depends on the opinion of specialists.<sup>19</sup> It is they who decide whether a given work represents a contribution of new knowledge to the field – in other words, if it is useful to them or not. Evaluation is carried out *peer-to-peer*. The *quality* of a product is something created by one specialist *for another specialist*, for his or her professional needs, as well as for the specialist him or herself – an absence of quality will result in his or her expulsion from the field. The *quantity* of products is something the specialist creates for him or herself, for his or her own symbolic capital, because from the consumer's point of view, it does not matter whether a number of good works have been produced, say, by an equal number of authors, or by just one.

Under the socialist system, the interpretation archaeological papers should embrace was decided by the Romanian Communist Party. It not only censored<sup>20</sup> but also imposed a certain political content: all

<sup>17</sup> The definitions of professional and symbolic capital are not reproduced in full from any authoritative text, but are based on Bourdieu 1980, especially the chapter entitled “Le capital symbolique”.

<sup>18</sup> Such as the danger of bankruptcy in the case of a business.

<sup>19</sup> There is a branch of archaeology that deals with non-experts and the wider public. This will not be analysed in this study because the IAB is primarily a fundamental research institute and a direct relationship with the wider public, though not excluded, is not its main task. In this field, its role would mainly consist of a critical approach to the relationship between archaeology and the larger social field in which it is practised, but there has been no research in this area either (for a comparison see Shanks and Tilley 1987, chapter entitled “Presenting the past: towards a redemptive aesthetic for the museum”). There have nonetheless been some attempts to popularise the results of archaeological research projects. Of relevance to this discussion is R. Harhoi's and D. Gora's book (2000), which is very well presented but whose high price acts against its declared purpose.

<sup>20</sup> Censorship and its consequences should be a topic in itself. Examples of censorship, with no comment, include:

works had to be written “in the style of the party documents” and comply with the “instructions”. Examples of this include the much discussed case of the independent and centralised Dacian state of Burebista (Verdery 1991: 250), and the various interpretations of archaeological material dating back to the first millennium (Curta 2001: especially p. 375). No pre- and proto-historical era, however, was free from political pressures. Although not all researchers yielded to this pressure in the same way, it is clear that the margin of freedom was generally low. There were very few alternative and simultaneous interpretations of the same archaeological material.<sup>21</sup> At the end of the day, all we had were variations on the same theme. The quality of the production, therefore, was not the result of the internal competition in the field of production of symbolic goods, but was the result of party orders. The beneficiary, the evaluator of the “quality” of the products, was the Romanian Communist Party. The opinion of specialists was accorded much less importance and sometimes disregarded altogether.<sup>22</sup> Expulsion from the field or resumption of the production process was not decided by the specialists, but by the party,<sup>23</sup> and was therefore not related to professional capital. Once free expression of opinion has been suppressed, the producers of symbolic goods – the authors – can only compete with each other in terms of quantity. Consequently, *in relations of production, symbolic capital acquires an exaggerated importance, to the detriment of professional capital. Insofar as it was not intended for the use of the party, archaeological production became orientated towards itself, towards the producer.* From this perspective, control over the means of production plays an important role: the more means of production a producer is able to control, the more efficient its work will be. This means it will produce a larger quantity of works per unit of time. Given that the volume of means of production is always limited, increasing control over them by a given amount means weakening your competitors by the corresponding amount. The basic feature of a socialist economy – competition for resources and means of production (see, among others: Verdery 1996: 25-26) – is also reflected in the production of symbolic goods, in this case that of archaeology works.

Analysis of the production process also brings to light a number of decisions which cannot be justified solely in terms of the interest to control the means of production. They in fact have more to do

---

1. Dr. Valeriu Sârbu of the County Museum in Brăila, whose articles were rejected without any explanation, was advised by Iulian Antonescu (†), former director of the Museums Directorate of the Culture Ministry, to avoid using words such as *religion, ritual, magic beliefs* and *witchcraft* in order to mislead the censors. Later, after 1980, when all museum publications had to be approved by the Museums Directorate of the Council for Culture and Socialist Education, the same author submitted for approval a manuscript whose first pages included references to party documents and general information, while the actual study appeared on the following pages. To avoid any ideological overloading of an article, once the text had been approved, the author replaced it with another with an identical number of pages but which from the old manuscript retained only the first page with the stamp and the signature approving its publication (information from V. Sârbu).

2. One way of preventing interference with a text was to give it a title that made it appear to be in compliance with the dominant ideology (e.g. “Die frühthrakische Kultur: Zur Bronzezeit in südwest Rumänien” [Chicideanu 1986]; “Zur Entstehung der geto-dakischen Zivilisation. Die Basarabi-Kultur” [Vulpe 1986]).

3. Dr. Eugen Nicolae, IAB, numismatist, member of the editorial board of the specialist journal *Studii și comunicări de numismatică*, talks about instances of self-censorship where the author, when publishing coins issued by Romanian kings, would show only the side of the coin not featuring the king. In the catalogue description the authors would use circumlocutions such as “effigy standing” etc. Following a number of telephone calls to the person in charge at the Ministry of Culture, who did not oppose the complete publication of numismatic information, the situation normalised (information from E. Nicolae).

4. It is worth clarifying why certain archaeological journals featured Nicolae Ceaușescu’s portrait and contained ideological texts, while others did not: *Dacia, Studii și cercetări de istorie veche și arheologie, Cercetări arheologice a Muzeului Municipiului București, Cercetări arheologice a Muzeului Național de Istorie a României, Acta Musei Napocensis* etc.

<sup>21</sup> For one of the rare examples of alternative interpretation, see the discussion by Mircea Babeș (1974) on the book by Hadrian Daicovicu *Dacia de la Burebista la cucerirea romană* (1972).

<sup>22</sup> The interventions by the “second in charge” (i.e. Elena Ceaușescu) that required archaeology specialists to take the Thracoman theories seriously are well known.

<sup>23</sup> Among others, M. Babeș’ monograph (1993) was not published before 1989 following complaints made to the Securitate by a colleague who had been given a bad review by the author (cf. Babeș 1982) or the case presented by Opreș 2004: 57.

with the way in which individual identities are constructed and can best be understood by analysing the way messages of power are sent (see below p. 32).

A notion that frequently occurs in this analysis is that of *local power*. Its nucleus is formed by the directors (general director, deputy director and scientific secretary) together with the scientific and administrative council. A general description of the decision making practice could be as follows:

- in urgent cases and especially in matters where it has a direct interest, the directors take decisions without calling a meeting of the council;
- scientific/administrative council meetings are often overwhelmed with minor issues;
- council members are able to influence decision making in direct proportion with their level of conservatism and verbosity. Limited though this may be, this access to decision making justifies the use of the notion of *local power*.

This paper will further look at:

- archaeological production in the intra-institutional space of the IAB (internal organisation of production; the actions of local power; the extent to which innovation is possible);
- the role of the extra-institutional space to which the IAB is subordinated (establishment of general research framework);
- archaeological practice on an individual level;
- the meeting points of the three areas.

My analysis often deals with the situation both before and after the fall of communism, since the research process did not take on any new elements after 1990. Where necessary, I will highlight the changes that have occurred since the end of the communist era. The institutional analysis before 1989 deals only with the last decade of the *ancien regime*. Considering the entire history of the IAB would of course have had its advantages (for example, identifying the development of disciplining methods or distinguishing between intended and unintended consequences) – however, the present day situation is more relevant for the purpose of this paper.

\*

## THE TECHNOLOGY OF DISCIPLINING

“Modernity was a long march to prison. It never arrived there (though in some places, like Stalin’s Russia, Hitler’s Germany or Mao’s China, it came quite close), albeit not for lack of trying.”

(Zygmunt Bauman, *Intimations of Postmodernity*, Routledge 1992: xvii)

The main instruments of disciplining are isolation, severing of the connection between work and salary, the poor division of labour, the use of financial capital to produce social and symbolic capital, the lack of professional independence at the time of employment, obedience, the control of time and gerontocracy.

### Isolation<sup>24</sup>

Isolation begins with the very moment of employment. Each researcher is assigned a *project*. All projects are designed in chronological order (from Palaeolithic to the Middle Ages; modern and contemporary eras are no longer included, though they used to be before 1990) and around the archaeological sites which fall under the scientific responsibility of the institute or whose excavation team includes members of the institute. The uniformity of the approaches, imposed at an extra-institutional level, has led to differentiation among researchers not in terms of ideas, but in terms of material. Each

<sup>24</sup> For *isolation* as a fundamental principle of organising a prison, see Foucault 1975: 239-242; 243.

believes he or she is one of the few, if not the only, expert on a given type of material and, implicitly, a given period. The creation of distinction in this way has an isolating effect mainly because critical approaches to the interpretations produced by a researcher from a “different specialist area” are limited by a lack of knowledge in respect of the material. As a consequence, the exchange of *ideas* is made more difficult in a “natural” way.

Another medium by which isolation is achieved is *the archaeological material*. In archaeology, and to a large extent even in theoretical archaeology, not having one’s own research material is tantamount to not existing as an archaeologist. The structure of the projects ensures a minimum access to the material. The “raw” material indispensable to the archaeological production has, at *intra-institutional level*, been turned into an instrument of isolation. This is first achieved by limiting the quantity of material: in order to be able to publish more than just the annual excavation report, a considerable amount of digging must be carried out at a given site. Although nobody has yet been able to establish what this means, it is clear that a cemetery should be dug out completely, or at least to a large extent, and that a settlement monograph cannot be written based on only 2-3 narrow trenches. When archaeology was in its early stages, during the 1950s and 1960s, the less money received for excavation, the longer the archaeologists would be tied to and isolated in the site or sites assigned to them.

In time, however, materials have started to pile up, especially since the 1980s. Those who began the excavations went into retirement, most having since passed away, and the materials have remained unpublished (for details, see below p. 20-22). When the time came to retire, those who did not relish the thought of someone else using the raw materials they themselves had excavated discovered a highly efficient means by which to fight the competition: they simply took the site records away (sometimes to their homes). Needless to say, without the observations made during the excavations, the material is of little use. In some cases documentation was simply lost, but there is still a large quantity of records available that were completed in keeping with the (Romanian) requirements in force at the time of the excavation. Yet even in this latter case, the material acts in an isolating way: this time because there is simply too much of it. Sometimes it feels as if it is dominating our lives: we feel tied to it, have obligations to it, and are reluctant to abandon it. The only way to relieve the burden is to process it – but that, we feel, is impossible.<sup>25</sup>

Besides isolation vis-à-vis project and material, the researcher is also isolated *in relation to his or her own institution*. With few exceptions, the institution offers little support when it comes to daily problems or issues related to the running of the project. For instance, according to the current system for financing field research, which is funded by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs, and not by the Romanian Academy as should be the case, a researcher is forced to start work using his or her own money which is only reimbursed towards the end of the year.

On a different level, isolation is created not by individualisation, but by *grouping*. There are three archaeological research institutes in Romania, one in each of the country’s historical provinces. For reasons of local patriotism, inherited tradition, personal animosity and financial limitations, Romania’s territory has been divided into research provinces. This division according to regional criteria also added to the division of specialisations on chronological criteria.

The next level is *international isolation*.

It is worth mentioning that, 16 years after the collapse of the communist regime, only the international isolation has been eliminated – for those with enough money for trips and conferences abroad – but that the academic system in no way contributed to this.

International isolation has receded, and a new form of isolation has appeared: isolation in terms of personal *financial problems*. Salaries at all levels are insufficient to ensure “decent living standards” and the salaries of young employees are downright ridiculous (they barely cover the rent for a modest one-room apartment, excluding costs). In circumstances such as these, instead of devoting their time to compensating for the flaws in the education system and gaining professional experience, young employees are forced to spend their time trying to earn extra money. The middle generation in terms of

<sup>25</sup> My confrontation with tonnes of archaeological material and more than 100 note books and 1,000 plans gathered over five decades of excavations in Popești gave birth to this analysis of archaeological production in the IAB.

age and experience, which is expected to be the engine of reform, is also forced to spend its time doing much the same thing. This is why the few international projects in which the institute has participated have yielded only modest results: the minimum necessary to complete the project was the best we could do. It is for this same reason that no applications have been made for European funding to fit the institute with new equipment. The misery of the researcher's daily life restricts his or her freedom of action and maintains his or her isolation.

The underfunding of research comes top of the list at official discussions as to why research is in such a bad state in Romania.<sup>26</sup> I will deal here with this issue last, however, because it has not always existed<sup>27</sup> and because when supplementary sources of finance do appear, we are incapable of meeting the necessary professional requirements imposed by the provider of the funds. Underfunding – in research as well as the entire economy – is the effect, and not the cause, of the way in which labour is currently organised. Once it becomes a reality, it also becomes a means and an argument in favour of preserving the current state of affairs – a means because the less money we have, the more we become caught up in the daily misery of the researcher's existence and therefore the more incapable of dealing with reorganisation we become; an argument because research cannot be modernised comprehensively at no cost: if we cannot modernise, we cannot change, and therefore we stay the same.

It is not enough to want to isolate people, or conceal this isolation (making it appear natural, as the specialisation in periods appears to many). In order for the disciplining process to work, it should be impossible for the people to escape from their isolation.

### **The means of correct training<sup>28</sup>**

"Though this be madness, yet there is method in it."  
(*Hamlet*, II ii 207)

The duration of a person's active life can be easily estimated. Controlling time is therefore essential to controlling life.

A large part of the efficiency with which time is spent on production depends on the means of production. This can be obtained simply by allocation, which means that, at an individual level, its accumulation is not time-related, but depends on the local authority entitled to allocate.

**The control of material resources.** The material foundation of archaeology, the means of labour, has always been modest. At the IAB, publications continue to come first in this category (some 68,000 copies), followed by electronic equipment. I believe that their manipulation is of relevance when speaking about power relations.

For decades, the library functioned as a storage room for books,<sup>29</sup> where researchers and other interested parties could borrow anything, from the most sought-after periodicals to monographs. Borrowing a book often

---

<sup>26</sup> 99% of the IAB's budget covers salaries and only 1% is for other expenses (there is an insufficient amount for maintenance, cleaning and research materials for daily use). Prof. A. Vulpe, a corresponding member of the Romanian Academy, has noted that the budget for the Academy is allotted in a similar way – around 70% goes to salaries, 20% to research, and the rest to maintenance costs – and thinks that things should be the other way round.

<sup>27</sup> It is a well-known fact that the difference between the living standards in Romania and the west was much smaller in the 1950s and 1960s than in the following decades. This is also reflected in the level of excavation funds and laboratory equipment: compare, for example, the many applications made by Vl. Dumitrescu (in charge between 1956-1963) for laboratory equipment (the original documents are with S. Marinescu-Bîlcu) to the current situation when no applications are made at all because the staff are convinced such action would be pointless; as a result, they simply wait for the management to tell them when there is some money to be spent (which usually happens in a big hurry).

<sup>28</sup> Foucault uses this expression to refer to the education/disciplining process in schools (1975: 172). I use it because, in my opinion, it renders perfectly the goal of all management methods: that of creating a certain type of researcher.

<sup>29</sup> This expression belongs to Prof. A. Vulpe.

meant taking it home with you: in the last two decades of the socialist regime, the heating supply for the offices was cut, which made it impossible to work there;<sup>30</sup> besides, it was only in 1999 that the IAB finally got a useable reading room. So it often happened that the publication you needed would be at someone else's home. You'd have to ask that person for it, set up a meeting, and only then would you be able to use it.<sup>31</sup> That it was very difficult to make copies only added to the list of problems. The consequences of all this are obvious to anybody familiar with culture-history: any article – and especially a book – is based on a large number of comparisons between artefacts and sites. In order to understand it, you need to consult as many of the cited works as possible and at the same time.<sup>32</sup> The more difficult it is to gain access to publications, the longer it will take you to finish reading a study and, implicitly, to write a study of your own.

For at least a decade before 1989, it seemed that access to publications was being controlled by an extra-institutional factor – namely: the cold. And after 1990, when the cold had mostly disappeared, things were still done in the same way. It was a situation that suited the then director well, the only ones to have books delivered to him personally by the librarian, while the rest of us had to waste 15 minutes going from the main building to the library only to discover that at least half the publications we needed had been lent out to somebody else.<sup>33</sup> In 1998, when a change in the law affecting property rights meant the library had to be moved to another building, a fierce debate began in the IAB management between those who wanted it moved to the Academy House – where the finishing of the room designed to house the library has not been completed to this day – and those who wanted it moved to the institute's main building thereby making it accessible to everyone. The library was eventually moved to the main building, putting an end to the privileged access of the director to this very important instrument of work.

It is also interesting to look at the situation of copiers. Before 1989 there was only one copier, which had been donated by the Humboldt Foundation, and consumables were paid for by the researchers themselves. In order to minimize wear and tear to the copier, its use was restricted to around 30 pages a month. After 1990, the IAB received a second copier. One of the two was for general use, with a more generous limit on the number of copies that could be made, and became the responsibility of the institute's administrator, while the second copier was installed in the director's office for use by himself (and possibly by others who had been granted this privilege). In January 1998, the general-use copier broke down and was only repaired in July. Despite this, access to the copier in the director's office was only allowed in exceptional circumstances, though not necessarily when the "applicant" was working on an urgent or important project. Like the library, the copier only became accessible to everyone after 1999, when the management of the institute had changed.

In the meantime, however, there had appeared another means of labour which was subject to preferential distribution: the personal computer. The first computer was brought in 1991; by 1996 the institute had 7-8 computers; and today there are around 30 (shared by 50 archaeologists, some of whom, admittedly, are based elsewhere where they also have their own facilities). The distribution of computers was not based on the needs of a given research project, but the degree of proximity to the centre of power. Receiving a good computer does not mean the user is working on a project for which it is needed, but that that particular person has sufficient influence. New computers start off at close to the top of the pyramid and then move downwards as they get older. 'Close to the top' of the pyramid because the directors, being advanced in years, thought they could do without them and thus distributed them to the people they were working with. Their attitude changed over time, however. They then decided that it is much more convenient to have a laptop than a desktop computer, even if it costs 2 or 3 times more and is only used for typing or downloading digital images. We have thus entered the stage of "laptops for directors", a phase we still find ourselves in at the moment. As far as laptops are concerned, the control over the means of labour overlaps with the symbols of power: laptops are an instrument to which nobody of an inferior rank can have access because they are very expensive. They have not been bought in order to prevent other researchers from having their own computer, but because they are a symbol of status to which the management is entitled. What prevailed was not its use for professional purposes, but the directors' need to show, despite all the criticism from the lower levels, that they can

<sup>30</sup> I had this experience myself in January 1986, when, in the middle of the day and in the very same office where I work today, the temperature dropped to 3°C.

<sup>31</sup> There were even a number of cases where access to specialist literature was restricted *intentionally* by not returning on time certain important publications after borrowing so as to prevent competitors from using them.

<sup>32</sup> In old capitalist countries, archaeologists could go and see the objects themselves, even if they had to travel abroad. This was not possible in Romania before 1989 due to the ban on international travel and also later due to lack of funds.

<sup>33</sup> Compare the access to publications by the IAB employees with that of their western colleagues: in Europe even the masters and PhD students have keys giving them unlimited access to the library. Access to the Green Library of Stanford University, for example, was controlled electronically and monitored by the library staff, and the library only closed for 8 hours a week: Sundays between midnight and 8 a.m. Next to the library shelves there were large armchairs in which the readers could take a nap.

have such costly equipment bought entirely for *their* project and *their* site. (It is worth mentioning that the last two laptops were paid for with money earned by average and low ranking researchers on preventive excavations, and that many of these researchers didn't have a computer to work on at that time).

Given that the means of labour in Romanian archaeology is generally low (albeit significantly higher than in the communist years), the main research resource is the workforce – i.e. the professional capital of the institute.

Unlike other means of production, *individual professional capital* cannot be allocated. Consequently, it is also something that no one can be dispossessed of, at least not through revocation. It can, however, be influenced by *the way in which* the institution's overall professional capital is allocated, i.e. by the way in which work is organised: an efficient organisation maximises the use of working time and can stimulate creativity.

**The control of human resources.** In theory, every research programme has a coordinator, and each programme will be made up of independent projects, each with its own person in charge. No other specification is made for a project, neither in terms of staff nor in terms of budget. For a researcher to be able to start the actual work of analysis and interpretation for which he or she is being paid, the archaeological material and all the paperwork need first to pass through some preliminary stages. This requires staff who are less qualified than senior researchers (research assistants, restorers, photographers, draughtspersons, cartographers etc.). At certain stages of the research work, the ideal ratio is 7 to 10 auxiliary staff to one researcher. The IAB, however, has only some 8 auxiliary staff, and as a result the work they do not have time to do ends up being done by the researchers themselves. Doing the work of seven people takes you seven times as long, and sometimes even longer because some tasks need to be completed at the same time in order to be efficient. Besides, researchers also end up performing a series of tasks which, according to their job descriptions, should be the responsibility of the administrative staff.

In other words, the IAB operates on the basis on a minimum division of labour, which only exists because it could not be completely eliminated. This situation is much more tangible to researchers at higher levels and with some authority within the institute, while for a young researcher, or someone who is not the protégé of somebody important, it is an object of constant negotiation. (This means, for example, that a young researcher may be asked to carry, load or unload various parcels or heavy objects,<sup>34</sup> or even to break up the ice forming in the institute's yard in winter<sup>35</sup> etc.)

Forced to work on tasks below his or her level of potential, a researcher is not left with much time to finish what he or she is in fact supposed to be doing: keeping abreast of the latest achievements in the field and also taking part in them. The time left to conceive and write a text is infinitely less than that spent processing the material and creating plates. The task that would no longer be the responsibility of an auxiliary employee thus consists of comparing the artefact drawings to be published to those already published and then adding some comments in a familiar form, which the researcher has learnt, through analogy, from other works and oral tradition. The main consequences of this are: 1. an archaeological paper which does not contain images – and most theoretical studies do not – is considered pointless and therefore bad;<sup>36</sup> 2. archaeology itself is considered a minor discipline, not requiring much knowledge to be practiced and not really producing anything new – an art for art's sake, which society could do without but which it pays for so that some people can satisfy their own personal curiosity.

Tasks for which researchers are overqualified and the state of disorder in the storage rooms are the main factors standing in the way of any realistic deadline-setting in the case of a project. The more complex the work involved, the fewer the chances it will be finished on time.

---

<sup>34</sup> The fact that these requests are not accidental is also reflected in the attitude of the members of the IAB managing board when discussing moving our things from the offices rented in the Education and Research Ministry building in Str. Spiru Haret nr. 12 to the Academy Building. Only one researcher requested that personnel should be employed for that purpose and his proposal was accepted because it was supported by the IAB chief accountant (information from Dr. E. Nicolae; the meeting of the managing board took place in March 2000, but the conversation was not recorded in the minutes because no final decision was taken on that date and also because of the emotional tone of the discussion).

<sup>35</sup> See below, note 68.

<sup>36</sup> To quote a colleague of mine, for too many people "Reading is bad for your health." (F. Matei-Popescu).

The disarray is sometimes so big that the exact amount of the material that needs to be processed for a specific project is impossible to estimate when starting working on it; the artefacts are hard to find, even when they are archived.

E.g.: To write my research project I needed material from the late Bronze Age and early Hallstatt levels of the settlement in Popești (for which I had become the scientific coordinator in the meantime, taking over from the supervisor of my doctoral thesis who was also the head of my department and the director of the IAB). In order to locate it I had to go through a huge amount of material (90% of which was of a much later date). With the benefit of some sponsorship funds, I was able to pay five people to help me. With one week left to finish the materials stored at the National History Museum of Romania, I learnt that some materials from Popești were also available from another storage room. When I finally got close to the end of my work here, I was told that the day before, due to the start of restoration works at the museum, other materials from Popești had been removed from a different storage room and had become inaccessible. To date, I have been unable to find out if that was the only material from the museum I didn't see, or if the final batch can be separated from the first two, given that they had been moved repeatedly because of the restoration works. While I was actually writing my paper, my colleagues who were organising the institute's storage rooms, would send me from time to time a box or two with materials from the same settlement.

An analysis of the *preliminary* work needed for my project show that it took:

- 4 years with 2 full-time employees to sort out the material in the storage rooms, rearrange it and set up a database
- 3 years with 1 full-time employee to conduct drawings and preliminary records
- 1 year with 1 full-time employee to process the site records. All this work involving money, qualified staff and time, was not taken into account when the deadline to submit the paper was established.

The “arrears” are added to new projects – e.g. those requested by the local power or as part of international collaboration, by participation in international conferences or arising out of unforeseen fieldwork situations – as well as to the “individual projects” (projects in progress but not accepted in the institute's research plan<sup>37</sup>). Some works are interrupted because others have suddenly become more urgent. This situation also applies to the auxiliary research staff, who are often called on to perform tasks of varying urgency and find it impossible to concentrate on their work. After any interruption you need more time to remember where you left off and what you were about to do. The main characteristic of this type of work process is *arrhythmia* (Verdery 1996: 57). Unlike in socialist enterprises, where arrhythmia was generally caused by the uneven distribution of raw materials, means of labour and fuel, in the IAB it is *primarily* the result of the elimination of the division of labour and is therefore of an intra-institutional nature.<sup>38</sup> To this can be added the extra-institutional factors, such as the cold under the former regime, or the delayed funding of works in recent years: in most cases excavation contracts (let alone the money) do not reach the site coordinators on time, not even by early July (May and June are usually the best months for excavations), and investment money reaches the IAB accounts only towards the end of the year for which it was intended for use.

Arrhythmia plays an essential role in *generating a feeling of personal powerlessness*. Completing his or her work only rarely and always too late, the researcher ends up believing that he or she is not capable of producing anything really important and that he or she is only a pawn, a cog in the system to which he or she should be grateful for its tolerance of his or her existence.

Another consequence of arrhythmia is *waste*. Due to the general confusion created by the interruptions, many works are started over and over again, while others are never finished:

- after talking to my colleagues, I discovered that on many occasions each of us had several drawings of the same object instead of one;
- over the last two decades, a number of researchers were employed to reconstruct the dwelling levels in Popești. The reconstruction has not yet been finished because when they stopped working (for financial, organisational, personal reasons etc.) no one handed over to their successors the results of their work, and they had to start from scratch.

<sup>37</sup> They are, however, still recorded as achievements of the institute at the end of the year.

<sup>38</sup> The only extra-institutional cause of arrhythmia is the egalitarian principle on which this division of labour is based.

**Severing the connection between work and salary.** Although at first sight it appears completely chaotic and random, the production process in the IAB is “organised” on certain principles. Probably the best way to understand them is by means of an analysis of *the institution of the research assistant*.

In the USA, this was defined as a person with advanced qualifications but not yet working independently, who helps out by performing various tasks in completing a project. Those with higher level tasks within the project are relieved of a number of minor tasks, while the research assistants receive a payment and acquire more experience in the field. Eventually, they write their own doctoral theses and start looking for better jobs<sup>39</sup>.

This term was imported to Romania. Up until 1989, in the institute’s operational chart, the equivalent of the research assistant came under the title of “archaeologist”. Their project was established in a contract with the Academy of Political and Social Sciences (ASSP), and consisted of a number of pages (typed text) equal or approximately equal to that of a researcher at the top of the IAB hierarchy. This pre-1989 tradition may have played an important role in establishing the duties of the research assistant, especially since, in the early 1990s, the holders of the posts of “archaeologist” were middle-aged people who were the authors of long lists of works. It is not clear to me why the old name was replaced with a new one inspired from the west, but it is obvious that the role of this type of work is still not understood 16 years after it was written into the operational chart. The *official* expectation that a research assistant should not pursue a project of their own, or not as their main preoccupation, but assist a researcher in completing his or her project, is regarded by IAB members as an attempt to *exploit* research assistants and deny them their first and most important right: to become authors themselves. This right is included in an assistant’s job description and the unspoken laws of the institute and is handled by the research community with more care than human rights themselves. Even though research assistants have little chance of actually enjoying this right – for reasons to which the system itself contributes – this right remains. A given salary is not directly linked to the performance of a certain kind of work; in the case of a research assistant (as well as any other type of researcher) the reward is not the salary, but the fact alone – and often only the *right* – of becoming an author. This idea gained more currency after the fall of communism, not least because salaries by that time had reached a purely symbolic level. If a person works to become an author, that is something else. If, however, the research assistant becomes an author, who then will do the job of research assistant? Following the logic of the system, the answer is that each researcher will do it for him or herself. In practice, however, in the Romanian society of yesterday as well as today, the perfect candidate for this job is a *woman*.

Over the years, many women have been employed as researchers in the IAB. All have remained in the shadow of their “mentors” and very few managed to make a name for themselves. Where they did, their achievements were only ever close to that of their male colleagues, but never equal to them. Personally, I have never seen a case where their achievements were larger than the men’s.<sup>40</sup> Women were chosen, not because they might make good researchers, but only if they were suited to attend to the needs of those who had employed them in the first place. Those who refused to settle for this sometimes achieved more. In my opinion, it is not by chance that women with no family achieved the best performances and that – as opposed to the situation with male researchers – most female researchers were either single or soon divorced.<sup>41</sup> Had they had their own families, the position of subordination resulting from the intersection of the two spheres (family and professional life) could not have been compensated for through human effort.

---

<sup>39</sup> Probably the most important moment in the evolution of my understanding of what was wrong with my institute came during my visit to Stanford University, where somebody told me that as a student she used to earn extra money by reading specialist publications and writing short summaries for professors, who on the basis of these summaries, would decide what to read. Such a job would be unthinkable in Romania (and, I’m afraid, in other parts of Europe as well).

<sup>40</sup> Of course, I made this comparison between the best male and best female researchers. When comparing the less professional researchers, both men and women, things appear more balanced. This comparison is based on an overall assessment of the quality of works and excavation techniques, followed by the number of published works, and is clearly subjective, approximate and difficult to quantify.

<sup>41</sup> A theoretical exception being women researchers married to colleagues: oral accounts tell of their many professional qualities and the support given to their husbands, with the number of own works produced decreasing in direct proportion with the number of years passed since marriage.

« Le monde du travail est ainsi rempli de petits isolats professionnels (service d'hôpital, bureau de ministère, etc.) fonctionnant comme des quasi-familles où le chef de service, presque toujours un homme, exerce une autorité paternaliste, fondée sur l'enveloppement affectif ou la séduction, et, à la fois surchargé de travail et prenant en charge tout ce qui se passe dans l'institution, offre une protection généralisée à un personnel subalterne principalement féminin (infirmières, assistantes, secrétaires), ainsi encouragé à un investissement intense, parfois pathologique, dans l'institution et celui qui l'incarne. » (Bourdieu 1998 : 84).

And quoting further the same author : « La vérité des rapports structureaux de domination sexuelle se laisse vraiment entrevoir dès que l'on observe par exemple que les femmes parvenues à des très hauts postes (cadre, directeur de ministère, etc.) doivent « payer » en quelque sorte cette réussite professionnelle d'une moindre « réussite » dans l'ordre domestique (divorce, mariage tardif, célibat, difficultés ou échecs avec les enfants, etc.) et dans l'économie des biens symbolique, ou, à l'inverse, que la réussite de l'entreprise domestique a souvent pour contrepartie un renoncement partiel ou total à la grande réussite professionnelle » (1998 : 145-146).

I find the following language-based example relevant to the way in which female researchers are valued at the IAB.

In informal conversations, when the local power referred to administrative staff and unskilled workers in the institute, they call them by their first names – e.g. Bebe, Mariana, Marinuș, Gabi – if they are younger than the members of the local power – and by their family names – e.g. Tudorache, Anton – if they are male and are (or look) approximately the same age as the local power. (They can never be older than the local power staff because the retirement age of a grade I researcher is higher than that for a worker). The same local power calls women researchers by their first names, irrespective of how old they are – e.g. Silvia, Roxana, Oana, Nona (70-40 years old) – while male researchers are always called by their family name, regardless of age – e.g. Măgureanu, Dragoman (under 30 years old). Creating a hierarchy by means of language places women researchers on the same level as the administrative and maintenance staff, while all male researchers are superior to them (the latter category also includes the older male workers). Nonetheless, when referring to women researchers who are older than the local power, the family name is used. It is only at an older age that a woman is worth as much as a man, but at an age at which they no longer have a professional relationship with the local power.<sup>42</sup>

It would, however, be totally unfair to leave the impression that it was only the women who were researchers “only in name” in the IAB’s history. There were plenty of men as well. The important thing to note is that for decades the local power expected a young female beginner to be *more of* a research assistant than they did of a young male beginner.<sup>43</sup>

The same principle of a lack of relationship between work and salary applies to the whole activity of the institute. An example of this is given by the repeated attempts of the Securitate, the political police under the communist regime, to *persuade* Prof. Nestor to complete his project (Opriș 2004: 59, 63, 68-70, 74, 79-81 etc.) instead of sacking him from his position. This principle also explains why the institute’s research projects still do not have any assigned budget – i.e. a budget for income and expenses: nobody knows the value of the information obtained at the end of a project. It is therefore easy to understand why no one is concerned that cleaning sherds, drawing artefacts, carrying various objects or breaking up the

<sup>42</sup> Without taking the discussion any further, it should be mentioned that the local power is not the only to use such qualifications (male vs. female, author vs. auxiliary, important vs. not quite so important). Almost all *younger researchers* – male and female – address *relatively* older male researchers as “Professor” or, in the case of female researchers, even when close to retirement age, “Mrs ...”

Truth be told, however, I should add that the description given above represents only the tip of the iceberg and that the full extent of the abuse of women in Romanian archaeology will probably never be recognised and discussed publicly.

<sup>43</sup> This way of designing and distributing tasks for female researchers illustrates the male domination (Bourdieu 2003 [1998]: 33-34; 35-36). Maybe the clearest indication of unchallenged male domination in the IAB is the rejection of feminism by women (Bourdieu 2003 [1998]: 37, 41-42, 54 etc.). In discussions I have held, some described feminism as “unscientific”, “superficial” or “silly”, while others didn’t even bother to describe it, though all see it as their *merit not to be a feminist*. For female researchers, as well as almost everybody at the IAB, the opposite of *feminism* is *objectivity*, not *androcentrism*.

ice are more expensive when performed by a researcher than somebody less qualified. This also explains the lack of a canteen to provide employees with at least one meal a day and standard cafeteria fare, despite the IAB's location only a 5 minutes' walk from the Romanian Academy headquarters and the Academy Library building, which would ensure sufficient custom for the canteen. Nor was room found for a canteen among the enormous spaces available at the Academy House,<sup>44</sup> despite the first institutes having moved there some 10 years ago and the closest food shop being 10 minutes' walk away.<sup>45</sup> This same way of thinking – which “overlooked” the building of a canteen in the institutes and led to the “postponement” of the opening of a canteen in the Academy House – also, in my opinion, explains the lack of concern shown by the management (and not only of the IAB management) for the cleanliness of the sanitary facilities as well as cleanliness in general. The very idea of a *comfortable* working space – and not one that merely gives the outward impression of being “modern”, one that is good to show to the superiors when they come to visit – seems an excessive demand.

These considerations, which are ultimately linked to the idea of work efficiency, are completely alien to the local management and the leadership in general, because the *productive function* of work was, and still is, of *tertiary* importance to socialist archaeology (and the socialist world). Ahead of this, in terms of importance, comes the *function of time control* (achieved by wasting competitors' working time<sup>46</sup> and the arrhythmia of the activities) and – of still greater importance – the *function of disciplining, shaping* a certain type of researcher (*reshaping* in the case of those who were already old when the IAB was established: see “re-education through labour”, a concept the communist regime was so fond of). By forcing them to work below their level of qualification, researchers are “knocked off” their “pedestal” of (real or potential) authorship, made to work shoulder to shoulder with the other employees of the institute, “re(shaped)” and subjugated. The more submissive they become, the less trouble they will cause the local power (and consequently central pre- and, to a certain extent also, post-1989 power). Their symbolic capital – a possible means of influencing others around them – is devalued such that they become submissive, even where this has negative consequences for their production.

“Homogenising” by lowering the “rank” of researchers was achieved through other means as well, of which at least one is known officially: *public reprimand*. A visitor sitting in on a working meeting at the institute is left with the impression that all researchers – of course, with the exception of those representing the local power – are an undisciplined group of people who do not respect working hours, do not meet the requirements set by the management (and even dare to criticise them openly), do not work as hard as they should etc., while the rest of the institute's employees appear to be working normally; the flaws in the auxiliary and administrative system – where too obvious to conceal – are mentioned only in passing. The management has nothing to reproach itself with. The contradiction between the classification of the IAB as a centre of excellence within the Romanian Academy and the discourse of reprimanding researchers goes unnoticed. Since 1989, and needless to say before, the management has failed even to pay lip service to the idea of analysing the situation at the IAB and proposing remedial measures.<sup>47</sup> It feels no need to explain, less still to reconsider its position. It need only issue reprimands, and the favourite object of its actions is its potential competitor: the researcher.

---

<sup>44</sup> As a project of the Ceaușescu regime in the 1980s, the Academy House as a whole was conceived as a space for supervising researchers, as a panoptic construction (Foucault 1975: especially. 201-229; 252-253 and note 4). The building process continues to this date, which should be commended, especially given the shortage of space suffered by all the institutes following successful restitution claims by former property owners. Fifteen years after the fall of communism we still see the same lack of concern for ergonomics in terms of the use of available space (for example, the difficulty of getting to work when there is only one bus every other 20 minutes, assuming it is on time; the building is not directly linked to the headquarters of the Romanian Academy and the Academy Library by public transport).

<sup>45</sup> There is always a canteen in close proximity to central or west European university or research centres; in Switzerland there are three obligatory breaks a day – one for lunch and two coffee breaks – and the space is arranged appropriately for this purpose. In the USA there is even space for sleeping.

<sup>46</sup> The current form of time control is expressed through *the lack of any concern* for efficient time management. This creates the impression of a lack of time control. However, this *form of control* is possible only because it comes at the end of a long period of conscious control and this new attitude towards time – that of the type “time cannot be influenced” – could be naturalized.

<sup>47</sup> See the IAB activity reports presented at general assembly meetings every year since 1990.

Also worthy of mention is another practice that, though it has been abandoned with time, was very common in my first eight years at the IAB: that of *ritual waiting*. This refers to the waiting time a superior imposes on a subordinate not because the superior is forced to do so, but because it serves to mark the social distance between the two, to show who is there to serve whom. A subordinate's time is expropriated by the power, which uses it to celebrate itself (Schwartz, *non vidi, apud* Verdery 1996: 49).

Any researcher, of any rank or age, who needed to have a meeting, of any duration, with the IAB director, had first to wait a long time in the corridor, even in the cold of the winter, before he or she was allowed to the director's office. In the meantime, members of the administrative staff would go in and out of the office, freely and unannounced. If you were lucky enough to be the only one waiting to see the director, when knocking at the door you would be greeted invariably with a "Get out!" accompanied by a waving of the hand signalling towards the door – and this regardless of whether the director happened to be busy or not. This also applied to researchers of the same generation as the director (my guess is that this was applied preferentially to the director's professional competitors). Things were completely different if a western archaeologist happened to be visiting, regardless of whether they were masters or PhD students. The director would then assume a western academic behaviour.

For almost a decade after the collapse of the communist regime, the legitimate violence practiced by the main representative of the local power included not only ritual waiting, but also a *body hexis*<sup>48</sup> of the communist *big man* type<sup>49</sup> (the hand gesture showing the door to whomever came in, turning his back and speaking down to subordinates, not returning a greeting, entering an office without knocking at the door etc).

With the change of management, however, both the ritual waiting and the "Get out!" reactions were forgotten, though the habit of yelling at subordinates still remained among some local power members. Some of the older researchers see this type of behaviour as a "prerogative of power", or, at best, one form of leadership, a form of legitimate violence. It is clear that what is important in this approach to the relationship with subordinates is not the subordinates as producers of science, but the distance separating them from the leader.

Any protest against the generalised disorganisation and the disregard for researchers' qualifications is still met by the generation in power with replies such as: "When I was young, I was cleaning potsherds in the yard" or "Young people should get used to injustice from an early age". These requirements are seen by the seniors as a kind of "military service", ensuring the transition from teenage years to adulthood/manhood, while to the young they appear simply arbitrary.

Work is organised on **the principle of managing the symbolic capital with maximum efficiency** to the detriment of other forms of capital, such as professional<sup>50</sup> or financial. This is why the decisions taken by the local power create a sense of unreality, of living in a fantasy world, to the younger staff and people from outside Romania.

The reason why the local power is not strongly contested is because the system has all the necessary means at its disposal to *create obedience*.

Taken in logical order, the first cause of obedience is one of an extra-institutional nature: **the lack of specialisation**. Romania is one of the few countries in Europe – so few they can be counted on one hand – where archaeology is not taught in higher education institutions.<sup>51</sup> According to Professor Mircea Babeş, the founder and director of the Vasile Pârvan Archaeology Seminar in the History Faculty of the Bucharest University, only around one third of a student's time is allocated to archaeology. Low as this

---

<sup>48</sup> « L'hexis corporelle, où entrent à la fois la conformation proprement physique du corps (le « physique ») et la manière de le porter, la tenue, le maintien, est censée exprimer l'« être profond », la « nature » de la « personne » dans sa vérité, selon le postulat de la correspondance entre le « physique » et le « moral » qui engendre la connaissance pratique ou rationalisée permettant d'associer des propriétés « psychologiques » et « morales » à des indices corporels ou physionomiques [...]. Mais ce langage de la nature, qui est censé trahir le plus caché et le plus vrais à la fois, est en fait un langage de l'identité sociale, ainsi naturalisée, sous la forme par exemple de la « vulgarité » ou de la « distinction » dite naturelle » (Bourdieu 1998: 91-92).

<sup>49</sup> Kurt Horedt notes the case of Constantin Daicoviciu who built a body hexis that imitated Mussolini (1988: 115).

<sup>50</sup> There is a noteworthy tendency of not using scientific titles in direct communication – Professor, Dr. etc. – replacing them instead with titles implying power relationships (symbolic capital): e.g. "Mr. Director".

<sup>51</sup> Pace Schuster, Gheorghiu 2002: 298.

may seem, it is still more than when I was a student thanks to the masters programme. The courses taught today deal with archaeology in general. They provide an unsystematic survey of culture-history for all eras – depending entirely on the qualification of the teachers and often failing to address the students' interests – and include a class on theoretical archaeology and/or anthropology. This can in no way be compared to a western curriculum, which divides archaeology into different fields (pre-historical, classical, Middle Eastern archaeology, Egyptology etc.); gives students the freedom (and in effect also the possibility) to study disciplines which in Romania would be regarded as “different specialisations, with no direct connection to archaeology” (zoology, botany, geology);<sup>52</sup> is taught in archaeology education institutions with different orientations,<sup>53</sup> of which students attend at least two during their studies;<sup>54</sup> and entails specific practical training from excavation techniques to restoration, preservation, analytical techniques, the writing of academic papers, grant proposals or applications for different positions. The profession of archaeologist has survived in Romania by passing on knowledge in a master-disciple system.<sup>55</sup> Its importance as well as the efforts made by both parties in this respect should not be overlooked. However, what is relevant for this paper is the way in which this unofficial teaching generates obedience. To someone unfamiliar with the system, this statement may seem exaggerated, because even in the case of official education, the practitioners of a given profession or craft feel they owe a certain amount to or claim to be following in the footsteps of one or more of their teachers: in other words, the “master-disciple” relationship is never completely absent. The similarity between the two education systems stops here, while the differences are many and important. First of all, official education is based on a curriculum, which (pre)tends to ensure, if not truly systematic education, at least the diverse knowledge essential to any profession. In this case, the teacher-student relationship is a contractual one, based on the rules of the education institution, and is therefore neutral. Teachers are paid to teach, students are required to study in order to pass their exams. This creates a student-teacher relationship of the type “many-to-many”, which is important in ensuring a variety of knowledge and access to different ways of working, thereby increasing the level of teaching efficiency and depersonalising the relationships between the parties involved. In the unofficial system, the teachers' role is assumed by the researchers. Their teaching of the handful of students they work with is not systematic, but depends on the various stages of the projects they are working on (excavation or stages of material processing or documentation). However, this ensures only a minimum level of professional development, and the “disciple”, long after starting his or her job, will remain *professionally dependant* on his or her “master” and, therefore, obedient to him.<sup>56</sup>

In the master-disciple system, the researcher-student relationship is “one-to-one” or “one-to-very few” and is based on mutual choice. It generates a very personal connection, similar to the so-called *love as an element of authority* (Breban 1988: 62; Verdery 1991: 286), as Constantin Noica's school of

<sup>52</sup> In the academic year of 1993-1994, none of the students attending the Pre- and Protohistory Seminar of Zurich University had chosen history as their second or third subsidiary subject (*Nebenfach*). Most of the students I talked to had already chosen or were about to choose zoology or botany (they were required to choose two main subjects or one main and two subsidiaries).

<sup>53</sup> E.g. Tübingen, known for its emphasis on natural sciences and theoretical archaeology; Berlin, a bastion of culture-history; Leiden, a centre of processualism and neo-Darwinism; Cambridge, a centre of processualism and post-processualism par excellence etc.

<sup>54</sup> I still remember how during my first visit to the west I was surprised to learn that students attended a different university for at least one year to experience different ways of thinking and working. When I was a student (1983-1987), attending another university would have been considered a lack of commitment and was something done for personal reasons only (usually family problems) which had to be fully justified in the application and accepted with the written approval from the rectorates involved in transfer. In a world in which everybody was supposed to learn the same things, moving to another university was professionally pointless.

<sup>55</sup> This is a commonly used expression at the IAB. I heard it for the first time in public in a talk given by Al. Niculescu entitled *Theory in Romanian Archaeology* at Workshop no. 2 of the SocialSciencesNet, which was coordinated by Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, Paris and dealt with Archaeology & Cultural and Social Anthropology: Unity and Diversity of Scientific Cultures and of Their Organization between East and West.

<sup>56</sup> This professional dependence probably stops with the publication of the doctoral thesis, when a researcher has gone through all stages from material processing to compiling a large publishable text (at around 40 years of age). It is not by chance, of course, that most western universities only employ people with PhDs.

philosophy has been described. And even if the connection may fade with time and the professional growth of the former students, the relationship between the two parties will never completely lose its personal component. These researchers-turned-*de facto* teachers do voluntary, unpaid work. In this system, passing on knowledge to following generations is seen as a favour the *de facto* teacher performs, not an obligation. The beneficiary, under pressure from the research community, thus feels *morally indebted* forever.

An additional moral obligation comes with employment. As with the means of labour, jobs are also allocated, albeit by means of a more complicated bureaucratic procedure. In the full swing of the socialist regime, the consequence was a *de facto privatisation* of these IAB resources. It was a special kind of privatisation: the capital invested by the local power was professional and political in nature (since access to the leadership required at least the approval of the Romanian Communist Party, if not more),<sup>57</sup> and risk was nonexistent as long as the obedience of all employees could be ensured. In other words, the price paid in exchange for *de facto* “privatisation” was personal obedience and action to ensure the obedience of subordinates.

For the applicant, winning the job is not so much the reward for having learnt archaeology – i.e. something not covered by the university curriculum; rather, it is an additional obligation on his or her *de facto* teacher, without whose contribution he or she would not be practicing archaeology – at least not in the conditions offered by the IAB.<sup>58</sup> Obedience is perceived in this case as a common denominator for the older and younger alike; it appears as something inevitable within the limits of political and institutional organization, and the local power is thus exempt from any blame. Thus, what comes to the fore is the relationship between the master and the disciple. At this level, obedience becomes an elevated form of the *teacher's loyalty to his student*, whom he supports in order to protect his initial investment and increase his social capital, and of the *student's loyalty to his teacher*, to whom he or she owes everything he or she knows and on whom he or she will depend in the future (e.g. to gain access to a certain site or material, for professional experience, recommendations to study abroad, promotions etc.). What at first glance may look like mutual affection reproduces on a social level a feudal type of relationship in which the young researcher becomes “so and so's man” (a common expression at the IAB and in the archaeological community in Romania), who – like the vassal (*vassalus, homo*) – is given a position and *other privileges* as if in a feudal contract laden with obligations established by tradition. The first and foremost of the obligations is that of *loyalty*.<sup>59</sup> In case of disagreement, any form of criticism – professional or administrative – of those from whom you have learnt so much and who, in most cases, are the ones with decision making power, is taken personally and regarded by the institute as a lack of gratitude. It is something that is simply not done, regardless of how dissatisfied you might be.

*Combating alternative professional capital* was one way of making sure that professional dependence on the “master” worked to the full. A look to the past shows that there were a number of researchers who have tried to break the pattern:

Corneliu Mateescu and his paedological investigations of the layers in Vădastra, his studies of the composition of Neolithic ceramic paste and zoology provide perhaps the best example. He relied on his personal connections with researchers from other fields (paedologists, chemists, zoologists). Not only did he not receive any

<sup>57</sup> These two factors – political status and scientific/cultural authority – is a general characteristic of cultural policies in socialist regimes (Verdery 1991: 92-94).

<sup>58</sup> The following statement, made by a research assistant: “I will be grateful to Mr X all my life for having given me a living” (information from Al. Dragoman and F. Matei-Popescu), though an extreme case, does reflect a real situation.

The only other possibility of finding work as an archaeologist is with local museums. However, they only employ museographers, since the profession of archaeologist was only entered in the National Professions and Trade Register in February 2005. At best an “archaeologist” spends much of his or her working time organising exhibitions and guiding visitors. In most cases, participation in excavations and processing archaeological material in the museum's storage rooms triggers a war of attrition with the management for whom archaeology simply does not exist (except as something used to fill up display cabinets for visitors).

<sup>59</sup> For a more comprehensive analysis of the transition from socialism to feudalism, see Katherin Verdery 1996: 204-228. In my opinion, socialism and post-socialism are simply two forms of feudal social relations.

support from the IAB, but he was also isolated and ridiculed all his life. The strategy is simple and has remained the same for decades: it suffices to find only one mistake in an excavation or in a work to persuade everybody that *everything* that person did was wrong and that he or she only does things differently from the majority because he or she is incapable of doing it like the majority. Others, such as Ion Nestor and Alexandru Vulpe (Nestor, Vulpe 1971), who tried to introduce elements of geology and mathematics to archaeology, did not fall prey to any such virulent attacks, but still abandoned these lines of research for more accepted approaches (in the first place because of the mass emigration of their mathematician friends during the 1970's).

All these attempts were never anything more than individual actions that faded along with the enthusiasm of their initiator or a change of circumstances in the light of which, like any personal investment, they prove to be most fragile (running out of own money, losing contact with collaborators due to the slow means of communication, being forced to work on other projects etc.)

The lack of institutional support for any attempt at renewal and the professional and moral discrediting of competitors are two techniques used for decades at the IAB to ensure obedience. Their consequence, if not the annihilation of alternative professional capital, at least ensures its obstruction in terms of preventing its introduction into the production process and its large-scale reproduction. This situation contrasts starkly with Bourdieu's model of the field of production of symbolic goods, which is dominated by the quest for the new. The logic of production at the IAB sees anything new as at worst useless and at best something we could do well without, while in practice, its governing mechanism swiftly eliminates it. (In terms of what is said, however, "the new" is always welcome, an attitude best described by I.L. Caragiale when he said: "I accept the need for revision – but just don't change anything!"<sup>60</sup>)

**The impossibility of escape.** In what for decades we considered to be the "free world", someone not happy with a situation, would either resort to criticism or decide to leave and find work elsewhere. The Romanian system's defence against criticism is so effective it excludes it altogether. Leaving is not an option, either, which is true for both before and after 1989, and for pretty much the same reasons: it is impossible financially, the number of research institutes is very small, and they are all in conflict with each other. But most importantly, *all the institutes* function in the same way, so changing jobs means leaving behind not only your oppressors, but also your protectors and intra-institutional allies. The only effective way of leaving the system, both before and after 1989, is to leave the country. Within the limits of (archaeological) research in Romania, escape has been and, for all intents and purposes, continues to be not only impossible but also pointless.

A rational person might well ask why the institute can not be reorganised. This is the same as asking how the system ensures its reproduction.

## THE SURVIVAL OF THE DISCIPLINARY REGIME

When things are not going well at an institution, it is only logical to blame first those in charge of the institution.

**Gerontocracy** (see annex 1) is both the product of the disciplinary regime and the guarantee of its reproduction.

In all societies, older generations enjoy a certain degree of authority over younger generations. Professional competence being equal, the older generation will defend its leading position, arguing that the young lack experience, are too impulsive and generally lack wisdom. The argument of age is used to naturalise power relations. In such a world, « la 'jeunesse' n'est qu'un mot » (Bourdieu 1984: 143-145). In the Romanian academic research system, however, in the first two decades of a career, youth is not just an empty word, but a professional reality. Dependence on the professional capital of those who are older ensures the *naturalisation of gerontocracy*: it is only natural for the most competent to run the institute, and though the most competent are not necessarily the *oldest*, they are certainly *older* than the majority. The same applies to various moral obligations: the authority of the older is not openly debated, even in cases where the ageing of professional capital or physical exhaustion have become too obvious to be compensated with the scientific performances of the past – the gerontocratic tradition is much too

<sup>60</sup> Translation by Samuel W. F. Onn and Cristina Mateescu.

powerful, and the idea that retirement is not far off offers the hope of an “elegant” solution in the not too distant future.

It could be argued, of course, that “old age is just a word”. But given that those who hold the power are always older biologically,<sup>61</sup> the power inevitably acts in a conservative manner.

Experience shows that, once over a certain age, researchers only work on syntheses, put together collections of the main articles they wrote in the past and, albeit rarely, work on publications related to excavations performed decades ago. This last case involves their looking over the entire documentation but only processing a small part of the material. For these works auxiliary staff is needed only in the final stage: the texts mainly reiterate old ideas, the plates are few and only meant to provide illustrative support. Consequently, not only are the dysfunctions of the production process felt less acutely by someone at the top of the hierarchy, they are also out of sight.

On the other hand, under the current labour laws, any possible restructuring would take years, since no one can be dismissed on the grounds that his or her *work* is no longer needed, and the only mechanism that would allow for any restructuring would be a redirecting of the jobs made available after retirement. Besides the bureaucratic limitations, restructuring inevitably implies fighting the interests and opinions of colleagues and tradition. The likelihood that someone appointed to a leading position at the age of 60 will begin a systematic reorganisation of the institute is as good as nil: it would take too long before yielding any results, would bring no advantage and create many unpleasant situations in the short term. Consequently, given the web of internal relations on which academic research in Romania is based, the old age of those in power acts as an essential means of preserving the system.

The age issue is also *used* in the IAB to *devalue professional capital as such*. Here are some language-related examples showing how the way people speak to each other reflects the power relationships at work between them (Bourdieu 1984: 121-133, especially 124):

- A leading member of the local power reproached me for my attitude in a matter related to the administration of IAB funds. When I tried to explain my point of view, he said: “No, I don’t want to hear it. At my age, I can afford to pass judgments.”
- At a meeting in 2004 of the editorial committee for *Dacia* (the main archaeological journal in Romania) called to discuss the system of bibliographical references, the editor-in-chief decided that older authors could use any system they wanted, while younger authors would have to comply with the journal’s requirements.
- The use of the second person pronouns *tu* and *dumneavoastră* (the informal and the formal forms of the second person singular pronoun *you*, respectively). Older researchers enjoy the right to use the informal form “*tu*” when addressing younger researchers – even when a 60-year-old researcher is speaking to a researcher of 50, or a 70-year-old to a 60-year-old – and to be answered with the formal “*dumneavoastră*”.<sup>62</sup> Until some five years ago, the non-research staff would use the formal form of address when speaking to researchers (except, of course, where there existed a personal relationship). For some time now, however, most auxiliary and administrative staff members, including unskilled workers, guards, and cleaning women, have been addressing the younger researchers using the informal “*tu*” and are being replied to using the formal “*dumneavoastră*”, as it is customary to use with all older persons.
- Although it is obvious that all people will have the same biological age at a certain point, there is a tendency in the IAB to give different ages, depending on the context:
  - the true age, if the person asking holds a managerial position or is a colleague and has the same position as the person asking;

<sup>61</sup> The relationship between age and power has been solved differently in western institutions. In Germany, for example, it is traditional that applicants in their 40s and older are not the first choice for the position of professor *ordinarius* [head of institute]. Despite this, there is concern about the excessive age of those who have access to academic positions and hence the attempts to reform higher education. In the USA, the law excludes age as a selection criterion in job applications as it is considered discriminatory.

<sup>62</sup> In the IAB, as in the whole post-war Romania, the dominant rule is that, among researchers, the younger one uses “*dumneavoastră*” when speaking to someone older, who will use “*tu*” when replying to the former. The age difference to which this rule applies is hard to state precisely, but according to my estimations, it is 6-8 years. Those closer in age use the informal pronoun “*tu*”. Depending on the personal relationships at work, there are also exceptions to this rule. The important thing is that language reflects a structuring of the community by age and that this structuring excludes the idea of “*mature, independent*”: you can only be “*younger*”, “*of the same age*” or “*older*” than your interlocutor, therefore position is a *relative* matter.

- a higher age, if the person asking is an older colleague with more authority (or simply authoritarian), a competitor, or is part of the auxiliary or administrative staff. This is done in almost all cases by those under 50;
- a lower age (or real age with the focus on the younger-sounding age, e.g. “34” instead of “almost 35”) when professional achievement is discussed.

These basic examples show better than anything else the value of the various forms of capital in the possession of the employees of this *research* institute:

- *In the past*: In the relationship between an older and a younger researcher with comparable professional capital (even between people of 50 and 60 years old, or 60 and 70, respectively), age would constitute a legitimate difference. In the relationship between a researcher and another IAB employee, the professional capital would compensate for the age difference where this was acting “in favour” of the non-researcher;
- *Present day*: Age has become the only legitimate *difference*. Professional capital has been replaced by another form of symbolic capital: age.

The main beneficiary of this process is gerontocracy. Even where a competitor possesses a considerable amount of professional capital, this is “of no importance” – at least, no more than age. Being older means being right *ipso facto*: neither the decisions nor the actions of the local power can be challenged using professional arguments (at least not without running the risk of feeling, or being made to feel, “ill-mannered”<sup>63</sup>). The second beneficiary is the “natural ally” of local power: the auxiliary and administrative staff. They acquire a status they would otherwise be denied given the nature of their contribution to the institute’s production. This, in dealing with requests from younger researchers, permits them to adopt an attitude that is totally bereft of amiability, characterised by a refusal to discuss the quality of their work or perform their tasks and even telling the researchers what they should do.<sup>64</sup> In other words, everyone is disciplining someone. Things have gone so far that many researchers, at a disadvantage due to age and the power relations at play, are no longer asking for the services the auxiliary and administrative staff should provide. As a result, there is an increase in isolation within one’s own project and the disciplinary role of the work, but this time not due to pressure coming from top to bottom (from the local power), but from bottom to top. (One solution is to call on the help of the kind and duty-conscious people working in the auxiliary and administrative staff, although this means they will become overburdened and the gap between work and salary will grow even wider.)

The production of obedience is not alone to blame for the tolerance of this situation. The individual interests of the researchers also play a role.

*The pursuit of individual interests* applies to many people, from the highest level of leadership and influential researchers down to the lowest level of the humble employee. This mainly consists in the use of the institutional organisation to *increase personal power* and *create a space of freedom*, away from the pressure of political or local power.

**The interests of the local power.** Since the local power is not held directly responsible for the poor professional performance<sup>65</sup> of the IAB, it has nothing to gain from a reorganisation of the production process – in fact, it only stands to lose. The mechanism that wasted the first decades in the careers of those in power today, now works in their favour as they can use it to waste away the first decades of the careers of their younger competitors.

Further, the dysfunctional production mechanism itself becomes a source of power due to the organisational chart. In the 1950s, the number of auxiliary research positions was much higher. Their number has since fallen, not due to any reduction in staff numbers (which has never severely affected the institute), but because they were gradually turned into research positions. The decision was taken at an intra-institutional level, prompted by the various interests of the “local power”: wasting competitors’ time and securing jobs for as many of their disciples as possible.

<sup>63</sup> For the connection between “common decency” and power relations, see Bourdieu (2003 [1998]: 39-40).

<sup>64</sup> For example, in 1992, the cleaning woman told me that researchers should clean their offices themselves. In January 2003, the IAB’s driver asked a trainee research assistant to help him break the ice in the yard (information from C. Ştefan).

<sup>65</sup> It is clear that the professional achievements of the IAB are considered poor when compared with the west, despite meeting all the requirements for excellence of the Romanian Academy.

I am sure that the local power would refute any statement that claims they want their competitors and the institute in general to be unproductive. A few examples will show that this is a fact, and not merely speculation:

- in the 1960s and the 1970s, a whole range of archaeological materials (e.g. from Căscioarele,<sup>66</sup> Corlăteni<sup>67</sup> and Popești<sup>68</sup>) were moved from an unsuitable storage room to one that was even worse or were removed from the restoration and draughting process due to bad relations between those in charge of the site and the local power;<sup>69</sup>
- in the 1950s, when there were enough assistant curators (these posts have since disappeared), they were asked to create a record of the artefacts for an IAB department (The National Antiquity Museum), not for the research projects run by the institute: it is therefore not the lack of jobs that is the cause of the unproductive organisation of work.

Recent years have been characterised not so much by an effort to hinder the smooth running of projects, other than those of the local power, but by a lack of interest in their outcome. The researchers are left to deal with the projects on their own, within the existing organisational limits. The question of auxiliary posts and laboratory equipment is treated as a minor issue.

**The individual interests of the researchers.** At all levels of the hierarchy, there are researchers whose only chance to hold this status is a diligently applied routine. For them, the structural waste (Besançon 1992: 49) inherent to the current organisation of work is the condition of their professional existence.

There is, however, something even the best researchers desire to achieve: internal isolation. This has been turned into a space of personal freedom. Before the fall of communism, the “one site for each researcher” system ensured there was a place beyond the control of party structures and the bosses, a space where researchers were free to make their own decisions.

In countries where the practice of archaeology is well organised, all sites, whether big or small, work with a number of qualified staff (archaeologists, excavation technicians and student helpers), which can at times reach 90%. Their work tasks are divided *hierarchically*, from actual digging and recording to the processing for publication of certain materials and contexts, which, irrespective of which part of the site they came from, are arranged according to the logic of the issue under analysis. The final project is the result of *collaboration within a hierarchical structure*.

In Romania, the issue of using qualified labour<sup>70</sup> for the actual digging, given the low number of archaeologists, has never arisen. There have been attempts to create excavation teams, but the fact that they soon failed in dividing the site into narrow trenches (unless they had already been split into trenches at the very beginning), was no accident in my opinion.<sup>71</sup> Tasks are not established according to the

<sup>66</sup> Information from Dr. Silvia Marinescu-Bîlcu, who, shortly after handing over the early Hallstatt material for restoration, was asked by the IAB deputy director to take it back.

<sup>67</sup> The archaeological material from Corlăteni (Botoșani county) was moved to an unsuitable storage room where it developed mould (source S. Marinescu-Bîlcu).

<sup>68</sup> Due to differences between the IAB management and Prof. Radu Vulpe, the person in charge of the archaeological site in Popești, the material from this site was stored in unsuitable rooms and even placed under the eaves of an IAB building, partially destroying it (information from Alexandru Vulpe).

<sup>69</sup> “The truth is that since I’ve been working here [about 30 years – *my note*], the draughting department has worked mainly for the management” (comment by Iuliana Barnea, cartographer). They worked for others “only when possible”. Access itself to the auxiliary services is revealing since there is no distribution of restorers, draughtspersons etc. according to individual projects. The researcher submits an application to the *management* asking for a given laboratory or department to process a certain number of artefacts necessary for a given project. The request is almost always approved. The draughtspersons, however, then say they are overloaded with work and the researcher is made to wait a long time for a few artefacts, as if the drawings were works of art and not working instruments. At the end of the year, all auxiliary staff write in their activity reports that all requests have been met, but only because most researchers give up asking for their services.

<sup>70</sup> The profession of excavation technician, on which western archaeological fieldwork is largely based (albeit mainly in preventive and rescue archaeology), does not even exist in Romania because there is no specialised higher education for archaeology.

<sup>71</sup> I. Motzoi-Chicideanu has described this phenomenon as “*site autism*” (in a talk given in December 2001 at a seminar held by the IAB entitled Romanian Archaeology: Where To?).

material's (archaeo)logic, but according to the logic of the relationships between the archaeologists. A researcher will agree, if needs be, to a reduction in his or her space, but not to reduction in his or her freedom. "Far from the madding crowd", the site – if not the whole site, at least the assigned trench – becomes the only possible space of freedom. This is the material and social evidence (a trench also involves workers and students) to support the fact that there is a space, no matter how small, where the researcher has some power and can make his or her own decisions. This is a message of power transmitted to oneself (see also Wobst 1999: 121-122) and in terms of a researcher's identity, this is more important than the efficiency of his or her work.

This practice is so old that, even after 1989, it is rare to find two or more researchers of a comparable qualification level working together in the same trench of an archaeological site. This, in my opinion, is the main reason why digging in trenches still exists in Romanian archaeology today, although it is common knowledge that it was abandoned in the west in the 1950s.

This freedom is also ensured by the way in which the rest of the research process is organised – namely that of "one man and his project" – in which a research project is not a collective but an individual effort.

This facilitates control over the material and site records.

For a more humorous example of manipulation of archaeological material in the context of power relations, see Opreș 2004: 62: After appropriating the site records and the material discovered in Agighiol before the War, considering himself the rightful heir of Ion Andrieșescu on his death on June 7 1961, Nestor announced publicly that he "gave it as a wedding present" to Petre Alexandrescu in order to gain the support of Tudor Vianu [father-in-law of the latter and full member of the Romanian Academy – *my note*] in becoming a full member of the Romanian Academy.

The archaeologist appropriates the results of the excavation, which become *de facto* "private" property and a counterbalance to the "private property" – also *de facto* – of the local power in terms of the means of production (means of labour and positions). The local power is therefore forced to "behave itself" with the researchers:<sup>72</sup> regardless of how poor their performance might be, their material can never be taken away from them and given to someone more capable.<sup>73</sup>

The interest of those in power to *isolate* combines with the researchers' interest to *isolate themselves*, thus ensuring not only the stability of the system, but also its poor performance.

## PANOPTIC POWER AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH

From what has been said above, one might understand that the main beneficiaries of this organisation of work at the IAB are the people running it and those in search of a comfortable but prestigious position while lacking appropriate competence.

There are, however, a series of indicators, pointing in a direction outside the institute, which show that there were also others with an interest in the matter. By paraphrasing Foucault's question « à quoi sert l'échec de la prison » (1975: 277), we are able to ask ourselves: "Who stands to benefit from the failure of the research institute?"

The flaws in archaeological research in Romania start with the *lack of specialist education*. The attention paid to higher education by the socialist power hardly needs mentioning. It set up and destroyed faculties and controlled the content of curricula, what was said and written within and outside the official framework, staff and students. Given these circumstances, the only explanation for the lack of an

<sup>72</sup> This relationship remains in place even after retirement: the local power provides researchers with a working space in the IAB (to the detriment of new employees, who sometimes spend years working on table corners and being moved from one office to another), and does nothing to recover the documentation and the archaeological material.

<sup>73</sup> The constant excavating, performed year after year, was also facilitated by the positivist notion – still current in Romanian archaeology – that the excavation is an objective phase of collecting information and does not imply interpretation, which is distinct and comes much later, in the final phase of the archaeological process (Thomas 2005: 76).

archaeological faculty is that, for the former regime, archaeological material was limited to “evidence” and “testimonies” (words which can still be found in post-1989 archaeological texts) of unity, continuity and whatever else could be placed in a given political context, the final aim of which being to provide evidence that the present (the Romanian socialist state) was the natural outcome of historical development.<sup>74</sup> The “correct” interpretation was whatever was useful to the Romanian Communist Party. The archaeologists were required to come up with the details: chronology and spread area. They also had one further task: to keep, i.e. store the material. The larger the quantity of material, the larger the quantity of evidence. The regime provided *excavation money* (Vulpe 2004-2005: 6), year after year, but in a world of total control it didn’t bother to ensure that the findings were processed (*pace* Oprea 2004: 70, 74, 79-81 etc.). The material was evidence in itself, and the written text something that could be easily produced should the regime need it.

The absence of an archaeology faculty was not an unintended slip of the socialist regime, as indicated by the careful monitoring of the “alternative school”:

In the summer of 1951, at the archaeological site in Poiana, Prof. Radu Vulpe, a former teacher at the University of Iași and at the time working as a researcher at the IAB, gave some afternoon courses on the typology of Latène fibulas. Soon after he started his courses, a party activist showed up at the site and told him: “Comrade Professor, you are only allowed to carry out practical works with the students, not teach them courses.”<sup>75</sup>

The regime, through its system of control, knew perfectly well what was happening in the institutes (see also Oprea 2004: 19-335).

The inefficient organization of work was profitable for the political power not just because it made it impossible to come up with alternative interpretations to those established by the regime, but also because it expanded – as a consequence – working time to the detriment of free, private time. This ensured a *larger level of control over a researchers’ life than would otherwise have been possible under legal regulations*.

Of all the means of supervision, control of the project was, in my opinion, the most relevant. The IAB’s scientific secretary was required by law to present all projects to a person appointed by the ASSP. The only thing ever to be checked was whether the number of pages submitted corresponded with the number specified in the individual employment contract. This is how, if not from the very beginning, then very soon afterwards, working on one’s own research project was confined to the end of the year. The result was as follows:<sup>76</sup>

- simple pages typed up from excavation books;
- a simple ream (or sheaf) of pages gathered from various unrelated manuscripts;<sup>77</sup> due to being old or of a different manufacturing, some pages were sometimes so different in colour that all but the blindfolded could see they had been put together in an *ad hoc* fashion<sup>78</sup>);

---

<sup>74</sup> At a certain moment, the regime chose to present “the evidence” to the wider public. The minister of culture decided that museums should exchange their archaeological material to make the exhibitions more homogenous. Artefacts originating from a single site, and sometimes from a single context, were displayed in different museums. Nothing has been done yet to remedy this situation such that an archaeologist is often forced to search in different locations to trace the artefacts needed for his or her study. For example, my findings showed that the late Bronze Age cemetery in Zimnicea is located in at least four different places: Romania’s National History Museum, the Museum of Art (one pot), the County History and Archaeology Museum in Giurgiu, and the County Museum in Alexandria. The inventory of the necropolis in Cârna (Dolj county) can be found at the Oltenia Museum in Craiova, the Museum in Caracal, Romania’s National History Museum etc.

The list of sites in this situation is much longer than that of sites whose finds are stored in one single location.

<sup>75</sup> Information supplied by A. Vulpe.

<sup>76</sup> My information comes from discussions with researchers who were active before 1989. I would like to thank Prof. Alexandru Vulpe, Prof. Alexandru Suceveanu, Dr. Silvia Marinescu-Bîlcu and Iuliana Barnea for providing these examples and giving me their permission to use them. The information they provided is all the more valuable as the ASSP archive does not appear to exist any more and the copies of projects have been destroyed by the authors themselves who were embarrassed by them.

<sup>77</sup> Information supplied by Iuliana Barnea, who has seen many such works as the wife of a scientific secretary.

- texts written only to fill the blank pages, as evidenced by an unprofessional and at times amusing use of language: e.g. a sherd described on two A4 typed pages;<sup>79</sup> expressions such as “sherd from the citadel on the bank of the lake with blue waves”;<sup>80</sup> a project for 1977-1980 for which 50-100 pages were handed in annually was published in a 25-30 page article (Suceveanu 1982);
- texts written by someone other than the holder of the contract.<sup>81</sup>

When the institute’s typist was overburdened, her work would be performed by retired relatives of the researchers, in which case the text would be largely unintelligible. Generally, people who worked during the former regime say that apart from the first and last page, you could write just about anything in a manuscript, from the story of *Little Red Riding Hood* to the *Our Father*. No one checked the content. One cannot help wonder, then, how a political regime that would imprison and kill a man over the contents of his *personal diary*<sup>82</sup> could tolerate such instances of “utter contempt”, which occurred both officially and throughout an entire institution. The attitude towards projects can be explained, in my opinion, by what Foucault used to call *tolerated illegalism*: through the law and legal practice, the political power deals with crime differently, punishing some and tolerating others, while using both to its benefit (Foucault 1975: especially 277, 280-282, 287-288, 298-290). If such projects did not run counter to the interests of the regime, they were not at odds with the goal itself of the institution either – that of disciplining and monitoring researchers. To be able to perform this function, the research institute was organised on the model of a *prison*: it was a type of prison acceptable to the world.

Seen by researchers as (small) victories against the demands of the system, for the representatives of the power, these projects were evidence of their success in combating the researchers’ desire to be the true producers of knowledge, to provide independent interpretations. Assuming the contents of the texts were being checked, in the eyes of the panoptic power their absurdity would only have confirmed the success of subjugation.<sup>83</sup> Controlling the project is a ritual that has the same role as party, trade union and work assessment meetings: it *conveys a clear message as to who holds power and who obeys*, a message that becomes all the more powerful the more its contents move away from the truth (which is known or can be verified empirically by any of the participants in this ritual).

The same applies to the prefaces to publications, which contained texts from party documents, and, later, the toleration of plagiarism. Contemporary society rejects plagiarism because it is the most serious threat to intellectual property. From the perspective of the communist-type panoptic power, however, the basic idea of the text originated from party documents. “The historians’ front” had to work “in the spirit of party documents” – namely, to convey their ideas correctly and to elaborate on them. The party documents themselves, on the other hand, were nothing but a detailed account of the ideas and indications of the party secretary general. The ideal of the socialist regime was a Romania with only one author. This author not only wanted his work to be reproduced in their entirety, i.e. plagiarised, he also wanted to impose this as a rule. The intellectual contribution of second-rate authors was no more than a detail. The fact that in real social relations, whether openly declared or not, gaining a certain position or promotion depended first of all on the party, and only secondly on the candidates, clearly demonstrates why the potential author of second-rate ideas played such a small role. In this world, not wanting somebody else to

---

<sup>78</sup> F. Mogoşanu (†) was said to count the pages by hops and skips, for example: 1-3, 6-7, 9, 11, 15-17, etc. (Information from Prof. Al. Suceveanu, taken over from Dr. Al. Păunescu).

<sup>79</sup> The author is Dr. S. Marinescu-Bîlcu, who gave me this information; the manuscript has unfortunately been destroyed.

<sup>80</sup> The author of the project was Dr. Al. Suceveanu, who gave me this information.

<sup>81</sup> Sandra Ştefan, a researcher at the IAB, was supposed to submit 100 pages by the end of 1987, but because she emigrated during the year she only handed in 50. The other 50 were written by Al. Suceveanu to prevent the whole institute from being penalised (Information from Al. Suceveanu).

<sup>82</sup> I am referring to the case of Gh. Ursu (Eng.).

<sup>83</sup> It would be unfair to imply that all research activity was restricted to these projects. Most researchers published works which had nothing or little to do with them. Regardless of their flaws, the printed publications were still archaeological papers and include some of the best works of Romanian archaeology from those times. In fact, the existence of these two areas of production – one for the party and one for oneself – also characterised the production of economic goods in Soviet regimes (Besançon 1992: 45-50).

put his or her name to a text you know is yours is no more than a matter of ego. Following the same logic, it was not allowed to publish the authors' photograph on the back cover. Book shops would dedicate an entire window section to the works of the presidential couple and party documents, and eventually filled the whole window with many copies of the same book *Homage*, which was dedicated to Nicolae Ceaușescu. *Repetition ensured discipline*. This way of thinking survived, however, for unexpectedly long time.

Plagiarism has not been punished, neither by the Higher Diploma Commission of the Education and Research Ministry, nor by the disciplinary commission in the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs.

1. In 1998, Prof. M. Babeș requested in writing that the commission not validate the award of the title of doctor to Gh. Calotiu because his publicly defended doctoral thesis contained some tens of pages of plagiarised text, some of which was taken from a book written by one of the members of the assessment board itself! After considering the pros and cons, the title of doctor was eventually granted by the commission and is still valid to this day.

2. Recently (February 2005), a group of archaeologists requested that Mircea V. Angelescu, the director of the General Heritage Directorate, be penalised for plagiarism. His books included large sections of translated material from two British books (1. *Standarde și proceduri în arheologie*, Bucharest: INMI 2004, which plagiarised *Standards and guidance* from the website of Institute of Field Archaeology of Reading University, and 2. *Arheologia și tehnicile de management*, Bucharest: INMI 2004, a third of which plagiarises *Management of Archaeological Project*, published by English Heritage in 1991<sup>84</sup>). The first of these had been previously published as a regulation and promulgated by the Ministry of Culture. The disciplinary commission in the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs said, however, that under Romanian law then in force (Law 8/1996), *plagiarism can only be considered if the real authors start a legal action*. As a result, the plagiarist was only lightly penalised for making a "technical mistake."

3. Apart from the cases mentioned above, it is clear that the law makers are not very concerned with the problem of plagiarism, since they have left a window open for the plagiarism of texts by deceased authors with no heirs.

The conditions of employment themselves showed very clearly that the communist regime did not expect archaeological researchers to produce professional interpretations in the western sense of the word. What was important was not their academic background (there was no archaeology faculty and all applicants were history graduates, classical philologists, geographers or theologians) but, during the last two decades of communism, whether they possessed a Bucharest ID (gained by right of being born in Bucharest). Since being born in Bucharest had no bearing on a person's creativity, it is clear that for the then regime creativity was of no importance: researchers were simply state employees and nothing more. The condition of possessing a Bucharest ID before applying for positions at the IAB was not, as might appear, the result of a consistent, albeit inept application of the law. This law applied first of all to "intellectuals", and in different ways (more to teachers and researchers than engineers and doctors), and almost never to the working class, who were famously brought en masse from Moldavia to Brașov, and from all over the country to build the Danube-Bucharest canal and the House of the People. When it served its interests, the regime would move large masses of people from one end of the country to the other, but at the same time opposed regional mobility in the case of a few research positions.

## THE DISCIPLINARY REGIME AFTER 1990

What has changed since the fall of communism?

In December 1989, suddenly and most unexpectedly, the local power witnessed the removal of what people of its generation considered to be the only restrictions imposed on its work – those of direct political control and restrictions on foreign travel. As a result of the employment conditions imposed in the previous decade, the age of most IAB researchers was very high. Many were forced to retire and were replaced by young researchers (myself included), who were free of the obligation to work as a trainee for a certain period in the education system and to possess a Bucharest ID. In the first few years, all the

<sup>84</sup> For more details, see the discussion at [www.archaeology.ro](http://www.archaeology.ro), as well as the articles published in the papers *Adevărul* (February 18 and 22 issues), *Cotidianul* (February 15), *Evenimentul Zilei* (February 24) and *Gardianul* (March 12), all of which appeared in 2005.

applicants for vacant positions were recent graduates, and a record level of 2-3 people competing for the same position was attained. Three years later, the number of applicants dropped as the cumulative result of the lack of specialist education – “the alternative school” inevitably produces a very small number of “graduates” – and the decrease in researchers’ salaries. A situation was reached where there would be only one candidate for a given post, so, before making a position available, it first had to be made sure there was a candidate available to occupy it (no one dared risk advertising an opening without knowing in advance that there was somebody to fill it). Employment is not based on open competition, but on *co-opting*<sup>85</sup> (a special form of selection that heavily reduces the chances of potential competitors in favour of the agreed applicant and which can generate clientelism) or, to use a word more in keeping with notions of feudalism, on *investment*. Thus, after a brief interlude of relative change, the old mechanism of guaranteeing the line of scientific descent was safely back in place.

After 1990, a new element appeared that has influenced the IAB’s professional capital: *foreign scholarships*. These are granted by western institutions in the hope that the mainly young researchers who receive them will help spread innovative knowledge, ideas and attitudes on their return to Romania. In reality, however, once back, they realise that no one is interested in what they have learnt abroad: a scholarship is viewed as sort of tourist arrangement paid for by the west. Wishing to obtain more scholarships does not demonstrate a desire to improve oneself professionally; it merely labels the researcher a “scholarship hunter”. At best, a scholarship is seen as a private issue, which, even with its moral support, should not be allowed to interfere with the institute.<sup>86</sup>

Some who received scholarships adjusted themselves to the local power, but, according to the logic of the system, these were the ones who learnt the least from their experience in the west.

The local power made some, albeit inconsistent efforts to improve the situation: by thinking about reform, with some justification, in terms of “employees and staff dismissed”, it lost power following the changes to employment law. It did, however, take a number of measures: it appointed new people to the institute and projects were made less formal than it was before 1990, giving researchers a greater degree of freedom based on the conviction that this would give more freedom to research in general. It then came as a surprise that the results of research did not meet its expectations. This idea of freedom and the role of the leader has its origin in the drawn-out game between obedience and authoritarianism practiced in the socialist system. The reformist effect of internal restructuring was not even taken into consideration, partly because it ran counter to the system’s interests, and partly because the generation in power had reached what Bourdieu calls the limits of adaptation of its *habitus*<sup>87</sup> (Bourdieu 1980: 104-105). Institutional organisation was considered a given that could change only at the request of a higher ranking institution and by no more than was strictly necessary. Not even when it was seen that positions could be defined from within the IAB was it understood that it was time to change the internal organisation and production process. The reaction was the same as during communist times: job definitions were requested, job definitions were supplied. These were mere descriptions of the (professional) duties performed by the people who already occupied the respective positions – as a result, the old structure was preserved under a new name.

In the IAB, and in Romania in general, the disappearance of the Romanian Communist Party did not affect the structure it had worked to create over the previous half-century. Only the highest level of power disappeared. The others remained in place and even increased their autonomy: power was only “parcelled” (K. Verdery 1996: 209).

Since the old power mechanisms have been largely preserved, so has the old institutional organisation, which now appears as “natural”. “Reformist” solutions, therefore, have been looked for outside those mechanisms. In the case of the IAB, after a brief comparison with western institutes that showed they have far fewer researchers in the west, there were two waves of reductions in the number of researchers, each of 10%. It has not occurred to anyone that the counterproductive system could still be

<sup>85</sup> This expression belongs to Al. Niculescu.

<sup>86</sup> In March 2001, before leaving for Stanford University (California), a leading member of the local power, after wishing me well, told me I should be wise enough to refrain from saying such things on my return as: “Things were like this and like that at Stanford...” “They did things differently at Stanford...” “At Stanford ...”

<sup>87</sup> For a definition of the concept of *habitus*, see below pp. 68-69.

maintained even if the reduction was *to* 10% and not *by* 10%. It has not even been noticed that the IAB covers what in Germany is dealt with by 4-5 separate institutes. Nor does anyone seem to understand the consequences of Romania having three archaeology research institutes, while Germany has about 30 archaeology chairs (which also conduct research). To paraphrase Clifford Geertz, this numerical approach is to the restructuring of the IAB what “counting the cats in Zanzibar” is to understanding local culture (Thoreau *non vidi, apud* Geertz 1973: 16). It will not make the IAB more compatible with the European Union, nor will it make Romanian research more dynamic.

The latest solution for the reform of research (I am unsure whether the word *reform* has been abandoned in the meantime) that the Romanian Academy seems to be advocating is that of hiring researchers on short-term contracts. One argument in favour of this is that this system is used successfully everywhere in the world. In my opinion, this will *not* work well *in Romania*, for several reasons:

- *Modernising* research topics is not causally related to the type of contract: there is a risk that old research topics will be accepted by the selection committee, while new topics will be rejected on the grounds that they *are not archaeology*.
- The large site monographs – the ideal of Romanian archaeology today – will not necessarily appear – except perhaps in name<sup>88</sup> – because they cannot be written by the one or two researchers who are contract holders and need a functional auxiliary system or a large number of students, both of which are lacking.
- Even though research topics are modernised, there is no guarantee that the *content* of the work will be modernised accordingly, because this requires a long period of study in fields which are under-represented in the Romanian archaeological school and practice.
- A contractual relationship in which responsibility for the failure of the project lies exclusively with the contract holder, and the decision making power with *somebody else* (though it is not yet clear with whom), will only reproduce the current situation in a different bureaucratic form: the local power will not be responsible for any failure; the way work is organised serves its interests and is to the detriment of the contract holder; the contract holder will therefore be forced to “deal with the situation” as well as possible given circumstances (the local power would say “given the personality”) in order to keep his or her job.

What I have tried to say with the arguments presented above is that, as long as there is no change to the entire organisation of production, short-term employment contracts will have the same fate as the institution of the research assistant: they will only work on the surface. The experience of doctoral theses already demonstrates this, where the only condition of their acceptance is that they are submitted on time:<sup>89</sup> the commission tries to find *scientific* justifications “for awarding the title of doctor”, even if the thesis itself is weak, and only punishes an author by giving a lower rating, *at most*. Private conversations with referees show clearly how the first impulse to reject a paper was repressed in favour of various arguments, such as: the need to maintain a good relationship with the supervisor of the thesis, or even the candidate himself or herself; they compare favourably in comparison with other papers of an equally poor or even poorer standard that were nonetheless previously accepted; the idea that people are unhappy and underpaid and would be helped by a 15% increase in salary (doctoral pay increase). If a bad doctoral thesis can be accepted for the sake of a 15% salary rise, who could ever reject a bad project in the knowledge that its author would then be left without a salary?

Research, like any other social activity, is not meant to justify salaries and expenses; its purpose is to answer questions that arise in society. The problem of the *critical, qualitative approach* to results can not be circumvented by counting the number of publications (works of differing quality end up being published) or by the punctual submission of papers. All of these attempts to make the evaluation process *impersonal*, and by extension also *objective*, can only end in failure, thereby ensuring the survival of the old power structures with all the consequences that entails.

<sup>88</sup> See, among many others, the case of the monograph of the Boian culture: years after publication of the book, unopened boxes of material from the settlement were found in the IAB storage rooms.

<sup>89</sup> Some papers have been rejected, but far too few given the quality of many others that have been presented.

\*

As can be easily observed, the attempt to separate the characteristic elements of the post-1989 situation has merely resulted in a repeat of the characteristic elements of the technology of power seen during the communist regime. What did change – freedom of expression, freedom of movement – turned out only to be a necessary, but not a sufficient, condition for reform of the system to take place.

## THE DISCIPLINARY REGIME AND THE INSTITUTE'S PRODUCTION

*"We work, we don't think!" (From a placard displayed during an anti-student demonstration in January 1990 by workers from the Heavy Machines Factory in Bucharest (IMGB)).*

### **Excavation and material.**

At the beginning we have the excavation. As I have already made clear, with rare exceptions, in Romanian these have been based on the method of narrow trenches, sometimes arranged one next to the other. The consequences of this for the present are as follows:

- Only those features that entered large proportions of the research area could be recognised and documented. The most seriously affected are the paedological formations, which, instead of being explained in terms of human actions and site formation, were regarded merely as an environment for objects, walls and paving – in fact, as simple “vertically nested containers for artifacts” (Thomas 2004: 160).

- Laying trenches one next to the other, year after year, does not reduce in any way the number of units of stratigraphy that go unnoticed. Instead, if at the end of the excavation campaign, they are not covered with earth (due to the lack of money), their profiles erode, taking features with them.

- The narrow trenches severely restrict the possibility of completing the material (fragments found in successive years are hard to correlate).

- Excessive fragmentation also applies to animal and vegetal remains. In the absence of information about their distribution in the surface, the goal of research has been restricted to the identification and frequency of species. Given that the species have undergone few changes since the Neolithic period, while variations in material culture have been huge, archaeologists' interests have focused more on the latter – and rightly so, in their opinion. This explains why archaeozoological and archaeobotanical analyses, when performed, are mentioned at the end of studies without a title – called simply “Annex I”, “Annex II”<sup>90</sup> etc. – and are very badly, or in no way, correlated with the archaeological material. The *archaeological* information gained is generally of a trivial nature: “People were mainly active in breeding animals and growing plants”, “The role of hunting diminishes” etc.

- The archaeological material comes mostly from the ignored units of stratigraphy, hence the focus on vertical distribution and restriction of interpretation to chronology and extra-site spread areas. All the other lines of analysis of human remains become impossible. Not even the site formation process, an approach of such general interest that should precede any other type of analysis, can be conducted *systematically*.<sup>91</sup> Any attempt at studying human behaviour, meaning or social practice requires excavations of a quality that is rare, if not altogether absent, in Romania today.

Due to the failure to process materials and site records in a timely manner, the same mistakes in the field have been repeated year-on-year and no need to *improve* the excavation techniques was felt. The material in the institute's storage rooms thus conceals *this trap*. This is one of the reasons why “we can't do it differently.” Harris designed the excavation based on real units of stratigraphy and the matrixes that

<sup>90</sup> The observation on the lack of titles for most interdisciplinary studies and their inclusion in annexes was made by Prof. Marin Cărciumaru (talk at the colloquium entitled Multidisciplinary Studies in Archaeology, Târgoviște, May 2003).

<sup>91</sup> Comments on site formation are part of a chapter of the European tradition dealing with the research stage (Hodder 1991b: 13) but do not go beyond generalities and are not the result of systematic investigations comparable to those of the processualists.

bear his name out of a need to create an appropriate excavation report “within a reasonable period” (Harris 1989 [1979]: xiii). However, he was working in a system in which the primary function of work was to be productive.

The poor performance of the IAB and Romanian archaeology in general has given birth to the idea that publishing archaeological material is difficult. To this day, this is considered the greatest *achievement*. Due to the lack of any analysis of archaeological practice, it went unnoticed that, to the extent that this can be called an achievement, it is strictly a local one.

### **The interpretation of material culture.**

Specialisation according to period is perceived by most archaeologists as natural and therefore universal. Examples of leading foreign experts quoted for the variety of the topics and periods they cover are met not with admiration but violent rejection. There is a deep conviction that all such research can only be a fraud: such diverse topics and ages cannot be possibly mastered “scientifically” (needless to say, this is only because we are not capable of doing the same!) In an archaeology that only repeats the same ideas, it is the material that gives the researcher an identity. There is only one step between this stage and believing that ideas themselves originate from the material.<sup>92</sup> Not only has this step already been taken, but the way back has turned out to be very difficult and thus remained mostly untravelled: “Let the material speak!” is a common phrase in Romanian archaeology. In this vain, the correct interpretation is given by the material, meaning: typology, periodisation, chronology, chorology, cultural assignment. Anything beyond this is seen as only empty words, unimportant matters – “Interpretations come and go [as did the demands of the Communist Party] but the material remains!” Any discussion concerning *interpretation*, explaining a way of thinking, is for some an attempt to reintroduce “politics” to the “science” called archaeology, while for others of a less conservative nature this is something other than archaeology (e.g. anthropology, sociology, epistemology). Though we may not be aware of it, our ideal is the same as that of the IMGB workers: working, not thinking. No wonder, then, that the least costly of the different archaeological fields, archaeological theory, has the worst reputation in Romania. The lack of a critical approach to interpretation and its conditioning has ensured, and continues to ensure, a reproduction of the way in which archaeology is practised.

We have failed to notice that, in recent decades, the very *notion of science* has acquired a different meaning from the Cartesian one common in Romania (VanPool & VanPool 1999). Ever since Foucault’s fundamental work (1975: 32-34; 186-196; 312 etc.), we have ignored the results of studies that deal with the relationship between knowledge and power:

“Intellectual activity is complexly related to power and may construct empowering ideologies even when intellectuals intend otherwise. In addition, I [Katherine Verdery – *my note*] presuppose that intellectual activity is *situated*: that it does not emanate from a neutral zone of ideas floating freely above and indifferent to social conflict, order, and interest, but that it is, rather, one of several instruments for realising these” (Verdery 1996: 4).

The disciplinary regime governing the production process (professional dependency, moral obligation, public reprimand) has excluded truly **critical thinking**. Thus, instead of being an opportunity to analyse the development of thought in Romanian archaeology, the history of research is in fact no more than a list commemorating those who came before us. This explains the countless number of minor names that often appear in the history of research, the preamble not only to archaeology books, but also to longer articles. Where criticism does exist, it is only targeted at adversaries and those with no ability to react, and at any rate refers to matters of little importance; criticism of one’s own mentors and predecessors in the scientific genealogy is only admitted at an insignificant level and is always played down by the use of expressions such as “in those circumstances” or “at that time”. The more polite use these excuses for anybody.

<sup>92</sup> Many times I had the feeling that excavations are continued precisely in the hope – even though this is not admitted – that ideas would somehow pop out of the ground. The available material is regarded as dull and uninteresting, and in the absence of good ideas generated by the researcher, “better”, “more relevant” material is looked for, material that should be sensational in itself.

The main characteristic of the history of research is that it never deals with the history of ideas itself, but only makes mention of those who dealt with the material studied. The history of interpretations – i.e. the succession of those who thought in a certain way about the relationship between the material and its chronological, social, ethnic interpretation etc. – is absent, without exception. Almost any “properly” designed history of research starts with what are mostly obscure names of the discoverers of archaeological material from the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century – while no one feels obliged to mention the great names of the same period, such as Montelius, Kossinna or Childe, whose ideas influenced Romanian archaeologists far more than just a few fragments of ceramics or bronze artefacts found more than a hundred years ago. The “objective” list of authors featuring in the history of research is in fact the result of rigorous, yet unconscious selection. Those working in a different paradigm, even in the few cases where have used materials found in Romania, are also not mentioned, because their ideas seem irrelevant to the Romanian archaeologist unaccustomed to the sociological issues this type of studies implies.

By appearing to be “comprehensive” and “objective” the history of research contributes in a decisive way to legitimising a number of fundamental ideas of Romanian archaeology, such as:

- the history of research is first and foremost the history of information about an increasingly larger amount of material;
- ideas originate from the material and therefore interpretations are not created but are as detached from the author as are the archaeological materials from which they seem to “descend”;
- interpretations differ to the extent to which authors, as human beings, also differ: some are more narrow minded, while others are far more cultivated (i.e. they are familiar with more material and have read more classical texts);
- at the end of the day, they legitimise the professional capital of senior archaeologists as the only valid form of capital and turn culture-history into the condition to be met by a text in order that it be considered archaeological.

The history of research thus forms a closed circle, eliminating the development of ideas from the history of research, and ideas from the legitimate preoccupations of archaeology. This accounts for the fixism and unavoidable repetition of interpretations, as well as the refusal to accept that, in so far as there is a point to archaeological research, it can only be to come up for with interpretations. (During a period of openness, someone from within the circle of traditionalists asked me to write an article on how to write archaeology; in other words, “the correct interpretation” is something that can be learnt from somebody else, not something that is looked for<sup>93</sup>).

In this world, to say that science does not progress by using a single method but using many different methods and that the history of science is not the constant development of a single paradigm but a succession of different paradigms – each of which *abandons* the “paths” followed by its predecessors (Feyerabend 1987) – is to say something wholly unacceptable, even unintelligible.

The lack of basic criticism in Romanian archaeology is also reflected in the review policy for publications. Friends either write favourable reviews or refrain from writing a review at all. Whoever writes a critical review or reply to your work, is certainly not your friend – at least, not any more. As a consequence, there are ever fewer reviews being written (for more on the shortage of reviews, see Babeş 1999: 7), and those that are written tend to resemble only lightly commented recountings of the book and as such are more like bibliographical notes.

1. An article on the preservation of archaeological monuments (Bâlici, Apostol 2001-2003) also approached the situation in Histria. The tone is descriptive and impersonal, but the conclusion – the same as in the case of most monuments – is less flattering for the authors of the restoration (idem, p. 113 and fig. 12-14). The person in charge of this archaeological site took this personally and accused the authors of “unprofessional behaviour” under the pretext that he had not been shown the text before publication. I say, “under the pretext” because I do not believe that publication of a favourable article without prior notification would have been considered “unprofessional”. The person in charge of the site decided to restrict the access of the authors to the site. The situation was debated by the IAB scientific council. As a consequence, the director reiterated the right of the person in charge to decide on

<sup>93</sup> Some western archaeologists seem to be confronted with exactly the opposite problem. U. Sommer, among others, notes that there is a rush to discover the latest philosopher in the bookshop, whose ideas are then applied in archaeology (2002: 193).

internal matters concerning the site he or she is responsible for, and the scientific council recommended that the parties involved reach a *modus vivendi*.<sup>94</sup>

2. The review written by A. Vulpe (1981) of the book by V. Vasiliev (1980) triggered feelings of ongoing animosity.

3. The review written by the young D. Spânu (1999) was referred to by another young archaeologist in the following way: "I would have understood if it had been written by Professor Babeş."<sup>95</sup>

The annihilation of professional criticism is therefore a result of the disciplinary regime:

In example 1: criticism is perceived as "lack of professional ethics"; isolation within one's own site is vital to defending personal professional capital and combating its alternatives;

In example 2: criticism is simply unacceptable: criticising a work is tantamount to a personal attack;

In example 3: it is not possession of professional capital that gives someone the right to criticise, it is the possession of symbolic capital.

**Institutional criticism** is in an even more difficult situation. Most people are convinced that this has no connection to archaeological practice (this paper aims to prove otherwise).

How far does the impact of the disciplinary regime reach? If it excludes all approaches other than the "legitimate" one (i.e. culture-history), has it at least produced any *significant progress* in the accepted fields of research?

**In the preferred topics of Romanian archaeology – periodisation, chorology, chronology and cultural classification** – there has been little progress, and where it exists, it consists only of a belated and often inferior imitation of western methods, ideas and models.

*Periodisation* requires the classification of artefacts. All archaeological directions have discussed this issue for decades (roughly 1950–1995): starting with the concept of "type" and then continuing with the origin and development of the classification systems, analysis of the various known types of classification, the difference between scholarly and folk classifications, the relationship between types of classification – whether hierarchical or not – and their social context, and the development of numerical methods of classification (of which some 1,000 titles a year were published in the 1970s; Cormack 1971: 323). Throughout the whole of this period, the issue of classification was not raised in Romania. A few methods of numerical classification, more or less appropriate to the material under study, were adopted. With only rare exceptions, this was done without consideration of their theoretical background. Not one single method was developed in Romania. Worse still, Romanian archaeology is still looking for the *genuine, real, unique "types"* for the artefacts it is working with.

*Chorology*. For most archaeologists, up until 1990, the spread of artefacts in space used to indicate the territory inhabited by a people. The observation that a certain spread of artefacts may be the result of very different types of human interaction (Hodder 1978) is still not included in Romanian approach. The majority have given up on the idea of identifying ethnic groups, preferring in their explanations to use the notion of "trends". As with common thinking, for archaeologists, trends come and go: seen as whimsical, they require no explanation. The social aspect of archaeological phenomena is again avoided.

*The notion of culture*. Culture history is founded on the *normative concept of "culture"*. Its connection with the normativism of the panoptic power has already been explained (Bauman 1992: 1-25, especially pp. 8-17). In the 1960s, *New Archaeology* criticised the idea that people create artefacts based on ideal norms learnt in the socialisation process and proposed an understanding of culture as an adaptive mechanism (Binford 1962, 1983). Post-modernism argued the case of viewing culture as an ensemble of meanings (C. Geertz 1973: 5; Bauman 1992: 22-24). A more recent proposal advocates placing the concept in a secondary position in favour of "behaviour" (LaMotta & Schiffer 2001), "adaptation", "competition" (Leonard 2001), agency (J. C. Barrett 2001). Romanian archaeology has remained entirely on the outside of this discussion and continues to use the normative discourse for no other reason that it is simply not used to analysing the concepts it works with and because there is no (social) need to adopt any of the other available concepts.

<sup>94</sup> This example is based on the accounts of 94 participants in the meeting: M. Mărgineanu-Cârstoiu, Al. Niculescu and Vlad V. Zirra. The discussion must have been recorded, even if in a more "presentable" form, in the minutes of the council meeting of June 2004.

<sup>95</sup> Information from A. Dragoman and F. Matei-Popescu.

Finally, *chronology* – the greatest passion in Romanian archaeology – is almost entirely based on contact chronology. Due to the flaws in the research system and the excessive focus on normative thinking, comparisons are often made between artefacts located far away from each other – hence the fragility (to the point of becoming irrelevant) of the results. As in any other field, here too Romanian archaeology has produced neither anything new nor any improvements. The value of certain physical-chemical dating methods was recognised only later, and with much difficulty, and the only method in somewhat more frequent use is radiocarbon dating. The general tendency is to use the results of the method without taking into consideration its theoretical basis.

In what I have said above, I have tried to show how the absence of criticism of interpretation affects not only social analysis but also the *ordering* of the archaeological material. It is an illusion to think that archaeology, in so far as it is limited to chronology, periodisation and cultural assignment, remains “scientific” and a valid source of knowledge forever, or at least for a long time. A critical approach to one’s own production and interpretations is a condition for producing work that is of any value. It is true that interpretations come and go, but they do so only to be replaced by better ones.<sup>96</sup> Archaeology stems from a need to understand – i.e. to interpret – archaeological findings, not just to fill storage rooms with material and publications with sketches.

German archaeology, for example, though still largely based on culture history, works with the latest excavation techniques and has an excellent interdisciplinary sector (archaeozoology and archaeobotanics studies have been routine in Germany since the 1970s; palinology and paedology are used when needed; the archaeometry sector is highly developed; there are an increasing number of paleopathology studies etc.) In fact, it was observed long ago that the technical side of archaeology has continued to develop even where archaeological theory made no progress (Härke 1991: 202). This can only happen in a world in which the rules of competition require producers to supply better *products* than their competitors. (For attempts to explain the peripheral position in German archaeology held by fields such as processualism and post-processualism, and archaeological theory in general, see Härke 1991: 204-208; U. Sommer 2002: 190-192).

So far I have used the term *culture history* to refer to the archaeology practiced in Romania. However, Romanian archaeologists describe the work they do as “archaeology” or, at best (since the dispute over what we should be doing has intensified), as “traditional archaeology” and “this archaeology of ours”. Romanian archaeology does not have a proper name because we are not used to thinking about its purpose, the purpose of our research. This implies answering questions such as: What am I doing? What is its purpose? What is the purpose of my project? and, by extension, What is the purpose of “our archaeology”? To understand, it is necessary to theorise the object of research. From my experience, I have noticed that at the IAB and, for that matter, everywhere in Romania, very few archaeologists are able to give a prompt answer to the question: “What is archaeology?” The majority may think for a moment that it is the publication of chronologically and spatially arranged material, but since they are not very fond of this definition they choose to say nothing. In practical situations, however, they are very categorical about saying what archaeology is *not*. This explains why familiarity with the radiocarbon dating *method* is rejected as not being the task of an archaeologist, but rather that of a physicist, just as the study of human or animal bones is rejected as the task of a physical anthropologist or zoologist etc. If someone argues that archaeological education in the west includes courses in all the abovementioned fields, not to mention many others,<sup>97</sup> the reply he or she receives is that “we can’t possibly know it all”. The profession of the Romanian archaeologist is defined by exclusion, as is also true of his or her place in the field of archaeological production. What we are left with, then, is a hollow profession, with no goal, whose only identity comes from its past, from repeating all that has been done before many times over

<sup>96</sup> Processualism criticised culture-history and was in turn criticised by post-processualism.

<sup>97</sup> While all western education systems provide general courses in all fields (archaeometry, zooarchaeology, archaeobotanics, physical anthropology etc.) needed by an archaeologist to be able to design, run and complete a research project, some go as far as to turn some of their archaeology graduates into experts in related fields: in France, for example, an archaeozoologist is usually an archaeology graduate who later completed a masters in archaeozoology (information from Dr. Adrian Bălăşescu); some of the staff working at the dendrochronology laboratory in Zurich were archaeology graduates (my own observation, Zurich 1994).

and called archaeology. This explains why the same researcher who in interaction with his or her colleagues vehemently defends the correct method, professionalism and the science called archaeology can become very modest as soon as he or she comes into direct contact with professional categories ranked by society higher than that of archaeologist: aware of the hidden weaknesses in the kind of science he or she produces, the researcher readily accepts that his or her science has no importance.

### WHY CAN'T WE PERCEIVE THE PRISON?

Until now this analysis has tried to show that research in Romania is organised in the same way as a modern prison. The current section will try to show how it is possible to live in a prison without being aware of it. I find two elements extremely relevant here: the naturalisation of the institutional organisation and its characteristic habitus.

An essential role in the naturalisation of the institutional organisation was played by *the isolation from the external world*. Fiercely defended by the state-party against any unauthorised trespassing, Romania's borders were also imprinted on the brain,<sup>98</sup> creating two spaces that existed in parallel between which there could be no transfer: the spaces of "over there" and "over here". What is "over here" we must accept, because there's no other choice. In fact, we would really like things to be as they are "over there", but we can only hope that one day things will be like that "over here". (It is worth mentioning that neither acceptance nor transfer implies reflecting on the situation). Isolation is synonymous with the border. Its other forms are not perceived.

Naturalisation was also achieved by an *overlapping between the lack of concern for a productive organisation of labour at an intra-institutional level and that at the wider extra-institutional level* (any institution or enterprise of the socialist state). All over socialist Romania, working schedules were primarily an instrument of surveillance and discipline. The first social category that required disciplining, if not simply re-educating, were the "intellectuals". That is why intellectuals were regularly sent to perform unskilled jobs. After being "taken out" (albeit rarely) to peel onions, weed sugar cane or pick carrots at an Agricultural Productive Farm (CAP) or State Agricultural Farm (IAS) with which it has nothing in common, a researcher no longer found it so absurd to be asked to clean, mark or glue together broken fragments, or stick drawings on boards etc. Work in this case resembles work in Foucault's prison: « C'est n'est pas comme activité de production qu'il est intrinsèquement utile, mais par les effets qu'il prend dans la mécanique humaine. » (1975: 245).

This comparison is only valid with regard to the *function* of work. In practical terms, the organisation of labour in the prisons (and also in the factories) of the modern west aimed to achieve a certain rhythm of the "human machinery": coordinated and rhythmic action facilitates surveillance by the representative of the panoptic power (Foucault 1975: 139-143; 151-171). The organisation of labour in socialist Romania aimed at a lack of coordination, at arrhythmia (Verdery 1996: 57). In this way, the ordinary citizen was no longer able to plan his or her activity (not even a project). A whole arsenal of measures (e.g. interrupting work to attend rallies or perform farm work, working on Sunday in exchange for a day off during the week, queuing for everyday use goods (especially food), bans on driving a car on certain Sundays, the obligation to attend events organised by the party on public holidays) added to this function of labour: a person no longer able to make plans is no longer in charge of his or her own time and, therefore, his or her life. By using time (Verdery 1996: 39 – 57), life itself is *etatised*.

These two very different types of actions – coordination of minute details on the one hand, and systematically coordinated disorder on the other – can probably be explained by the different roles of the central power: in the west, it needed only to supervise and "administer" a society which largely preceded its installation; while in the communist case, it needed to reorganise, shape and discipline society – supervising it was not enough (Bauman 1992: 156 – 157, 160).

<sup>98</sup> "Les divisions institutionnelles, qui sont le produit de l'histoire, fonctionnent dans la réalité objective (par exemple, si je forme un jury avec trois sociologues ce sera une thèse de sociologie, etc.) sous forme de divisions objectives juridiquement sanctionnées, inscrites dans des carrières, etc., et aussi dans les cerveaux, sous forme de divisions mentales, de principes de division logiques." (Bourdieu 1984: 53).

In this world in which total control was combined with total chaos, researchers no longer wondered if internal organisation could still be rationalised. Time wasting and subordination were accepted as unavoidable and natural. If anything were to be blamed for this, it was the head of state and the Romanian Communist Party, not the leadership of the institute. This explains the frequent comments, still heard today, such as: “What can we do? That’s Romania!” and “The whole country is the same.”<sup>99</sup>

*The underfunding of research* has been a reality for decades. The danger of not having money to cover maintenance costs and to pay for basic materials was used by the management to justify the lack of initiative in terms of restructuring: “These are the working conditions, we can’t improve them because there’s no money. You come with all these ideas, when we barely have money to pay the gas bill...”. However, even measures that would contribute to reforming the institute without putting pressure on the budget are yet to be taken.

A reform that never comes (and one no one seems to have a clear picture of), institutional crisis, the habitus in crisis of the local power generation, personal crises, conflicts arising from confrontation between researchers (some of whom using their professional capital, others their symbolic capital), the end to the surveillance of private conversations – all these, which took place after 1990, have created a *soap opera-like atmosphere*, in which the people, while mainly criticising the actions of the local power and the leadership of the Academy or the state, are especially critical of each other. This atmosphere ensures a feeling that something important is always happening in the institute, when in truth the only important matter is that *nothing ever happens*; it appears to give *formal confirmation* to the idea that everything depends on the people themselves and, more importantly, creates a “cloud” around the mechanisms of power, which therefore remain hidden. Indeed, a new camouflage strategy has appeared in recent years: *the paternalist discourse*, in which we are told – at least from one sector of the local power – that we are all one big family and therefore should cease fighting with each other, form a united front etc. It is easy to see the benefit of this discourse to its transmitter: it leads to the conclusion that the transmitter, *pater familias*, is seen to have the purest of intentions at heart, is doing the utmost to ensure the wellbeing of “the family members” and that any form of revolt, therefore, is seen as a lack of good faith, if not patricide.<sup>100</sup>

The nodal point in adjusting to the prison and in its reproduction is, in my opinion, what Bourdieu calls *habitus*:<sup>101</sup>

“systèmes de *dispositions* durables et transposables, structures structurées prédisposées à fonctionner comme structures structurantes, c’est à dire en tant que principes générateurs et organisateurs de pratiques et de représentations qui peuvent être objectivement adaptées à leur but sans supposer la visée consciente de fins et la maîtrise expresse des opérations nécessaires pour les atteindre, objectivement ‘régliées’ et ‘régulières’ sans être en rien le produit de l’obéissance à des règles, et, étant tout cela, collectivement orchestrées sans être le produit de l’action organisatrice d’un chef d’orchestre” (Bourdieu 1980: 88-89).

This means that in order to act (in a structured way – i.e. predetermined – and structuring way – i.e. determining through the action itself) does not in practice require awareness of the ultimate model and the principles that explain the decisions; rather it requires only the learning of a set of rules and attitudes to be adopted in particular but nonetheless typical situations. Just as a knowledge of grammar is not required to speak a language correctly, or a consideration of the general principles of traffic rules is not required to drive a car (Shanks and Tilley 1987: 125 - 126), awareness of the prison rules is not needed in order to know how to behave, to have a typical prison guard or prisoner *habitus*. This is generated by a whole arsenal of *means of correct training*. This means that a researcher at the IAB needs to know:

- not that it is the way labour is organised that wastes financial capital, but in which situations you need to optimise spending (e.g. in the distribution of excavation funds) and in which you don’t (in almost every other respect);

<sup>99</sup> Prof. A. Vulpe.

<sup>100</sup> It is interesting to note that the paternalistic approach appeared, for the time being only in particular situations, among the auxiliary staff and occasionally the service staff in their relationships with younger researchers.

<sup>101</sup> The definition refers to the plural *habitus* and therefore should be understood as “a system of dispositions...”

- not that work and salary are in principal unrelated, but that an employee may be given as many diverse duties as possible;
- not that labour is organised according to symbolic capital, but what can be asked of whom, and what can be imposed on whom;
- not that age is more valued than professional capital, but the common formulas of address, the local rules of *common decency*, and that the paternalistic attitude can be passed off as goodwill in the eyes of the employee instead of being rejected for its lack of pertinence etc.

A characteristic of the majority *habitus* is to define thought as an understood repetition. Therefore, the priority is not critical thinking, but simply more work. This definition of thought helps to reproduce the system – a system which, through the chaos and insignificance of the tasks and the array of shortages, largely destroys the results of the work performed. The encouragement of repetition, of following models, comes from many directions and characterises all societies (Feyerabend 1987: especially 315-316). In my opinion, the generations that were still at school during the 1970s and 1980s are familiar with repetition in a particular and extreme form: during that period, hundreds and thousands of pages from textbooks had to be learnt off by heart in order to pass university admission exams. For someone educated in this way, a text can only have one interpretation and does not need to be thought about, discovered or contested by the reader; rather it needs only to be learnt from those who already know it. For an archaeologist, archaeology implies a single method, a single thought pattern, with no room for questions about the origin, the logic and the problems of the thought pattern or the use of other ways of thinking. The legitimate pattern in Romania is of German origin, more precisely an orally transmitted *vulgate* version of it.<sup>102</sup> This is because it was learnt at the unofficial school from a generation that studied in Germany, because the relationship with the German world was stronger than with any other western country,<sup>103</sup> and, in my opinion, especially because German archaeology exerts on Romanian archaeologists that same fascination masculinity exerts generally on people (Bourdieu 2003: 20 and *passim*). With the same characteristics as the German army or German technology (a clear and established method, the respect for rules, hard work and discipline), German archaeology appears to Romanian archaeologists to be more important than the critique of fundamentals and flexible thinking (flexibility = a feminine characteristic *par excellence*). The perception of the masculine as superior characterises not only the ordinary *doxa*, but also the scholarly one.<sup>104</sup> The fascination for rules and discipline was only intensified by the feeling of disorder resulting from the local waste and arrhythmia, even where this was not understood.

Another idea – this time of Romantic origin – common to the Romanian archaeologist's *doxa* is that of the uncreated creator (Bourdieu 1984: 207). It comes as no surprise, then, that the leading role in camouflaging the power relationships at the IAB is the publicly stated conviction that success in research work depends entirely on the individual qualities of the researcher, as proved by the professional successes of some and the failures of others of the same generation. A progressive correlation is acknowledged between the success of a researcher and the support received from his or her family, but that is explained away with the idea that "some are luckier than others". The institute thus appears as a community of professionally successful researchers favoured by fate, less successful researchers less favoured by fate and professional failures who are only taking advantage of the safe jobs guaranteed by law both before and after 1989. The "camouflage" purpose of this discourse consists precisely of the fact that it is partly true: since we are dealing with an activity which does, or at least should, imply a certain

<sup>102</sup> Judging by the results, the largest difference between German and Romanian archaeology is that the former actually deals with culture-history, while the latter only wishes to do so. For a critical approach to German archaeology, see H. Härke 1991; for more recent developments with regard to the integration of archaeological theory: Sommer 2002.

<sup>103</sup> The contacts were the result, among others things, of German financial generosity (DAAD, Humboldt scholarships etc.) and the interest showed by German archaeology in south-eastern Europe. Before 1989, only a single researcher from the IAB had any close contact with US archaeology, which at the time (1972) was in the middle of the processualist movement. The relationship was not maintained for various reasons, including the Securitate (secret police) surveillance (after meeting again in Bucharest with Martin Wobst, A. Vulpe eventually broke off contact due to the harassment of the secret police).

<sup>104</sup> Students choose foreign universities based on the masculine or feminine image of the disciplines and the countries in which they wish to study (N. Panayotopoulos, *non vidi, apud* Bourdieu 2003: 121, note 39).

amount of creativity, personalities plays a crucial role. What is not true remains, however, outside the discussion: saying that professional success depends only on individual qualities is to say *implicitly* that the institute provides equal resources for all; that the organisation of work is unimportant; and that apart from the researcher himself or herself, no one can be responsible for his or her professional failure. *The responsibility is thus passed from the institution to the individual* and the old power structure is free to continue as before with no one even thinking to analyse it.

In conclusion: we are not able to perceive the prison because we have internalised it.

## WHAT USE IS THIS PAPER?

“Truth will set you free.” (John 8. 32)

My colleagues will recognise in this text some ideas that are currently in circulation at the IAB, especially the idea of “over beer”. Few of these were of my own making. My contribution has been mainly to structure these ideas, and then to try to identify the principles and general patterns at play in the way the institute functions, principally by adopting the explanatory model of *feudal type relationships and the prison*. When I first understood these things, I experienced a sudden feeling of relief. First of all, because I was able to explain why we are the way we are, why our efforts do not yield the intended results, why it is so difficult to change anything, and especially why we are not able to do even those things which at least at first glance depend only on ourselves (as the local power would put it).

The specialist literature often refers to the genesis of various new trends in archaeology: processualism developed at a time in which demographic growth and industrial development in the USA raised ecological concerns (hence the idea of “culture” as adaptation to the environment, even if this is not exclusively natural [Schiffer 1988: 468]); post-processualism was born out of the post-modernism of western society, which instead of coercion now uses the seduction of consumption to integrate people and which accepts and recognises the value of a wide range of traditions and a diversity of opinion (hence the definition of culture in terms of meaning and the need to interpret the various meanings: Bauman 1992: 18-24; Shanks and Hodder 1995: 5-6; Moore 1995: 53). There was no such explanation for Romanian archaeology. It seems to be totally disconnected from the society in which it was being practiced.

While writing this paper I discussed a number of the issues it contains with some of my colleagues. Most expressed their agreement, or were even delighted by the idea of the paper. Some, however, were surprised by the idea of the prison: for them, there is too much freedom at the IAB, so much that it borders on the limits of disorganisation. I do not believe that this kind of freedom contradicts the prison theory. “Too much freedom” is nothing but the result of the enhanced arrhythmia following the end of the direct political control that existed before 1989. For decades, the socialist regime tried to force people obey. It did not get the response it wanted but did succeed in rendering the people inactive. The result today is a lack of initiative, bottom-to-top change, and *organised action* combined with this continuous and aimless floundering. This means that the “le monde va de lui même” in the same way it was designed.

One colleague who agreed with the idea of a disciplinary regime, told me that there is a risk that once they become aware how little freedom of action they really have, the researchers will do nothing to change the way things are. I agree that this might happen. But I also believe that to be effective, we first need to understand what it is we need to change. *The numerical approach* of restructuring (understood as staff reductions) will bring no good, especially since the number of researchers is already far too low in comparison with the size of the Romanian population.

What is there to be done? Any author who criticises the way things are is also expected to propose some solutions. I have worked on a few, of which only some are related to the issue of decision making by the local power in the IAB. Others may make proposals of their own, and all these will naturally have to be discussed. The degree of validity of the analysis and the degree of acceptance of the solutions will in the end remain as two things which are only partially related.

(1). At an **extra-institutional** level: a system of higher education for archaeology, separate from history, needs to be established; there is no other way to professionalise archaeology or reduce the age at which an archaeologist becomes professionally independent.

**(2). Intra-institutionally**, it is necessary to:

- reorganise the available staff according to new projects; nothing will change if the *de facto* system of “one person and his/her project” is not abandoned;
- redefine the position of research assistant and other positions;
- develop the research sector conventionally known as “interdisciplinary”;
- evaluate works within departments or even by the entire research staff of the institute.<sup>105</sup>

**(3). More money** is needed. If this paper has only touched on the financial problems of research, it does not claim they are unimportant. What this paper aims to say, however, is that even with more money available, without restructuring we can not expect to see an improvement in the quality of the work produced that would match the increase in funding. This is because the results of research depend largely on the relationships between the members of the field of production, which work against qualitative improvement. At any rate, in the beginning there were the people, and only then did the money come. On the other hand, the technical progress seen in recent decades imposes a basic financial limit on any research process, below which no work can be performed. Currently, the under-funding of research only adds to the effect of the institutional organisation in producing obedience.<sup>106</sup> Since the end of the communist system around the world, many sociologists have given intellectuals the decisive role of being the sole critics of the capitalist system (Bauman 1992: 177; 184-186). In this respect, Romanian archaeology again has chosen a different path than the western one.

For a while, it was believed that the west would contribute to the qualitative selection of research – at least in terms of archaeological research. The last few years have shown that this is not happening. We are not part of their production field, so the usual criticism applied to their works does not also apply to ours.<sup>107</sup> This can be clearly noticed in the few reviews of the books written in Romania as well as public reactions at conferences.

In April 2003, a university professor from the Faculty of History in Iași gave a positive speech about the organisation of the local archaeology education system. None of the audience – including three teachers from European Union states and two from the former Yugoslavia, countries with better archaeology teaching than Romania – made any comments. *In private*, a teacher from Great Britain told me: “Don’t expect me to say anything about the paper. Think about where these people are coming from.”

Thus, when it comes to Romania, it is not the principles of professional criticism that are applied, but those of political correctness. The west is in the full swing of post-modernism: people are brought up to be tolerant of other traditions and, indirectly, other people’s flaws.

Of course, western archaeologists know how to look after their own interests as well. If the smooth running of a project depends on the collaboration with a high-ranking Romanian archaeologist, they will

---

<sup>105</sup> I have taken the idea of peer-to-peer *evaluation* from Al. Niculescu (roundtable discussion held by the NEC on Romanian Historical Research: European Models and the System Crisis on June 26 2002), which he has proposed several times to the department and the scientific council of the IAB (so far unsuccessfully).

<sup>106</sup> E.g. since 1998, the Romanian Academy has provided no excavation funds for the IAB. Although excavations do not need to continue on all sites every year, suspending all of them, with no selection, poses problems not just for the IAB’s research plan but also the site itself (halting excavations for a longer period of time implies a different set of measures than when excavations are suspended until the following year). In order to be able to continue with field research, the IAB – as well as all the other institutes around the country – has received excavation funds from the Ministry of Culture (and Religious Affairs): after being told (by the Romanian Academy) that the state budget was too small to finance excavations, money was still received from the state budget, but through different channels; in exchange, gratitude must be shown to the public servants who distribute the money.

<sup>107</sup> See the review by Raimond Thörn (2002) of the book by Christian F. Schuster, Alexandra Comșa, Traian Popa, *The Archaeology of Fire in the Bronze Age of Romania*, in which critical comments, although related to the principles of interpretation and consequently affecting the central idea of the book, are listed rapidly (see pp. 377-378 which mention the lack of attention paid to “the large difference between then and now”). Generally, the author of the review is content with discovering more about the Bronze Age in Romania. Personally, I wonder if that was not chiefly because the book was published in English. (For the attitude of English speakers towards archaeological works published in other languages than English, see Harding 2000, p. 5).

accept the situation as it is. This will inevitably consolidate the local position of the Romanian partner. Depending on his or her identity, the consequences for Romanian archaeology could be good or bad. Still, our western colleagues do not feel responsible for the consequences, even if post-modern ethics would require them to do so (Bauman 1992: 201-203). We will therefore have to get ourselves of the situation on our own. The most we can do is ask the west from time to time for help in the shape of money.

I would like to make it very clear that I have not written this paper in any way *against* the IAB, but in its *favour*. If other, similar institutions choose not to look at themselves with a critical eye, this does not mean that they are in a better situation. Any institution wishing to undergo a systematic analysis needs to allow at least some “freedom” to its critics. This is something the IAB, despite the many stumbles along the way, has so far allowed to happen.

That there is a lack of criticism of the running of similar institutions – of fundamental research and higher education and even institutions belonging to the Romanian Academy and the Ministry of Education – is in fact the result of their being even worse off than the IAB. (Who at all in Romania today is in a good situation?) It is no coincidence that the most dynamic archaeology is practised precisely in those countries where institutional criticism has become a regular occurrence.

Many critics of the research institutes of the Romanian Academy have said that the main reasons they are doing so badly is because they were set up by the communist regime based on the Soviet model. In my opinion, this argument is not valid in itself: the university existed before communism but was simply unable to avoid the same organisation model.<sup>108</sup>

## CONCLUSION

« Ce qu'on ne comprend pas [...], c'est que la méthode et l'organisation collective du travail de recherche peuvent produire de l'intelligence, des engrenages de problèmes et de méthodes plus intelligents que les chercheurs (et aussi, dans un univers où tout le monde cherche l'originalité, la seule originalité vraie, celle que l'on ne cherche pas – je pense par exemple à l'extraordinaire exception qu'a été l'Ecole durkheimienne). Être intelligent scientifiquement, c'est se mettre dans une situation génératrice de vrais problèmes, de vraies difficultés. » (Bourdieu, *Questions de sociologie* 1984: 51)

With the installation of the communist regime, Romania, like all the east European states, was forced to undergo a system revolution. Unlike political revolutions, which only change the rules of political life to harmonise them with the pre-existing social organisation, system revolutions need to create social forces on whose behalf they can then act. The communist political power needed first to *build* the society it would then rule (Bauman 1992: 156; 160). Its first task had to be *the production of power*,<sup>109</sup> just as the first task of the institutions and enterprises it ruled had to be *the production of obedience*. In order to achieve this, society was organised as a pyramid, with different social positions being occupied through *investment* from top to bottom. The main criterion for social integration is *loyalty*.<sup>110</sup> Social and symbolic capital within the structure generated by the power are of primary importance, to the detriment of the other types of capital (financial, professional) from which they are derived in only small measure. During its process of social construction, the political power adapted the

<sup>108</sup> Proof of the crisis is also given by the fact that, according to a poll conducted by the Jiao Tong University in Shanghai (<http://ed.sjtu.edu.cn/ranking.htm>), in 2004, no Romanian university was among the best 500 in the world (*Aldine*, a weekly supplement of the Romanian daily newspaper *România Liberă*, from July 30 2004, p. II) (The person who told me about the article was Iuliana Barnea).

<sup>109</sup> “The production of power is the first duty of the soviet regime when socialism is weak, for power is its bedrock, and again when socialism is strong, because power is then its natural expression.” (Besançon 1992: 51). (Translation by Samuel W. F. Onn and Cristina Mateescu).

<sup>110</sup> see Bauman 1992: 17, 48-53, 98, 111, for the integration through labour relations in modern capitalism and integration through consumption relations in post-modernist capitalism.

institutions created under modern capitalism – schools, the army, manufactories/factories, hospitals, asylums and, in particular, prisons (the basic organisational model for them all) – in order to discipline, supervise and punish (Foucault 1975: 302-303; 310-311).

The Vasile Pârvan Institute of Archaeology in Bucharest is one such institution created by the system revolution following the Second World War. This was the object of this case study, and in so far as my analysis is correct, the same can be said of all the other institutions and enterprises that existed under the former regime, regardless of whether they existed beforehand or not: all were organised according to the prison model, though a different one from that described by Foucault. The difference lies mainly in the *form and type of rhythm*. The “classic” prison model is coordinated, harmonised, down to the smallest detail, so that anyone who disturbs this rhythm is immediately noticed and obliged to conform; “our prison”, on the other hand, is disordered, out of time, also down to the smallest detail, so that not being able to rely on anything, no one is able to put into practice any of their intentions.<sup>111</sup> Arrhythmia has some big advantages: under the communist regime, it gave the – admittedly, quite truthful – impression that you could only rely on yourself, and in time, this destroyed the idea of organisation as a solution to improving the efficiency of action. After the fall of the communist regime, this created the impression of freedom, and consequently laid the blame for failure at the feet of the individual.<sup>112</sup> In both cases, it played an essential role in creating a feeling of powerlessness among common people and therefore a weak civil society.

Neither the enterprises nor the institutions of the former communist regime are still able to face the demands of the contemporary world. With the former enterprises, post-1989 governments have achieved (or at least tried to achieve) their transformation by means of *privatisation*; while with institutions like the IAB, they have attempted to transform them by means of *reduction*. This approach to “reform” has not affected the system, and as a consequence, 16 years after the collapse of the communist government, and in a world dominated by post-modernist capitalism, we still have institutions which operate on the model of extreme modernism. Their survival has been ensured by the habitus of the generation in power.

The main idea behind this study is that power relations and the resulting organisation of labour can explain:

- the poor performance of the IAB in comparison with western institutions in the same field;
- the advanced age of authors publishing their first work;
- the Romanian notion of what archaeology is supposed to be – *in our works, what speaks is not so much the archaeological material, but the power relations and the organisation of the production process from which they resulted*.

The disciplinary feudal system is very stable. The only condition for its survival is accepting obedience. As long we don't question the decisions of our superiors, we can collect our salaries in peace. Production can be feigned (consciously or unconsciously) in two ways: *routine* (the most frequent at the IAB, which is a kind of generator of “living fossils”) and *imposture* (more the exception at the IAB, but something that characterises many works produced by other institutions). The difference between the works produced in these two different ways is that the former would have been considered of value in western archaeology in the 1950s, while the latter would never have been seen as part of archaeology.

Doing away with the disciplinary regime is difficult. Seen strictly from the perspective of access to power, the older a researcher becomes, the more the system works in his or her favour. The less creative he or she is (within the current organisation), the more productive he or she becomes and the better the chances are of moving up the ladder. It is to be expected that anyone trying to reform the IAB will come into conflict with others of his or her own generation – who, once in a position of power, prefer to use it

<sup>111</sup> The impossibility of making any plans at an individual level is the corollary of the *total order* to which all communist regimes aspired (Bauman 1992: 178).

<sup>112</sup> Contemporary society has the tendency, even in societies organised differently to Romanian society, to place the responsibility for the problems created by the social system with the individual (Z. Bauman 2002: 68-69, which quotes Ulrich Beck 1992: 135-137).

to reproduce the disciplinary regime – and, at the same time, be faced with competition from younger generations, whose performance is expected to improve rapidly with the reform.

If the IAB fails to implement reform, we will have to get used to the idea that the accumulation of archaeological material will continue at a pace greater than that of our ability to unpack it; we will continue to work in a paradigm that was abandoned 40 years ago by the world's top archaeology departments; not even the best among us will ever hope to do something that is really new; the institute will never be successfully involved in any large international projects with important contributions from the Romanian side; and the list does not end here.

What can the individual researcher do in these circumstances? In my opinion: anything but archaeology.

The sign [at the entrance] read: "FREEDOM AND REASON".

I was pointing at it and laughing.

"Why are you laughing? What's there to laugh about? [...] I won't allow it, do you hear me? Those are holy words, you idiot, how dare you? I forbid you categorically, you impetuous child, do you hear me? Don't laugh!"

I caught my breath ... and then said: "You mean ... this ... and this ... the sign and the rats [whose legs you chopped off] are not a laughing matter? They don't exactly go well together, do they?"

"[...] What do you mean they don't go well together?" he said.

He then shouted: "Freedom? There's your freedom if you want it."

He pushed the gate of the enclosure wide open; his glasses shone furiously.

"There you are! Do you see anyone running away? Is anyone even trying? They're not even moving, don't you see?"

"What the hell is this, if it's not freedom? What is it?"

He was still watching them, and his face hardened.

Turning to me, he looked morose and somehow solemn.

"As for reason", he said, "as for reason... [...] Yes, that's decided ... I am Reason." (Al. Monciu-Sudinski – *Guliver*, Ed. Ileana, no date: 115).<sup>113</sup>

### Postscript:

1. This manuscript was completed in May 2004 as part of a "private" project together with three other colleagues. The project failed in the sense that each ended up publishing their research separately.

2. The situation at the IAB has changed in the meantime, both for the better and for the worse. One positive change was that the organisation of the storage rooms and the editorial staff at our main archaeology journal (*Dacia*) has been completed. On the other hand, for all the efforts of the new management to show a non-partisan attitude towards the parties in conflict, the dominant generation, uninhibited in expressing its positions, has directly or indirectly opposed the assertion of undesirable ideas and persons within the public space of the institute (achieved by displaying unjustified verbal aggression towards the unwanted speaker). As a result, we find ourselves increasingly trying to abstain from the common activities of the institute: we have the feeling that if things continue as they are now, the institute will dissolve of its own accord – and not at the behest of any foreign body, such as the European Union, as we have been told for years.

3. Specialist literature focuses on the idea that various forms of power create various forms of knowledge in order to fulfil their needs. In my opinion, this case study demonstrates how the power exerted by the Romanian Communist Party, and prolonged for 16 years after its disappearance through the habitus of the generations it disciplined, has reduced the level of knowledge to the point of destruction and, as a result, is pushing the institutions responsible for generating knowledge to the brink of self-dissolution.

<sup>113</sup> S. Oanţă-Marghitu and Al. Dragoman drew my attention to this text. Translation by Samuel W. F. Onn and Cristina Mateescu.

## ANNEX 1

**THE DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL MUSEUM OF ANTIQUITIES (MNA) /  
THE INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY IN BUCHAREST (IAB)**

Director	Time in office	Age	Specialist field
Grigore Tocilescu	1881 – 1909	31 – 49	historian, archaeologist, epigraphist, folklorist
George Murnu	1909 – 1910	41 - 42	philologist, historian
Vasile Pârvan:	1910 – 1927	28 – 45	historian, archaeologist
Ion Andrieșescu	1927 – 1935	39 - 47	archaeologist
Vladimir Dumitrescu	1935 – 1938; 1940 – 1945	33 – 36; 38 - 43	archaeologist
Scarlat Lambrino	1938 – 1940	47 - 49	historian
Theofil Sauciu – Săveanu	1945 – 1947	61 - 63	historian
Ion Nestor	1947 – 1951	42 - 46	archaeologist
Gheorghe Ștefan	1952 – 1956	53 - 57	historian, archaeologist
Emil Condurachi	1956 – 1970	44 - 58	historian, archaeologist
Dionisie Pippidi	1971 – 1981	66 - 76	epigraphist, archaeologist
Constantin Preda	1981 – 1989	56 - 64	numismatist, archaeologist
Petre Alexandrescu	1990 – 1999	60 - 69	historian, archaeologist
Alexandru Vulpe	1999 – present	68 -	archaeologist, historian

## ANNEX 2

**NOTES ON THE DISCIPLINARY REGIME IN THE ROMANIAN ACADEMY  
AND IN UNIVERSITIES AFTER 1990**

This phenomenon is obvious throughout the Romanian Academy and universities, as described below.

**The Romanian Academy:**

1. After a long period of heated debate in the media about the Canadian gold mining project in Roșia Montană, the Romanian Academy finally held its own debate on March 4 2003 in the aula. The discussions covered the following topics in the order given: the natural environment, the historical value of the region, local geology, again the natural environment, the results of archaeological research, the advantages of preserving the archaeological site and the benefits of gold mining. In the end, a group of students and then locals opposed to the mining took to the floor. As a spectator, I was left with the impression that a lot of intelligent things had been said, but in a bizarre, illogical order.

2. Sometime in June 2004, at 6 o'clock in the evening, the conference room of the Romanian Academy hosted a discussion typical of Thracomania.<sup>114</sup> The room was too small and there were only a few chairs. Some of the audience were standing, others were outside in the corridor. The Academy member chairing the meeting did not manage to solve the problem of chairs and the space. At the end of the meeting, he insisted that no questions be asked, and no discussions be held. He argued that this was the practice at the Academy because there used to be “all sorts of people, who wouldn't have minded staying on and talking until 10” (from 7 pm, when the talks ended).

The intellectual quality of the two events is obviously very different. What they have in common is the ritualisation of discourse. At the first event, *who* was speaking was more important than *what* was said.<sup>115</sup> At the second event, it was clear that no reply would be permitted to what had been said.

<sup>114</sup> The talk was entitled “A Possible Source of Knowledge of the Dacian Language”, held by Aurora Pețan, and chaired by the supervisor of her doctoral thesis, Academy member M. Sala.

<sup>115</sup> It is clear that the topic addressed by the speakers played no role in the organisation of the “debate”. From my observations, the organising principle was taken from the internal hierarchy of the Academy: department heads

*The disciplinary use of space.* The debate on Roșia Montană took place in the Aula of the Academy. Through its architecture, the room places the audience in a position of physical inferiority to the speakers.

If someone in the audience wants to make a comment, they have to cross the room all the way to the Academy president, who, assuming he agrees to allow the comment, must then move from his or her seat over to the speaker. The latter must then return to his or her seat in the audience, out of politeness. It is only then that the person who wishes to say something at the microphone can do so (by going all the way from the president's seat to the podium and waiting for the president to return to his or her seat). The route from the audience to the podium is shorter if the person who wants to make a comment puts his or her name on a list beforehand, but this is not a spontaneous reaction to what is being said.

In other words, the aula only serves as a space for celebration and ritual, and not as a space of a proper debate (because the physical distance between the speaker and the audience is so large and arranged vertically in such a way that any reply is delayed excessively or becomes unimportant due to the time it takes to get to the microphone), or, if the speaker is a good speaker and not intimidated by the situation, becomes the space for another authoritarian discourse.

The situation is quite the opposite in the council room, which is used to hold talks: it is too small and has fewer chairs than it can accommodate. The distance between the speaker and the audience, both horizontally and vertically, is appropriate for discussion. "Academy practice", however, does not allow any discussion once the presentation is over!<sup>116</sup> In this case, the absence of any disciplinary space has been made up for by means of an internal regulation.

3. The activity of the Academy's institutes is evaluated according to a system which is said to measure the completion of the "projects as shown by publications." Books are rated higher than articles, and any works published abroad are rated higher than those published by Romanian publishers or journals. (There are also some other criteria which I will not talk about in this paper). Activity reports are submitted by the institutes by December 1 of the year for which they are valid.

*Published* works that appear in the report are mainly the result of one year before last year's activity (sometimes even earlier years'). The main purpose of an evaluation is to regulate the activity under evaluation. As it is conceived, the evaluation of the institutes has no regulatory value because it includes activities that took place before the year that is ending and for which the evaluation is being performed. Even if the management of an institute were to take steps to fulfil the criteria for a favourable evaluation for the current year, this would only enhance the arrhythmia: projects would have to be interrupted for the sake of other projects which are smaller but publishable in a short time.

As for the criterion concerning the place of publication, this only serves to avoid the thorny issue of the *qualitative evaluation* of scientific production. Establishing a hierarchy of publications based on the criterion of "better abroad than in Romania" has at least two serious flaws: 1. It does not take into account the importance of the publisher in question (e.g. a book that appeared in 2003 in Chișinău automatically received more points than any book brought out by the Academy's Publishing House); 2. It discourages publication in Romanian journals that have foreign circulation and therefore jeopardises their existence as well as that of Romanian libraries, all of which rely on exchanges to replenish their stock (the money for new acquisitions ran out decades ago).

The sheer quantity of published works reintroduces – through the back door – "the philosophy of tonnes per capita" (Bauman, 1992: 171).

---

who were also full Academy members (possibly in order of age, first from Bucharest and then from Cluj), department heads who are only corresponding members of the Academy, the directors of the two archaeology institutes involved in archaeological excavations. The lack of structure around the *topic* to be addressed – which was known beforehand since the speakers had been asked to present the opinion of the departments they represented – left the impression of a strictly formal and rigorously ritualized recital.

<sup>116</sup> In a conversation with the IAB director, the following day after the presentation, the president of the Romanian Academy Eugen Simion said that the person who chaired the meeting – who was not there – should have allowed the audience to discuss what had been said by the lecturer. I do not believe, however, that this incident will put an end to the "Academy practice".

### The universities:

This paper does not aim to analyse the disciplinary regime in universities – that is a task for those who know it better than me. Still, one does not have to be involved in the university world to see how it is dominated by a disciplinary regime. The number of publications – especially books – required before gaining access to the higher levels of the university hierarchy has increased in recent years, as have the chances of those who are more interested in their careers than their profession itself. There is no mechanism in place to keep at bay the occurrence of unreliability, opportunism or, simply the “rational approach” to the situation (in the case of those who, after writing a few good works, have produced some more simply in order to reach the number required by the rectorates or the Higher Diploma Commission). Promotion is not based on content: this is assumed to be of the requisite standard, as was the case with the ASSP and research projects before 1990. Such “books” are the *published, public* proof of the victory of the disciplinary regime. It is clear that any person promoted in this way will – once at the top of the pyramid – fight against the development of any critical spirit. The circle has closed, then, and obedience (“loyalty”) will survive for a long time in a full “democratic” political regime. This is well illustrated by the response to student criticism, which, where not actually punished, is ignored (though not that which can be put to good effect against adversaries, competitors or the less agreeable). An even more relevant example of the success of the disciplinary regime is given by the growing level of teacher absenteeism (another apparent indicator of “too much freedom”). Absence from the work place is far easier for the local power to notice than is the quality of printed works or that of classes and seminars. The phenomenon continues, however, because the logic of the system backs it up: so long as the members of a hierarchy remain within the limits imposed by the local power – i.e. they respect the rule of obedience – it is not important what they produce or, for all intents and purposes, whether they produce anything at all.

Furthermore, the fact that no Romanian universities offer any specialist education in archaeology demonstrates their lack of concern for the very purpose of their existence: preparing students for the employment market. The increase in various types of building activity – e.g. housing, office buildings, roads – is constantly boosting the demand for archaeologists, and entry into the European Union will consolidate this trend. In these circumstances, it is to be expected in the not too distant future that our preventive excavations will be conducted by foreign archaeologists, while Romanian higher education graduates who are not adequately trained for the local labour market will have to go abroad to pick strawberries.

(Translation by Samuel W. F. Onn, B. Sc., and Cristina Mateescu, B. A., M. A.; final proofreading by the author).

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- \*\*\* 2001 - *Istoria României*, vol. 1–4, Bucureşti: Editura Enciclopedică.
- Alexandrescu 1993 – Petre Alexandrescu, “Muzeul Naţional de Antichităţi – Institutul de Arheologie. 65 de ani după Vasile Pârvan”, *SCIVA* 44 (1), p. 5–8.
- Alexandrescu *et al.*, 2004 – Emilian Alexandrescu, Sanda Bălescu, Alain Tuffreau, “Nouvelles données chronologiques, technologiques et typologiques sur le Paléolithique supérieur ancien de la Plaine Roumaine du Danube: le gisement de Giurgiu-Malu Roşu”, *L’Anthropologie* 108 (3–4), p. 407–424.
- Anghelinu 2003 – Mircea Anghelinu, *Evoluţia gândirii teoretice în arheologia din România. Concepte şi modele aplicate în preistorie*, Târgovişte: Cetatea de Scaun.
- Arnold 1999 - Bettina Arnold, “Drinking and Feast: Alcohol and the Legitimation of Power in Celtic Europe”, *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 9 (1), p. 71–93.
- Babeş 1974 – Mircea Babeş, “Puncte de vedere relative la o istorie a Daciei preromane”, *SCIVA* 25 (2), p. 217–244.
- Babeş 1982 – Mircea Babeş, Book review of Dumitru Berciu, *Buridava dacică*, Bucureşti 1981, *SCIVA* 33 (2), p. 250–257.
- Babeş 1993 – Mircea Babeş, *Die Poieneşti-Lukaševka-Kultur. Ein Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte im Raum östlich der Karpaten in den letzten Jahrhunderten vor Christi Geburt*, Saarbrücker Beiträge zur Alterkunde, Band 30, Bonn: Dr. Rudolf Habelt GMBH.
- Babeş 1999 – Mircea Babeş, “Cinci decenii în slujba arheologiei româneşti”, *SCIVA* 50 (1-2), p. 5–9.

- Bâlici, Apostol 2001-2003 – Ștefan Bâlici, Virgil Apostol, “Observații privind protecția și conservarea monumentelor arheologice în România”, *Revista monumentelor istorice*, 52 (1), 2001 – 2003 (2003), p. 109–117.
- Barrett 2001 - John C. Barrett, “Agency, the Duality of Structure, and the Problem of the Archaeological Record”, in I. Hodder (ed.), *Archaeological Theory Today*, Cambridge (UK), Oxford (UK), Malden/MA (USA), p. 141-164.
- Bauman 1992 - Zygmunt Bauman, *Intimations of Postmodernity*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Bauman 2002 – Zygmunt Bauman, *Society under Siege*. Cambridge (UK): Polity; Malden/MA (USA): Blackwell.
- Beck 1992 – Ulrich Beck, *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*, London, Newbury Park/CA: Sage Publications.
- Besançon 1992 – Alain Besançon, *Anatomia unui spectru. Economia politică a socialismului real*, translated by Mona Antohi and Sorin Antohi, București: Humanitas (after *Anatomie d'un spectre. L'économie politique du socialisme réel*, Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1981).
- Biehl *et al.* (eds) 2002 – Peter F. Biehl, Alexander Gramsch, Arkadiusz Marciniak (eds), *Archäologien Europas. Geschichte, Methoden und Theorien/Archaeologies of Europe. History, Methods and Theories*. Münster, New York, München, Berlin: Waxmann.
- Binford 1962 - Lewis R. Binford, “Archaeology as Anthropology”, *American Antiquity* 28 (2), 1962, p. 217-225.
- Binford 1983 – Lewis R. Binford, *In the Pursuit of the Past. Decoding the Archaeological Record*, New York/NY: Thames and Hudson.
- Bonsall *et al.* 2002 – C. Bonsall, M. G. Macklin, D. E. Anderson, R. W. Payton, “Climate change and the adoption of agriculture in north-west Europe”, *European Journal of Archaeology* 5 (1), p. 9–23.
- Bourdieu 1979 – Pierre Bourdieu, *La distinction. Critique sociale du jugement*, Paris: Les Éditions de Minuits.
- Bourdieu 1980 – Pierre Bourdieu, *Le sens pratique*, Paris: Les Éditions de Minuits.
- Bourdieu 1984 – Pierre Bourdieu, *Questions de sociologie*, Paris: Les Éditions de Minuits.
- Bourdieu 1998 – Pierre Bourdieu, *La domination masculine*, Paris: Éditions du Seuil 1998.
- Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992 – Pierre Bourdieu avec Loïc J. D. Wacquant, *Réponses*, Paris: Édition du Seuil.
- Chicideanu 1986 – Ion Chicideanu, “Die frühthakishche Kultur. Zur Bronzezeit in südwest Rumänien”, *Dacia NS* 30, 1986, p. 7–47.
- Childe 1956 – V. Gordon Childe, *Piecing Together the Past. The Interpretation of Archaeological Data*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Clarke 1973 – David Clarke, “Archaeology: the loss of innocence”, *Antiquity* 47, p. 6–18.
- Cormack 1971 – R. M. Cormack, “A review of Classification”, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, A*, 134, p. 321–353.
- Curta 2001 – Florin Curta, “Pots, Slaves and ‘imagined communities’. Slavic archaeologies and the history of the early Slavs”, *European Journal of Archaeology* 4 (3), p. 367–384.
- Daicoviciu 1972 – Hadrian Daicoviciu, *Dacia de la Burebista la cucerirea romană*, Cluj: Dacia.
- Diaconu 2000 – Petre Diaconu, “Cui aparține cultura Ciurel?”, *Istros* 10, p. 491–493.
- Earle 2002 – Timothy Earle, *Bronze Age Economics. The Beginnings of Political Economies*, Boulder and Oxford: Westview.
- Feyerabend 1987 – Paul Feyerabend, *Farewell to Reason*, London, New York: Verso.
- Foucault 1975 – Michel Foucault, *Surveiller et punir. Naissance de la prison*, Paris: Gallimard.
- Geertz 1973 – Clifford Geertz, “The interpretation of cultures”, C. Geertz, *The interpretation of cultures. Selected essays*, New York: Basic Books: p. 3–30.
- Gero, Conkey 1991 - Joan M. Gero and Margaret W. Conkey (eds) – *Engendering Archaeology. Women in Prehistory*, Oxford (UK) and Cambridge/MA (USA): Basil Blackwell.
- Gheorghiu, Schuster 2002 – Dragoș Gheorghiu, Christian F. Schuster, “The avatars of a paradigm: a short history of Romanian archaeology”, in P. F. Biehl *et al.* (eds), *Archäologien Europas/ Archaeologies of Europe*, Münster, New York, München, Berlin: Waxmann, p. 289–302.
- Harding 2000 – Anthony F. Harding, *European societies in the Bronze Age*, Cambridge (UK); New York (USA): Cambridge University Press.
- Harhoiu, Gora 2000 – Radu Harhoiu, Daniel Gora, *Aurul migrațiilor. Piese de podoabă și de port din secolul al V-lea din Muzeul de Istorie Națională a României*, București: Editura Enciclopedică.
- Härke 1991 – Heinrich Härke, “All quiet on the Western Front? Paradigms, methods and approaches in West German archaeology”, in I. Hodder (ed.), *Archaeological Theory in Europe*. London: Routledge, p. 187–222.
- Harris 1989 – Edward C. Harris, *Principles of archaeological stratigraphy*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., London, San Diego, New York, Berkley, Boston, Sydney, Tokyo, Toronto: Academic Press. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers [1<sup>st</sup> ed. 1979].
- Heintz 2005 – Monica Heintz, *Etica muncii la românii de azi*, București: Curtea veche, Series Actual.
- Hodder (ed.) 1978 – Ian Hodder, *The Spatial Organisation of Culture*, London: Duckworth.
- Hodder (ed.) 1991a – Ian Hodder, *Archaeological Theory in Europe*, London: Routledge.
- Hodder 1991b – Ian Hodder, “Archaeological theory in contemporary European societies: the emergence of competing traditions”, in I. Hodder (ed.), *Archaeological Theory in Europe*, London: Routledge, p. 1–24.

- Hodder 2000 – Ian Hodder (ed.), *Archaeological Theory Today*, Cambridge, Oxford (UK); Malden/MA (USA): Polity Press.
- Jones 1997 – Siân Jones, *The Archaeology of Ethnicity. Construction of identities in the past and present*, London & New York: Routledge.
- Kacsó 2004 – Carol Kacsó, *Mărturii arheologice*, Muzeul Județean Maramureș, Seria “Colecții muzeale” 1, Baia Mare: Nereamia Napocae.
- LaMotta, Schiffer 2001 – Vincent M. LaMotta, Michael Brian Schiffer, “Behavioral Archaeology: Towards a New Synthesis”, in I. Hodder (ed.), *Archaeological Theory Today*, Cambridge, Oxford (UK); Malden/MA (USA): Polity Press, p. 14–64.
- Lemonnier 1989 – Pierre Lemonnier, “Bark capes, arrowheads and Concorde: on social representations of technology”, in I. Hodder (ed.), *The Meanings of Things. Material culture and symbolic expression*, London, Boston, Sydney, Wellington: Unwin Hyman, p. 156–171.
- Leonard 2001 – Robert D. Leonard, “Evolutionary Archaeology”, in I. Hodder (ed.), *Archaeological Theory Today*, Cambridge, Oxford (UK); Malden/MA (USA): Polity Press, p. 65–98.
- Leone *et al.* 1995 – Mark Leone, Paul R. Mullins, Marian C. Creveling, Laurence Hurst, Barbara Jackson–Nash, Lynn D. Jones, Hannah Jopling Kaiser, George C. Logan, Mark S. Warner, “Can an African–American historical archaeology be an alternative voice?”, in I. Hodder, M. Shanks, A. Alexandri, V. Buchli, J. Carman, J. Last and G. Lucas (eds), *Interpreting Archaeology. Finding meaning in the past*. London and New York: Routledge 1995, p. 111–124.
- Mantu 1995 – Cornelia–Magda Mantu, “Câteva considerații privind cronologia absolută a neo-eneliticului din România”, *SCIVA* 46 (3–4), p. 213–235.
- Meskell 1999 – Lynn Meskell, *Archaeologies of social life: age, sex, class et cetera in ancient Egypt*, Malden/MA (USA), Oxford (UK): Blackwell Publishers.
- Moore 1995 – Henrietta Moore, “The problems of origins. Poststructuralism and beyond”, in I. Hodder, M. Shanks, A. Alexandri, V. Buchli, J. Carman, J. Last and G. Lucas (eds), *Interpreting Archaeology. Finding meaning in the past*. London and New York: Routledge 1995, p. 51–53.
- Nestor, Vulpe 1971 – Ion Nestor, Alexandru Vulpe – “Metode noi în arheologie”, in *Metode noi și probleme de perspectivă ale cercetării științifice*, București: Ed. Academiei RSR, p. 131–136.
- Niculescu 2000 – Gheorghe Alexandru Niculescu, “The Material Dimension of Ethnicity”, *New Europe College Yearbook 1997–1998*, București, p. 201–262.
- Niculescu 2001 – Gheorghe Alexandru Niculescu, “Nationalism and the representation of society in Romanian archaeology”, in *Nation and national ideology. Past, present and prospects. Proceedings of the international symposium held at the New Europe College, Bucharest, April 6–7*, București, p. 209–234.
- Niculescu 2004 – Gheorghe Alexandru Niculescu, “Material culture, tradition and collective identities”, *New Europe College Yearbook 2000–2001, 2001–2002*, București, p. 285–308.
- Niculescu 2004–2005 – Gheorghe Alexandru Niculescu, “Archaeology, nationalism and the ‘History of the Romanians’ (2001)”, *Dacia NS* 48–49, p. 99–124.
- Olariu *et al.* 2002 – A. Olariu, R. Hellborg, K. Stenström, G. Skog, M. Faarinen, P. Persson, E. Erlandsson, I. V. Popescu, E. Alexandrescu, “Analysis of a fossil bone from the archaeological settlement Malu Roșu, Romania by accelerator mass spectrometry”, *Journal of Radioanalytical Nuclear Chemistry* 253 (2), p. 307–311.
- Oprîș 2004 – Ioan Oprîș, *Istoricii și Securitatea*, București: Editura Enciclopedică.
- Palincaș 1996 – Nona Palincaș, “Valorificarea arheologică a probelor <sup>14</sup>C din fortificația aparținând Bronzului târziu de la Popești (jud. Giurgiu)”, *SCIVA* 47 (3), p. 239–288.
- Palincaș 2003 – Nona Palincaș, “Asupra cauzelor nerestructurării cercetării în arheologia din România”, in *Abstracts book of the talks delivered at the roundtable “Perspective ale interdisciplinarității în arheologia românească”, Târgoviște, May 23–24 2003*, organized by the Faculty of Humanities of the Valahia University in Târgoviște and the National History Museum of Romania, p. 28–30.
- Palincaș 2004–2005 – Nona Palincaș, “Zur chronologischen Stellung der kannelierten (Vor-Basarabi-) Keramik von Popești”, *Dacia NS* 48–49, p. 55–64.
- Palincaș 2005 – Nona Palincaș, “On classification in archaeology”, *New Europe College Yearbook 2001–2002 (2005)*, p. 219–248.
- Papacostea 2002 – Șerban Papacostea, “O nouă sinteză de istorie românească: metodă și probitate”, *Revista* 22, an XIII (626), nr. 10 (5–11 martie).
- Păunescu 1984 – Alexandru Păunescu, “Cronologia paleoliticului și mezoliticului din România în contextul paleoliticului central-est și sud-european”, *SCIVA* 35 (3), p. 235–265.
- Păunescu 1993 – Alexandru Păunescu, *Ripiceni–Izvor. Paleolitic și mezolitic. Studiu monografic*, București: Editura Academiei Române.

- Păunescu 2003 – Alexandru Păunescu, *Din istoria arheologiei românești pe baza unor documente de arhivă*, București: Editura AGIR.
- Păunescu, Alexandrescu 1997 – Alexandru Păunescu, Emilian Alexandrescu, “Săpăturile arheologice de la Giurgiu-Malu Roșu. Campaniile 1992-1996”, *Cultură și civilizație la Dunărea de Jos* 15, p. 13–59.
- Pels, Hetherington, Vandenberghe 2002 – Dick Pels, Kevin Hetherington, Frédéric Vandenberghe, “The Status of the Object. Performances, Mediations, and Techniques”, *Theory, Culture and Society* 19 (5–6), p. 1–21.
- Redman *et al.* 2002 – J. E. Redman, M. I. Stewart, A. M. Gernaey, “Ancient tuberculosis and lipid chemistry: odd bedfellows?”, *European Journal of Archaeology* 5/1, p. 112–120.
- Schiffer 1988 – Michael Brian Schiffer, “The structure of archaeological theory”, *American Antiquity* 53 (3), 1988, p. 461–485.
- Schuster, Popa 2000 – Chr. F. Schuster, Traian Popa, *Mogoșești. Studiu monografic*, Bibliotheca Musei Giurgiuvensis. Seria Monografii 1; Giurgiu.
- Schuster *et al.* 2001 – Christian F. Schuster, Alexandra Comșa, Traian Popa, *The Archaeology of Fire in the Bronze Age of Romania*, Giurgiu: Vavila Edinf SRL.
- Shanks, Tilley 1987 – Michael Shanks, Christopher Tilley, *Re-Constructing Archaeology. Theory and Practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shanks, Hodder 1995 – Michael Shanks, Ian Hodder, “Processual, postprocessual and interpretive archaeologies”, in I. Hodder, M. Shanks, A. Alexandri, V. Buchli, J. Carman, J. Last and G. Lucas (eds), *Interpreting Archaeology. Finding meaning in the past*, London, New York: Routledge 1995, p. 3–29.
- Sommer 2002 – Ulrike Sommer, “Deutscher Sonderweg oder gehemmte Entwicklung? Einige Bemerkungen zu momentanen Entwicklungen der deutschen Archäologie”, in Biehl *et al.* (eds), *Archäologien Europas/ Archaeologies of Europe*, Münster, New York, München, Berlin: Waxmann, p. 185–196.
- Spânu 1999 – Daniel Spânu, Book review of Aurel Rustoiu, *Fibule din Dacia preromană (sec. II î.e.n. – I e.n.)*, Bibliotheca Thracologica XXII, București 1997, SCIVA 50 (1–2), p. 85–95.
- Suceveanu 1982 – Alexandru Suceveanu, “Contribuții la studiul ceramicii romano-bizantine de la Histria”, SCIVA 33 (1), p. 79–107.
- Suceveanu 2004-2005 – Alexandru Suceveanu, “170 d’années d’archéologie en Roumanie”, *Dacia NS* 48–49, 2004–2005, p. 11–18.
- Thomas 1996 – Julian Thomas, *Time, Culture and Identity. An interpretive archaeology*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Thomas 2004 – Julian Thomas, *Archaeology and Modernity*, London, New York: Routledge.
- Thörn 2002 – Raimond Thörn, Book review of Chr. F. Schuster, Alexandra Comșa, Traian Popa, *The Archaeology of Fire in the Bronze Age of Romania*, *European Journal of Archaeology* 5 (3), p. 377–378.
- VanPool & VanPool 1999 – Christine VanPool, Todd VanPool, “The scientific nature of postprocessualism”, *American Antiquity* 64 (1), p. 33–53.
- Vasiliev 1980 – Valentin Vasiliev, *Sciții agatârși pe teritoriul României*, Cluj-Napoca: Editura Dacia.
- Verdery 1991 – Katherine Verdery, *National Ideology Under Socialism. Identity and Cultural Politics in Ceaușescu’s Romania*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- Verdery 1996 – Katherine Verdery, *What was socialism and what comes next?*, Princeton/NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Vulpe 1981 – Alexandru Vulpe, Book review of Valentin Vasiliev, *Sciții agatârși pe teritoriul României*, Cluj-Napoca: Editura Dacia, 1980, *Dacia NS* 25, p. 398–404.
- Vulpe 1986 – Alexandru Vulpe, “Zur Entstehung der geto-dakischen Zivilisation. Die Basarabi-Kultur”, *Dacia NS* 30, 1986, p. 49–89 and map.
- Vulpe 2004-2005 – Alexandru Vulpe, “Celebrating 170 years of archaeology in Romania”, *Dacia NS* 48–49, 2004–2005, p. 5–6.
- Wobst 1999 – Martin Wobst, “Style in Archaeology or Archaeologists in Style”, in Elisabeth S. Chilton (ed.), *Material Meanings. Critical Approaches to the Interpretation of Material Culture*, Salt Lake City: The University of Utah Press 1999, p. 118–174.