

Structurally then, the choice in Guiné, as probably elsewhere, appears to have been between national control without funding and a measure of loss of such control but with the prospect of research actually going ahead. What was happening in 1981 in Senegambia and Guiné was something of an oscillating balance between these alternatives. However, one background change was unidirectional. This was a change in personnel: not only has the number of nationals with professional training been increasing but also the means of reproduction of such a cadre, whether in class training in the University of Dakar or in situational apprenticeship in Bissau, has been becoming locally based. Moreover, this change in personnel is also true of expatriate involvement and in this there lies the hope of an accommodation between indigenous and foreign interests in the African past. In 1981 this was registered in a spectrum of attitudes concerning the Senegambian megaliths, depicted above, by the overseas francophone team whose project sought to bridge the requirements of international scientific practice, and local perceptions of the material heritage.

References

- Brooks, G. 1980. Kola Trade and State Building in the Upper Guinea Coast and Senegambia Between the 15th and 17th Centuries. Boston University African Studies Centre, Working Papers 38.
- Cabral, A. 1980. Unity and Struggle: Speeches and Writings. London, Heinemann.
- Charane, B. 1980. Recherches archéologiques sur la moyenne vallée du Sénégal. Thèse 3ème année. Aix-en-Provence.
- Davidson, B. 1984. Portuguese-Speaking Africa. In Crowder, M. (ed) The Cambridge History of Africa Vol. 8. London, Cambridge University Press, 785-810.
- Hodder, I. 1985. Postprocessual archaeology. Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory 8, 1-26.
- Miller, D. 1980. Archaeology and development. Current Anthropology 21, 709-726.
- Miller, D. 1982. Explanation and social theory in archaeological practice. In Renfrew, C., Rowlands, M.J. and Seagraves, B.A. (eds) Theory and Explanation in Archaeology. New York, Academic Press, 89-95.
- Nzewunwa, N. 1984. Nigeria. In Cleere, H. (ed.) Approaches to the Archaeological Heritage: A Comparative Study of World Cultural Resource Management Systems. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 101-108.
- Odak, O. 1980. Comments on 'Archaeology and development'. Current Anthropology 21, 721.
- Ray, K. n.d. An archaeological reappraisal of the Cross River monoliths. Paper presented to the 9th Pan-African Congress on Archaeology and Related Subjects held at Jos (Nigeria), 1983.
- Sinclair, P. 1984. Archaeological production in a political context. Archaeological Review from Cambridge 3(1), 77-81.

ARCHAEOLOGY, IDEOLOGY AND DEVELOPMENT: MOZAMBIKAN PERSPECTIVES

Paul J.J. Sinclair

Recent discussions amongst some archaeologists working in East Africa have centred on possible rôles for archaeology in contributing more directly to the range of current development programmes in the region and on the importance of including cultural resource management projects in overall development planning. At the TILLMIAP (The Louis Leakey Memorial Institute for African Prehistory) workshop in Nairobi in 1979, in which archaeologists from five East African countries were represented, discussion centred particularly on the potential that archaeology has for contributing a balanced perspective on the past to national education systems. Recommendations were put forward to encourage the institutions which fund archaeology in the region to consider the educational relevance of research work both for East African scientists and educational systems. It was also thought important to encourage an even-handed approach to the study of different periods of the East African past in order for archaeological research to provide more effectively material of educational relevance.

Since then, discussion has arisen (Miller 1980 and comments), placing the debate in a wider frame of reference. At the 1982 Theoretical Archaeology Group Conference in Durham (England) a considerable awareness of issues concerning the ideological content and the rôle of archaeological research in different countries was shown by the participants. In Sweden, there exist the beginnings of an active exchange between archaeologists and anthropologists. This is reflected in a recent symposium (Hjort 1983) and in discussions of the place of both disciplines in relation to the different concepts of development under consideration in the wider Swedish context (Krantz 1980).

For an archaeologist, the array of different concepts of development is quite bewildering. Following Hettne (1982), differing national strategies will be conceptualised here as the outcome of interaction between development theory, ideology and internal and external power structures. At the risk of over-simplification we shall focus primarily on examples from capitalist and non-capitalist systems. Ultimately, it should be possible to outline a framework for considering aspects of the articulation of archaeology with development theory and in turn to provide some elements which should be included within the definition of various concepts of development archaeology.¹

These issues are further elaborated in this paper in relation to Mozambican archaeology, support for which has been forthcoming from SAREC (Swedish Agency for Research Cooperation With Developing Countries) during the last four years. Particular attention will be given to the contribution of archaeology towards an historical consciousness and

a sense of national identity. The necessity of an historical perspective for understanding the complex set of factors influencing societies at the national, regional and local levels will also be mentioned. A detailed consideration of the benefits of a long-term perspective for social and agricultural planning will be the subject of future work.

Archaeology as Science: Archaeology as Ideology

One of the clearest realisations to emerge from the various conference exchanges is that of the complexity of the issues which currently govern the funding and production of archaeological knowledge in different parts of the world. This is well illustrated by the coverage given in two issues of the journal *World Archaeology* to various regional approaches to the subject (Trigger and Glover 1981). A similar range of approaches for social anthropology is provided in recent surveys (Gerholm and Hannerz 1982; Fahim and Helmer 1980). However, what remains implicit in the above archaeological surveys is the importance of the varying positions of the different regional tendencies of archaeology in relation to the complex and difficult categories of science and ideology. It is in relation to this theoretical dimension of the debate concerning the nature of archaeology that the differences and similarities between the regional variants of archaeology become most apparent.

The concept of ideology takes many forms (e.g. Larrain 1979) and when considering the practice of archaeology in relation to these, sharp differences become apparent, such as when the positivist and hermeneutic positions are compared. These depend partly on the extent to which human society is conceived as distinct from nature and also the extent to which science is held to differ from ideology. For those archaeologists influenced by positivism, one aim is to exclude ideology, here conceptualised as distorted knowledge, from scientific practice and to maintain a "quarantine" (Lindholm 1981, 61) as far as possible. For those influenced by an hermeneutic tradition, the distinction between the social and natural sciences is sharper and, in Western Europe, science itself has been viewed as part of an anti-imperialist revolutionary process. This is also encountered in various parts of the Third World.

A perspective similar to that outlined by Larrain (1979) would seem to hold promise for conceptualising some philosophical dimensions of archaeology as an historical discipline in relation to the changing sets of circumstances within which it is practiced. It would involve the recognition of human history as part of natural history and at the same time the realisation that our awareness of both is conditioned by our historical position in our own society. The lack of a sharp distinction between science and ideology on the one hand, and the rejection of the necessary equation of science with the ruling class ideology on the other, would allow the possibility of a course being steered between the Scylla of positivism and the Charybdis of historicism. In addition, an emphasis on seeing the relationship between science, ideology and archaeology in terms of an historically specific set of circumstances allows the analysis of forms of archaeological practice which are explicitly oriented to contributing to a class-based ideological framework.

A model provided by Clarke (1972, 6) of the "archaeologist at work" which views the aims and the operational procedures of the archaeologist as being determined by an interaction between the categories of philosophy, paradigms and methodology provides a useful conceptual map for this part of the discussion. Influences permeating into the discipline which result in changes in any of these categories can and do produce significant differences in the form of archaeological practice carried out in any given situation. For instance, marked differences in the logical emphasis of procedures for verification in research can be seen in projects using inductive or hypothetico-deductive procedures. In Africa, paradigm shifts similar to those in Swedish archaeology (from an interest in morphological features of artefacts to approaches which view artefacts in relation to the social context) also occur but they are in response to different stimuli. A methodological example is provided by considering the extent to which differential access to new computer and data-processing technology limits the range of possible operational models in most areas of the Third World.

If we integrate here the influence of external and internal power structures mentioned above, it is not surprising that there seems to be no universally accepted standard of archaeological 'common sense' and correspondingly no single concept of development archaeology 'suitable for export!' This, however, does not preclude striving for mutually beneficial exchanges and communication on all aspects of the discipline. Nevertheless, it should be remembered that the varying traditions of archaeological practice do indeed show idiosyncratic traits and have "individual political tinctures of varying hues" (Clarke quoted in Trigger and Glover 1981). Soviet archaeologists (e.g. Mongait 1961; Klejn 1980) have long been aware of the varying positions of archaeological practice in relation to the different class interests embedded in the economic, ideological and political levels of society but this has not resulted in a single monolithic form of Soviet archaeology. A number of different lines are current within an overall Marxist ideological framework (Klejn 1977; Bulkin *et al.* 1982).

In Western Europe the myth of an 'objective' or 'value-free' archaeology which has resulted in forms of archaeological practice which are standardised and widely distributed in former colonies is currently being undermined from several points of view (Trigger and Glover 1981). Examples of this tendency are provided by those with leanings towards the Critical Theory of Habermas, Horkheimer and the Frankfurt School, and who have extended the critique of the rôle of science in West European society to include counterposing the positivistic content of much recent archaeology with various forms of "critical discourse" (Miller 1980; Pinsky n.d.). This has led to a greater awareness of the problems of their own rôle as archaeologists by those working in the Third World but it is not clear how far such considerations are relevant to archaeologists from Third World countries, where different perceptions of the relationship between science, ideology and society occur. Here, calls for equal access to the product of even strongly positivist forms of archaeological practice are encountered. Third World archaeologists are often in the position of striving to overcome the residue of

paradigms implemented with regard to Colonial priorities and to compensate for their under-development in comparison with the methodologies and technical facilities available to their Western colleagues.

It is far from clear to what extent forms of rationality, different from European materialism and idealism, will be able to develop alternative perceptions of the past resulting in new and perhaps (from a western viewpoint) unorthodox, forms of archaeological practice. Ucko (1983) provided an interesting example of such a case where Australian Aborigines formulated an archaeological research proposal involving the following of the movements of a mythical "Dreamtime" hero. However, the growth of this along with other possible examples is greatly constrained by present macro-scale political and economic conflicts. It seems likely that these conflicts will ultimately be used, as in the case of the Aboriginal use of archaeology to bolster land claims (Murray and White 1982), to determine at least the form of archaeological expression.

Challenges to the Eurocentricity inherent in most archaeological research are developing in different parts of the world (e.g. Trigger and Glover 1981) and this is a necessary counter to decades of metropolitan dominance. The need to establish a national frame of reference in opposition to 'imperial' science in turn leads to the need to transcend the limitations of a nationalist framework. Typical research foci, such as the 'indigenous' or 'foreign' origin of particular cultural features, are often loaded with colonial prejudice or attempts to overcome such prejudice, as in the case of research into the Zimbabwe State. These issues can usefully give way to a more fruitful concern with the range of different economic, ideological and political processes which operated on the different scales from the international to the local.

As indicated above, archaeological practice can, in certain circumstances, be explicitly formulated in ideological terms. For instance it might well be difficult to understand why archaeology was practiced at all in Vietnam during the war or in Mozambique during the Rhodesian conflict unless the specific contexts of the scientific practice are taken into account -- in these situations, archaeology can be seen as one means of reaffirming cultural identity in the face of imperialist and Colonialist aggression which dehumanises its 'object' of attention. Cabral puts the issue clearly when he states "if imperialism has the vital need to practice cultural oppression then national liberation is necessarily an act of culture" (1980, 143).

In the field of the dissemination of archaeological information in schools, severe difficulties are encountered with respect to conflicts with the syllabus requirements of 'Bantu education' where the lack of large-scale support for educational programmes has limited the value of the persistent and far-sighted efforts of some archaeologists (e.g. Mason 1971; Voigt 1972). In the Bantustans on the other hand, especially in relation to the current reconstruction of the royal capital of Kwa-Zulu, archaeology is being generously funded to stimulate a form of 'nationalism' rigidly constrained within the ideological framework of Apartheid.

The direct involvement of the Smith régime in censorship of the results of archaeological research is well documented by Garlake (1973; 1982). Further ideological constraints which govern the selection of explanatory models in archaeological research in (then) Rhodesia and South Africa are considered by Hall (n.d.). The underdeveloped position of archaeology in Colonial Mozambique where little archaeological research was undertaken before 1970 on the period covering the last two millennia has been discussed by SARQ (1980). Current Mozambican work is oriented explicitly to correcting these temporal imbalances (Sinclair n.d.; Morais n.d.). A similar tendency for archaeologists to concentrate on the distant past in British Colonial Central Africa has been discussed by Derricourt (n.d.), and this was in a region which saw a significant flowering of archaeological studies. An account of the issue of bias in African archaeology as a whole is provided by Ray (n.d.).

Some examples are provided above of the ways in which colonialism has influenced the practice of archaeology. However, in a post-colonial situation, new contexts are provided in which archaeological research is to be carried out and there is a pressing need for the formulation of new research strategies. Briefly, archaeology must be de-colonised as well.

Towards a Conceptual Framework for Development Archaeology

There is no clear unitary concept of 'development archaeology'. The differing national developments lying behind or, more frequently, restricting the sources of funding for archaeology, could usefully be the target for analysis. For the Swedish case, in view of the more general involvement of social anthropology in development projects (cf. Krantz 1980), it is useful to contrast Hannerz's overview of Swedish anthropology (1982) with that of Moberg (1982) for archaeology. The articulation of theoretical archaeology with the varied conceptual frames of development thinking is a complex task which has only just begun.

Differences between development strategies which attempt to reproduce capitalist relations of production in the Third World and those which attempt to support economic and cultural disassociation from the capitalist system directly influence the context in which archaeological research is carried out. On the one hand, forms of archaeological practice based on neo-colonial dualistic conceptions of the 'traditional' and 'modern' society can often result in a preservationist and an academically exclusionist attitude to the remnants of 'traditional' society. On the other hand, the focus on the 'traditional' can also lead to biases emerging against the 'modern'. This differs markedly from a programme of research which seeks to recover and present archaeological data in a form relevant to the widespread extension of an historical consciousness as part of a non-capitalist development strategy. For the latter case, archaeology can be seen as a process of selection, recovery, analysis and dissemination of historical data on the basis of an historically specific class analysis of society. The contrast with the metropolitan, and by extension the colonial, and neo-colonial position of archaeology as an isolated academic discipline is clear.

This distinction should not, however, be taken as indicating the existence of a simple formula for the practice of archaeology as part of a non-capitalist development strategy. On the contrary, the mosaic of class interests and different historical experiences present a complex series of foci for archaeological research.

Notwithstanding the almost universal overall bias of colonial scholarship in the social sciences towards colonial matters, it is important not to discard this period as a potentially interesting area of archaeological research, particularly when questions of developing area historical consciousness are considered. Useful examples from such disparate sources as Cuba (Wurbspers. comm.) and the USA (Leone n.d.) support this and in Mozambique the same realisation has been incorporated in official policy:

...it is important therefore to preserve as a symbol of the tenacity and determination of our people and as a memory of their humiliation and foreign domination, all historical remains referring both to the creativity and struggle of the Mozambican people as well as the colonial presence in Mozambique. (Resolution of the Popular Assembly. Noticias 28 April 1979).

The rôle that archaeology has to play in any development process is far from easy to establish and new ideas and different approaches to the study and dissemination of the past have to be tried, discarded and tried again. In view of the lack of material resources and trained personnel, it is often difficult to strike a balance between research and training on the one hand and curatorial and rescue work on the other. All of these aspects, including the financial, have to be conceptualised within a long-term perspective as one interlocking system.

The true importance of cultural resource management strategies is only realised in relation to a coherently planned research programme which, when oriented at the educational needs of the population, provides the rescue programmes with the necessary set of priorities. Differing attitudes to the formulation of programmes for the management of cultural resources reflect clearly the varying ideological contexts in which archaeology is carried out. No programme on a national level has been implemented yet in southern Africa although attempts at this are currently being made in Mozambique. Decisions concerning the relative balance between the different components of archaeological practice on a number of different levels (international, national, regional and local) have to be taken and these will materially effect the form in which archaeological knowledge is produced. In each case the methods required to maintain the links between the different levels of activity are usually prohibitively expensive in Third World countries.

Appeals for committed participation which seek to create cultural appreciation amongst people on the basis of self-sufficiency, although laudable in themselves, are insufficient if they do not acknowledge the relationship with the rest of society. More useful examples of this form of "horizontal thinking" are given by Biro (1982). Once again, the

overall ideological and political context is crucial and there seems to be no escaping the consequences. It is likely that the 'committed researchers' identifying with the needs of the people (which group or class?) in a neo-colonial context find themselves, even indirectly, to be part of the process of providing the cultural context for extending the implementation of capitalist relations of production in the rural areas. On the other hand, in a peoples' democracy, the 'committed researcher' will be involved in socialist construction and the practical implementation of the worker-peasant alliance.

Recognition must be made of the point that the perceived impact of the research can easily be different from the intentions of the researcher. Furthermore, it should be borne in mind that the phenomena under study on the micro scale may be localised expressions of larger scale processes. Similar factors affect the process of objectification of research. Publications which coherently present the results of an academic foray on the international level can, and often do, appear to present the appropriation of the means of production of the historical knowledge on national and local levels. On the other hand, pedagogical projects designed to present results in a way meaningful to local residents can often merely reproduce an alienated form of appreciation, of objects torn from their social context. While committed participation and two-way communication in themselves are insufficient, without them both there is little hope of success.

The Experience at Manyikeni

Some examples from our experience in Mozambique will be used in order to illustrate some of the above points. In 1974, during late colonial times, Mozambican archaeologists have begun a process of re-thinking and redefining the course of archaeological research in the country. This is seen as a priority and involves not only the conceptual framework touched on above, but also a redefinition of the theoretical and applied concepts used in research as well as the questions tackled. It is only with a clearly and explicitly formulated national research and rescue programme that foreign research teams can be incorporated equably. A major shift in research strategy began with the completion of a rescue project which has focused on an extensive stone age sequence in southern Mozambique. It was decided to concentrate efforts on the remains of the farming communities of the last two thousand years. The Manyikeni project began in early 1975 shortly before the formal granting of independence. It was initiated with the intention of contributing to changing the focus of University research work away from an urban (and even in the case of some social sciences, a metropolitan) focus towards a form of research which was more relevant to the perceived needs of Mozambican society as a whole. The Manyikeni project has replaced colonial with national priorities (Sinclair n.d.; Morais n.d.) and continues to play an important rôle in the testing out of new ideas and the implementation of new methods.

The initial two years of research produced important results (Barker 1980 inter alia) from field teams comprising small, highly-

trained technical units supported by local residents working collectively. However, in 1977 we were emphatically reminded in a local residents' meeting that "during the visit of the University for two years we have participated in voluntary work to clear a new road and also taking grass from the site but with little to show for it". It was clear that changes in approach were urgently needed. The looming Rhodesian conflict and the accompanying military incursions and the infiltration of armed bandits posed new questions about the commitment and the correct orientation of the project and its meaning within a local frame of reference. A lengthy period of individual contacts between the University team and the residents culminated in four days of public debate about the approach which should be taken. More than 80 people actively participated in the debate including representatives from all the surrounding communities.

Finally, a joint approach which entailed the voluntary contribution of one day's work by between 20 and 25 men and women from each of the surrounding communities was mutually agreed upon. People in some cases walked more than 35 kms to participate in the work. The members of the University team undertook to provide a daily introductory tour and explanation of the historical and cultural significance of the site (a Zimbabwe stone wall enclosure) and to integrate workers more into technical aspects of the project. The participation of local residents under supervision in excavations was encouraged. There followed two seasons of excavations and more than 400 people participated in the work and in educational tours.

The significance of archaeological work on the extension of the Zimbabwe culture to Mozambique was not lost on the media. The programme became a very successful reaffirmation of the importance of cultural work for helping to create a Mozambican national identity and also for contributing to the struggle against the forms of cultural oppression and censorship then practiced in Rhodesia.

In addition, the first open air museum in the country, with seven education points around the site selected by experience with the daily tours, was built entirely from locally available materials and decorated by Mozambican artists. Finance for this was provided by the Mozambican Government and SAREC. A guide who had participated in the four years of excavations and spoke all the languages of the area was trained as the resident worker at the site. Until the recent escalation of armed incursions into the area, workers from Inhambane, more than 250 kms away, came to the site in organised tours.

Experience gained from Manyikeni is currently being absorbed into the various levels of formulating an archaeological programme which will contribute to the formulation of an historical consciousness as part of a non-capitalist development strategy. It remains however to be seen to what extent the degree of public involvement achieved at the local level can be maintained at the regional and national levels in the face of greater specialisation and technological sophistication of institutionalised forms of archaeological practice. In addition to the field

programme, considerable effort has been put into deriving an historical materialist theoretical and methodological framework suitable for the definition of research questions and the carrying out of analytical work. This has involved a reassessment of previous archaeological work done in the region (Sinclair et al. n.d.) and the formulation of new questions of research (SARQ 1980; Sinclair n.d.; Morais n.d.).

Further redefinition of regional and national programmes has been carried out and a new Department of Archaeology and Anthropology established at Eduardo Mondlane University. Since 1978, the project has received generous support from SAREC on the basis of a Mozambican definition of research priorities. This support has also allowed the participation of personnel from the Riksanstikvarieambetet and other Swedish institutions, again at the request of the Mozambican authorities and working for a series of goals defined by the Mozambicans themselves. Interestingly, these include the building-up of a long-term perspective on the farming communities of the last two thousand years to provide educational material and data of direct utility for the planning and implementation of current agricultural projects.

Conclusion

The ideas presented in this paper are the product of collective discussions and experiences. They comprise a first attempt at formulating a framework within which to undertake archaeological research as part of a non-capitalist development strategy. Much more could be said about methodological and technical options which best suit such an approach and these will be the subject of future work though theoretical issues are dealt with in the sources cited in the text.

Two major issues are worth re-emphasising. The first is the importance of a national definition of the priorities for archaeological research and rescue work within an educational framework. The second is the important distinction at all levels from the international to the local between contributing to, and appropriating from, the means of producing historical knowledge. If a common rationality of archaeological research is to be acceptable in the different parts of the world and archaeology is to integrate the best possible interpretive machinery from all the different schools within a single coherent discipline (Clarke 1979, 102), then it will only occur on the basis of archaeological research as part of a mutually beneficial cultural and scientific interchange rather than as one of the ideological expressions of the reproduction of relations of dominance.

Acknowledgements

Sincere acknowledgement is made to discussions with Prof. K.E. Knutson and P.A. Stroberg at an early stage of the project and to colleagues in Mozambique for collective work and discussion. In particular, I thank J. Morais, T. Cruz e Silva, A.L. Forte, L. Adamowicz, C. Jaffery and B. Bingham. In Uppsala, A. Hjort, J. Oveson and B. Hellander kindly read and commented on the text. This work was done as part of a

SAREC-sponsored project: "Strengthen the development rôle of archaeology in Mozambique and Zimbabwe"

Note

1. A comprehensive survey of development theory is provided by Hettne (1982). For the Swedish case, the SIDA (Swedish International Development Authority) position is presented in a mimeographed report (SIDA n.d.) and the ideological, political and economic contexts of the aid programmes and the forms of development strategies favoured have been discussed by Hermelle (1982). Other views are presented in Palmberg (1980) and in a SAREC compendium (1982).

References

- Barker, G. 1980. Economic Models for the Manekweni Zimbabwe and Mozambique. *Azania* 13, 71-100.
- Bulkin, V.A., Klejn, L.S., and Lebedev, G.S. 1982. Attainments and problems of Soviet archaeology. *World Archaeology* 13, 272-295.
- Biro, A. 1982. The local space: a privileged instance of development. *Development Dialogue* 1, 103-13.
- Cabral, A. 1980. Unity and Struggle: Speeches and Writings. London, Heinemann.
- Clarke, D.L. 1972. Models in Archaeology. London, Methuen.
- Clarke, D.L. 1979. Analytical Archaeologist. London, Academic Press.
- Derricourt, R. n.d. Nation, race and prehistory in southern and central Africa. Paper read at the Theoretical Archaeology Group (TAG) Conference, Durham 1982.
- Fahim, H. and Helmer, K. 1980. Indigenous anthropology in northwestern countries: A further elaboration. *Current Anthropology* 21(5), 644-650.
- Gariake, P.S. 1973. Great Zimbabwe. London, Thames and Hudson.
- Gariake, P.S. 1982. Prehistory and ideology in Zimbabwe. *Africa* 52(3), 1-19.
- Gerholm, T. and Hannerz, U. 1982. The shaping of national anthropologies. *Ethnos* 47(1-2), 5-35.
- Hall, M. n.d. The burden of ethnography: models adapted to a paradigm. Paper read at the Theoretical Archaeology Group (TAG) Conference, Durham 1982.
- Hannerz, U. 1982. Twenty years of Swedish social anthropology: 1960-1980. *Ethnos* 47(1-2), 150-171.
- Hermelle, K. 1982. Sweden and the Third World: development aid and capital involvement. *Review of African Political Economy* 23 (Jan-April), 85-100.
- Hettne, B. 1982. Development theory and the Third World. SAREC Reports 2. Stockholm, SAREC.
- Hjort, A. (ed.) 1983. Samhälle och Ekosystem om Tolkningsproblem i Antropologi och Arkeologi. Stockholm.
- Klejn, L.S. 1977. Panorama of theoretical archaeology. *Current Anthropology* 18(1), 1-42.
- Klejn, L.S. 1980. On the building of a theoretical archaeology. *Current Anthropology* 21(4), 521-526.
- Krantz, L. 1980. Anthropology in Development Cooperation: a Swedish model. Stockholm, Department of Social Anthropology Development Study Unit.
- Larrain, J. 1979. The Concept of Ideology. London, Hutchinson.
- Leone, M.P. n.d. The contribution of archaeology in shaping American national identity. Paper read at the Theoretical Archaeology Group (TAG) Conference, Durham 1982.
- Lindholm, S. 1981. Paradigms, Science and Reality. Research Bulletin of the Institute of Education, Stockholm, University of Stockholm.
- Mason, R.J. 1971. Prehistoric Man at Melville Koppies, Johannesburg. Occasional Papers 6. University of the Witwatersrand, Department of Archaeology.
- Miller, D. 1980. Archaeology and development. *Current Anthropology* 21(6), 709-715.
- Moberg, C.-A. 1982. From artefacts to timetables to maps (to mankind?): regional traditions in archaeological research in Scandinavia. *World Archaeology* 13(3), 209-221.
- Mongait, A.L. 1961. Archaeology in the USSR. Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- Morais, J.M.M. n.d. Past and present: An outline of archaeology in Mozambique. *Journal of African Archaeology*. Forthcoming.
- Murray, T. and White J.P. 1982. Cambridge in the Bush?: archaeology in Australia and New Guinea. *World Archaeology* 13(3), 255-263.
- Palmberg, M. (ed). 1980. Problems of Socialist Orientation in Africa. Uppsala, Scandinavian Institute of African Studies.
- Pinsky, V. n.d. Archaeology and critique. Paper read at the Theoretical Archaeology Group (TAG) Conference, Durham 1982.
- Ray, K. n.d. Material assemblages and material culture in African archaeology. In Ray, K. (ed.) Proceedings of the 1982 Meeting of the British Africanist Archaeologist Association. Oxford, British Archaeological Reports. Forthcoming.
- SAREC. 1982. Utvecklingsstrategier Forskaseminarium 17-19 June 1982. Parts 1 and 2.
- SARQ. 1980. Arguelogia e connecimento de passado em Mozambique. Trabalhos em Arguelogia e Antropologia 1. Maputo, Seccao de Arguelogia, Trabalho-Collectivo.
- SIDA n.d. Mimeographed report on aid programmes and development theory. Stockholm, SIDA.
- Sinclair, P.J.J. n.d. Theory and praxis in Mozambican Archaeology. In Ray, K. (ed.) Proceedings of the 1982 Meeting of the British Africanist Archaeologist Association. Oxford, British Archaeology Reports. Forthcoming.
- Sinclair, P.J.J., Morais, J.M.M. and Bingham, B. n.d. Archaeology of Mozambique and Zimbabwe. Paper read at TILMIAP Workshop on Eastern and Central African Prehistory, Nairobi 1979.
- Trigger, B. and Glover, I. 1981. Editorial. *World Archaeology* 13(3), 133-137.
- Ucko, P. 1983. Australian Academic Archaeology: Aboriginal transformations of its aims and practices. *Australian Archaeology* 16, 8-11.
- Voigt, E. 1972. The extra-mural museum. *South African Museums Association Bulletin* 10(4), 162-169.