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Preface

Mining is a highly dangerous occupation, involving its workers spending many hours underground in ‘inhumane’ conditions, subject to falls of tunnels and to the invasion of gas or of water. It is work that free men rarely wanted to do and so the Pharaohs found slaves and convicts to go there. In later times, men were forced to do this, either for money or also because they had no land, no other job. Mining has virtually disappeared in Britain (and Europe) during my lifetime and the search for metals has been largely transferred to ‘developing’ countries, just as in the early days Europe was the continent to be plundered, and ‘developed’ in the process. This book, which is an account of that search, is humbly dedicated to these miners, who formed their own community, as the work of Clancy Segal and of Slaughter and Henriques has brought out. While my own trajectory led me to a different, and more comfortable, existence, my life has been much influenced by the Hunger Marches of the miners of my youth, by my serving in a regiment of Nottinghamshire miners in the war, by friends as ‘Bevin Boys’ on my return, by the work of the Tavistock Institute in the coalfields after the war, of the political activity of workers in the Fife coalfields, and by the attempts of Arthur Scargill and others to fight to keep the industry in this country.

This work was written because various scholars from abroad (including those at the Muslim College) had asked me to contribute a lecture for them and for CRASSH, the Centre for Arts and Humanities at Cambridge, so they could link their European studies with their homes in the east; but in the end I gave something different and got down to writing the book.

So it is about the development of society in Europe and the Near East from the Bronze Age on, when the urban civilisations had little or no metal and therefore had to search among other peoples and in other places. And so the situation remained in the Near East. But the fact that the book is largely about metals should not make us forget the other aspects of urban civilisation, the spread of literacy and of written religions. All these are linked together and it is a mistake completely to separate off the two spheres, as so many do, both

1 See Segal 1960 and Slaughter and Henriques 1956.
scientists and humanists. Given the frequent use in the humanities of the
dichotomy between sciences (and technology) and the arts (and communi-
cation), I must stress that I am not seeking to exclude one or the other (nor
yet the religious or the secular) but to trace the connections in a rounded
(anthropological) view.

I have not given as much attention to China and the east, nor yet to the
Americas, as I should have done, but my reason is that I began with the
question of Europe and the Near East – and that remains very much the focus.
The former did develop an Age of Metals, possibly stimulated by the Near East
but with a different history until recently. In Meso-America similarities
existed at the level of urbanisation but metallurgy as distinct from metal-
working (in gold) was little advanced before the coming of Europeans.

I am aware that arguments have gone on about the ‘diffusionist’ approach;
in an essay Wengrow writes of ‘the collapse of diffusionism’ and offers an
‘interactionist’ approach instead. Rather than drawing a line between ‘civil-
ised’ (Bronze Age) and ‘barbarian’, he himself prefers ‘interactionism’ and
would rather make a distinction between ‘archival’ and ‘sacificial’ economies,
the first associated with a complex administration, the second not. I can see
some tendencies to different uses that can be so described but nothing like a
dualism. One does not exclude the other. In looking at metals, we have almost
certainly to take a modified ‘diffusionist’ approach, which is not the answer to
every question and certainly does not exclude local invention. In the Early
Bronze Age cultures, we find ‘sacificial’ hearths although the use of metals
was present in warfare and in peace; there is nothing contradictory here.

I have concentrated upon iron as it seemed to have the most immediate
consequences for the history of long-term development. But this has meant a
certain neglect of the precious metals which have been so significant for the
exchange and booty economies, and which were often mined together with
others – not so much with iron which was usually plentiful on or near the
surface, but with copper and lead. And the search, in which I am especially
interested, often took place more for them than for those of the less valuable,
more utilitarian kind.

I have consistently used the themes ‘civilised’ and ‘barbarian’, in a technical
archaeological way. I do not wish to indicate a permanent, mental difference.
That my work on writing would immediately discount. When he came to
London, my colleague, Kum Gandah, who helped collect and translate the
later versions of the long Bagre myth of the LoDagaa, became a computer

2 Wengrow 2009.
expert and statistician as the result of his schooling. The transition was quite comprehensible and the situation entirely contextual; he (and to some extent I) could operate in both modes. The terms refer to ways of living.

So, stimulated by students from Asia, this book began as an attempt to bring closer together their work and interest in Europe and the Near East and the other countries they came from. The Bronze Age had always fascinated me as a focus for a balanced account of the east and the west, a common origin rather than the divisive versions of many recent historians. Comparative advantage was to be found in both at different times. But in exploring the early lead of China in metallurgy, paper, printing and other fields, one also wanted to account for the later achievement of Europe, both economically and intellectually (for they do intersect). This could be best done by concentrating on the fact that the Bronze Age civilisations had few indigenous metals and that those had to be searched for among the 'barbarians' at the 'periphery', a process that eventually led to their own advancement. Europe was one of those latter areas, inhabiting the 'Eurasian metallogenic zone' formed by the clashing of tectonic plates. It continued to be a source of metals for the Near East, although most trade disappeared after the decline of the Roman Empire. That was especially so when Venice took up the role of intermediary between the Levant on the one hand and the Germans and others to the north, who had specialised in iron-working since the Hallstatt period – and in copper before that. This renewal of the exchange of metals for Asian 'luxuries' led to the spectacular achievements made in Europe during the modern Iron Age, particularly in later medieval and subsequent times, eventually leading to what we know as the Industrial Revolution. That change included the achievements in the realm of knowledge, in the arts, which were now able to expand in a secular direction as the result of their release from Abrahamistic hegemony, as well as in the use of metals. Many of the prerequisites of those developments, of gunpowder and cast iron, as well as of porcelain, the compass, of silk textiles, first took place in China – as did much early science. A considerable contribution was also made by other written civilisations. But my question here is different. How did Europe itself take off after the Renaissance to produce what has been called 'capitalism'?

What especially interests me here is the role of metals not only in relation to early cultures but to the European Renaissance and to 'modernity' in general. The search for those materials entailed one for other forms of knowledge (including those about the underworld and even the other world) as well as the arts, leading up to the changes that have occurred in Europe and the contemporary world.

I start with the Bronze Age area that was so central to the beginning of civilisation in the sense of the culture of cities. It also saw the invention both
of writing and of the plough. But the river valleys where it occurred had no copper to make the bronze nor did they have other metals. These had to be sought from the dwellers in the hill country, the ‘barbarians’ who, in the course of this search for and supply of metals, changed their way of life.

Literacy was all-important in this exchange that developed, inside between the urban centres and the plough farmers, outside with the ‘barbarian’ hill tribes, in the first place as a record-keeping device. Subsequently it became a tool for more complex language use and spread in all directions as the search for metals extended further into the Mediterranean, the Eurasian plateau and into Europe, not only to the centre but also to Spain, and to the west, as well as to Greece and subsequently Rome. But that expansion was in the Iron Age, when the production of the metal largely centred on southern Germany and Austria. The collapse of the Empire in the west saw the decline of trade to the Near East, even though local iron-working continued, especially for swords and protective armour. However exchange with the east, for its spices, textiles and other ‘luxuries’ was virtually discontinued, not to be restarted in a major way until Islam, Byzantium and others took it up again in the new millennium. For in the Near East, exchange with Asia had never ceased and led to the development of a bourgeois culture that has been compared with later Italy. But the Near East was always short of metals at a time of increasing usage. Their metals came from various parts but mainly from Central Europe and the exchange of goods with the north was essential to the development of trade in Venice and other Italian towns. It was this activity that involved the birth of Renaissance culture and then to its extension to the north. The Germans had been experts in metals from the Hallstatt period and developed and transmitted that expertise. It was they who were called to Britain to modernise the mines and the whole production of metals so needed by Elizabeth in her struggle with the Spanish, who were themselves bringing precious metals across the Atlantic. The English industry, with its plentiful and available supplies of iron and coal (for coke) then took off with the help of German mining engineers and metallurgists as well as of local contributors. These resources the valleys of the Near East hardly ever had and Europe took over the industries they had developed and brought them into the modern iron age.

In this discussion, I am pursuing the theme of the alternation, which was at the same time a spiralling, in the movement of the east and west towards ‘modernisation’, which constituted another view of Eurasian history, especially to those notions expressed in works written following the Industrial Revolution, the period of hegemonic European dominance. This was a sphere in which ‘progress’ was clear, unlike others, and it is the transfer of the notion to other fields that has so often blighted the consideration of the past. This and the failure to appreciate
the common roots of the economies and cultures of Eurasia and their continuing interaction, as well as the to and fro movement in European as well as Eurasian societies, means that we need to discount much ‘essentialist’ history that assumes that ‘modernisation’ and ‘capitalism’ were inventions of Englishmen, or even Europeans, flattering to our egos as that idea has been.

In this piece I have covered a long period of time and will undoubtedly have got some things wrong, although I hope my references will usually bear me out. On few, perhaps none, of the subjects am I expert, but the expert does not always see the wood for the trees. One reason for my taking a long time-span is that historians have taken a much too restricted view of their subject and this has prevented them from going back to the commonalities which join us both to the Near and the Far East of what is essentially one continent. For this reason I would question the history cultivated in part of that region, in Europe since the eighteenth, but especially the nineteenth and twentieth centuries when the west led the way in many things. They emphasised the development of ‘capitalism’ as a new mode of production in Europe (an idea not limited to Marxism) and have therefore overlooked the commonalities of which I have spoken. Undoubtedly something happened in the west in the ‘modern’ period but this development should be seen within the context of ‘alternation’ and of the occurrence of similar activities in other parts of the world. If I have moved around chronologically, it is partly to emphasise the process of development over the long term, of the similarities in many respects of accountancy, trading and exchange, as with early eastern colonies in the western Mediterranean, of Europeans in the east, and of the foundation of the Turks in Vienna. These were structural similarities which over-ride considerations of time or place.

I have tried to take the analysis up nearly to the present day in the belief that anthropologists (and prehistorians) do not explicitly consider the relationship of what they do to the contemporary world and that historians (and sociologists) rarely look far enough back or beyond their own shores. So it is an attempt to counter those approaches from the angle of the social (and broadly human) sciences.

The general approach has some political implications in the context of contemporary life. It means that ‘capitalist’ or ‘socialist’ no longer define alternative political systems. Most economies are ‘capitalist’ in that they involve exchange, accumulation and all that that implies. All such systems are also influenced by some social considerations, although this occurs in varying degrees. So all political programmes are composite in this sense, with varying emphases in one tendency or another, in particular on equality or differentiation, both aspects of all systems.
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<tr>
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<td></td>
<td>eighteenth century</td>
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<td>1779</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>1784</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Bessemer process for making steel patented in England</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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