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The city of Chan Chan was the capital of the Kingdom of Chimú from 850 to 1470 (Keatinge and Day 1973; Keatinge 1974). With a society based on divinity and nobility, the Chimú ruled the entire north coast until their abrupt end through their defeat and incorporation into the kingdom of the Inca Empire. Around the year 1400 (Topic and Moseley 1983). During their time of regional rule and the subsequent influence on the Incas, the Chimú played a crucial role in the development of social complexity in the Andes (Topic 2003). The urban core of the city covered ten square kilometers (Keatinge 1974). During the Chimú Kingdom, the population of Chan Chan is estimated to have been between 20,000 and 40,000 people (Topic and Moseley 1983). Chan Chan is characterized by three main architectural types; monumental, intermediate and small irregular agglutinated rooms (SIAR) or slums (Keatinge and Day 1973; Moore 1981). Enclosed, partitioned and divided spaces suggest that the city followed a pattern of restrictions and permissions reflective in the social classes.

The city was surrounded by a fortress wall to protect from enemy and nature, but this also served as a tool to differentiate between social classes and restrict access to the inner city (Keatinge and Day 1973; Moore 1992). With its centralized architectural pattern, the city's construction

“Urban-based elites reach deep into the countryside not only as a matter of political control, but also for investment of centralized resources into infrastructure, such as canals, roads, and territorial borders”
was a physical representation of a hierarchical society with its central configuration of power. There are nine distinct compounds separated by trapezoidal walls of 6m to 9m in height, each corresponding to a King (Keatinge and Day 1973; Moore 1992; Topic 2003). The architecture of Chan Chan, with its high walls, long hallways, small doors and gates, and narrow passageways suggests that its chiefs used architecture as a means to control the flow of people. The composition of the city consisted of ciudadelas. These compounds were made up of nine rectangular units surrounded by fortified walls, composed of temples, housing, farms, cemeteries, gardens, bodegas, and water deposits. According to Jerry D. Moore, “ciudadelas make up the urban core of Chan Chan” (1992). These ciudadelas are monumental in size, and with the carefully elaborated and decorated interiors, we could assume that these structures were most likely the dwelling areas of the nobles and the higher social class. Following a rectangular architectural configuration, each unit had a narrow entrance that would give access to a long corridor, opening to other passages and covered walls and buildings, interior patios, administrative buildings, and temples (Moore 1992; Topic and Moseley 1983). Each of its palaces, most of which are deployed in the same way despite differences in size, are characterized by three types of structures: U-shaped rooms, cellars, and wells (Keatinge and Day 1973). The flow of people was controlled by the high walls of the sites, long corridors, strategically configured passages, and small entrances. The U-shaped rooms are of different sizes and are considered to be the administrative offices of the Chimu elite. A network of passageways unites the diverse ciudadelas with a ceremonial plaza, the biggest in the world at that time with a surface of 20,000km². Chan Chan’s territorial configuration was a horizontal representation of the vertical hierarchy of power in the Chimu society. This same hierarchy was used in a centralized manner where the great chief occupied the center of the city. How the city is organized shows that there was a strong stratification,
with different social classes occupying different sectors and buildings specific to their economic condition (Moore 1992). M. Rivero and J. von Tschudi were the first to observe that the differences between the large enclosures and the surrounding units of architecture suggested a stratified society (Keatinge and Day 1973). Citadels, for example, are protected by high walls and have only one access. Unlike the city of El Paraiso, with open floor plans that suggest freedom of spatial interaction, as well as socio-economic norms, Chan Chan portrays urban planning that suggests the division of spaces to accommodate the status of the different social classes (Moore 1992).

**Audiencias**

It is not hard to think of architectural structures being used as a means of controlling the masses when in modern cities we have schools, banks, and prisons. Thus, we can look at the audiencias in the ancient city of Chan Chan as ancient banks that controlled non-money valuables and consequently controlled the masses. Chan Chan followed a hierarchical social organization with the Kings at the top and the rest as subordinates. The Kings and the noble class ruled over the state and held all of the power. Accordingly, the production, the administration, the storage and the distribution of food, as well as other resources, were controlled by the state (Keatinge and Day 1973).

Audiencias are the U-shape rooms found inside the ciudadelas and elite compounds in the city. However, some were also found inside building complexes located in the hinterland of the Moche Valley, which Keatinge referred to as the Rural Administrative Center of the capital (1974). Archeologists believe these rooms were used as storage rooms by the nobles and elite to store goods and valuables. In the Archaeology of Urban Landscape, Monica L. Smith notes that the "Urban-based elites reach deep into the countryside not only as a matter of political control but also for investment of centralized resources into infrastructure, such as canals, roads, and territorial borders" (2014). Under the pretext of urban development, having the “ability to marshal large amounts of labor for field and canal construction: the elite effectively maintained its control over the two most important factors in the Chimú economy: land and water” (Keatinge and Day 1973).

The rural administrative centers outside the city are believed to have been used as distribution centers – the food and other goods were kept in the hinterlands audiencias until they were transported into the city and to be distributed amongst the Kings (Keatinge 1974). The nobles who had power over the state would then store the goods in the audiencias in the ciudadelas, to then distribute them to the commoners. It is not clear if the distribution of goods were a form of payment to the servants or if it was distributed to all the commoners as a form of welfare system.

Thinking in modern terms, the audiencias functioned as government-controlled banks. Items of high value to the Kings would be stored here to be protected from commoners, and from possible enemy attacks, the same way people today would protect those items in safes at homes and in banks. Moreover, audiencias operated in the same manner as today’s banks when administering people’s money. By administering resources and the distribution of goods of the commoners, the Kings had them under their power and were able to control them to their needs. Architecture has always been a marker of socio-economic differences, status, and class. This is particularly clear in Chan Chan’s urban fabric and the sizes of its living spaces. Social stratification has been identified in many ancient cities throughout history and we continue to see it today in most modern cities. These ancient cities perhaps served as a prototype in the formation of major cities of today, as modern cities are not that far different than our ancient ones. Today’s cities portrayed the same centralized configuration of power as Chan Chan. The main economic, administrative and governmental power are located in the center. Palaces, presidential houses, parliaments, city halls, police headquarters, among others, are all concentrated within the core of the urban space. These structures are surrounded, or protected, by the different structures of the next class, which created a form of layers that stretches from the elite spaces to the middle-class working area, to the slums on the city outskirts. The farther from the city center, the lesser the economic impact. We could say, Chan Chan, its architecture, urbanism, and management of goods and labor, laid out the base for the economy ruling cities of modern societies.
One of the most archaeologically studied ancient cities in Mesoamerica, Teotihuacan has given many scholars a wide range of information and research opportunities. Professor Michael E. Smith, the director of Arizona State University’s Teotihuacan Research Laboratory, said that “very few ancient cities are mapped to the extent Teotihuacan is” (Seckel 2018). The reason why that is, is that back in the 1950s and 1960s an archaeologist named René Millon pioneered ‘The Teotihuacan Mapping Project’ (1963). This project was done by taking aerial pictures of the grounds, making photogrammetric manuscript maps to excavate and documenting thousands of found artifacts. One of the most important findings has been living compounds or barrios (Millon 1963; Smith 2014). Teotihuacan is located in the northeastern Valley of Mexico, about 25 miles north of Mexico City (White et al. 2004). It approximately covered 20 km square (8 square miles) at the civilization’s height and had a population that is believed to have been between 100,000 and 200,000 (Millon 1963; May 2010; Stanley et al. 2016). That would have made it “the largest urban center at the time in Mesoamerica” (Mays 2010). Mysteriously the city started to decline by the 500s and by the 600s it had already collapsed (Stanley et al. 2016). Scientists and other scholars still do not have a clear explanation of why it collapsed, but there are many theories out there, including that the growth in social-economic differences could have been one of the main reasons.

Archeologically it is hard to understand social stratification in ancient cities and civilizations when written text is absent, thus making archeologists rely on other forms of observations. According to Linda R. Manzanilla, “archaeology must rely on very careful observations of how identities are expressed in material traces related to various behaviors and practices—culinary, attire, funerary, ritual, and social” (2009). One of the main indicators of differences in social classes is architecture; we can see this from the Great Pyramids in Giza to the massive elaborated buildings in Ancient Rome and the rich mansions in our modern world. Teotihuacan had approximately “2,000 residential compounds” (White et al. 2004). Each compound, which today would be alike apartment buildings, consisted of “domestic residential areas as well as shared courtyards and patios” (Smith et al. 2012), “each household had a dormitory, storeroom, kitchen, portico, service patio, as well as a ritual courtyard where ceremonies to the family patron god were celebrated” (Smith et al. 2012). There were massive solid walls around each compound with only one entrance, this is believed to have been used as external protection and safety. They are believed to have housed as many as 200 or more individuals. The compounds differ in sizes and elaborations (depending on the barrio), making archaeologists believed that those differences were because of economic reasons (Manzanilla 2009). There were elite compounds located near the center on the city and the non-elite ones were not so centrally located. However, this does not mean that there were no socio-economic differences within compound walls as well, there is evidence that points to a hierarchical organization within each compound. “As was evident in multifamily T-shaped compounds— at Oztoyahualco 15B:N6W3—a typical Teotihuacan compound…only one family revered the God of Thunder as a patron deity and had access to...
foreign raw materials and goods...in its domestic sector, it [also] had the largest ritual courtyard” (Manzanilla 2009).

For the growth of the city, Teotihuacan had to either bring immigrants or accept those who came on their own (White et al. 2004). There were urban pulls, like specialized labor, that attracted people from other regions like Oaxaca and Michoacán. This is known because of figurines and other artifacts of Michoacán style that were found at tombs and compounds in Teotihuacan, specifically at Tlajinga 33 (White et al. 2004). Since there were many people from many different places the city was multi-ethnic and multi-cultural, and that also affected the structure of social classes. There were barrios that housed the different ethnic groups creating some architectural and spatial division, which could also translate to socioeconomic differences (Manzanilla 2009; Smith et al. 2012). Although there is no concrete evidence for the collapse of the city there are theories that suggest that because of the massive inpur of immigrants with specialized jobs coming into the city and creating less of a gap between the upper and middle class, there was a shift to the social class triangle and that made the city not sustainable enough for its enormous population.

With not enough of a middle class to run the economy and a changing social stratification, the once largest urban center in Mesoamerica faced its decline and the city ended up being abandoned. Teotihuacan was a multi-ethnic city that in modern times could be thought of as New York City: a city with a high population density, thousands of multifamily housing, and a mix of races and ethnicities. The city of New York is always referred to as a ‘melting pot’ but as seen in Teotihuacan, immigrants were not melting into each other as everybody thought. In New York City immigrants from the same country or ethnic background tend to agglomerate into the same neighborhood and not a great deal of ethnic mixing is happening. For example, there is Chinatown, Little Italy, Washington Heights (a large population of Dominican immigrants reside here), Korean Town, and many more. The idea of everybody assimilating to the host culture, in this instance ‘American’ culture, and becoming one big group is not happening. Instead what is happening is an ethnogenesis – “the formation and development of an ethnic group” (merriam-webster.com), but is not just one ethnic group, is the birth of more than one “with new social identities that reflect new and shared conditions” (Taylor 2019). In many aspects New York City and Teotihuacan share similarities, including the expansion of the middle and upper class while alienating the poor.
The government and the wealthy had control over the urban food supply and with that, they controlled the masses, especially the poor and slaves. This dominant and subordinate scenario contributed to the socioeconomic inequality that was rampant in the city of Rome and later on in the empire. "In Cicero's time a moderately wealthy man had an income 714 times that of one who was poor, while the extraordinarily rich were 10,476 times better off than the poor" (S. J. Bastomsky 1990). During the expansion of Rome in the 130s and 120s B.C., a tremendous amount of wealth was coming into the city and staying in the hands of the rich. They were getting wealthier and flaunting that wealth to everyone. They threw banquets and expensive parties; one wealthy individual outdid the other by the next banquet. It was a competition of who had the most amount of money. On the other hand, the poor were getting poorer; they lost their lands and became tenants and some even penniless. The government and the ruling class also became wealthier and money was not an issue (Duncan 2017). For hundreds of years Roman rulers and emperors mishandled the economy of the city, first by implementing different types of welfare systems, that were not completely based on need; and then by implementing a system of taxation that for many years seemed to work, but then it brought the entire empire to its collapse. The population of Rome kept increasing during the republic and as the empire conquered more land; there are no concrete numbers for the entire population but historians and archaeologists estimate that it could have been anywhere between half a million to a million citizens. However, Glenn R. Stroey (1997), argues that if the population was one million, then there was a tremendously "high population density of 72,150 persons per square km." According to Augustus, the city had its biggest population ever during his time as leader; and that brought in merchants and entrepreneurs who helped the economy, but it also brought a large group of poor citizens who depended on the state to subsidize their living. It is estimated that around 123 B.C, C. Gracchus started the sale of grain at a lower price to all of the citizens, regardless of their economic needs. They were allowed to buy a fixed amount for a fixed price. Robert J. Rowland Jr. (1996) discussed that with the system of government-subsidized grain the ones who benefited were the rich and even the middle class because they had the money to buy it. And that the poor were not able to afford it even at a reduced price, "it is very clearly confirmed..."
"In Cicero's time a moderately wealthy man had an income 714 times that of one who was poor, while the extraordinarily rich were 10,476 times better off than the poor."

that the doles were not a provision for the very poor, but a perquisite of the already privileged middle classes of the cities. The subsidies of grain continued to be kept in place, and also modified, by many of the other leaders of the city and the empire. There was Saturninus, probably around 103 B.C., who is believed to have lowered the prices, even more, accommodating the poor; however, the “penniless” were still outcasted. Then, there was Lepidus in around 78 B.C. who lowered the prices even more than Saturninus, and “ingratiated himself with the populace by private largesses and by grants bestowed in the name of the government” (Rowland Jr. 1996). Later on, there was more government intervention in the distribution of grain to the citizens. It wasn’t until 58 B.C. under the ruling of Clodius, that grain started to be distributed for free. This resulted in “a sharp increase in the influx of rural poor into Rome, as well as the freeing of many slaves so that they too would qualify for the dole” (Bartlett 1994).

By the time that Julius Caesar became ruler, there were already over 300,000 people benefiting from the dole system in Rome. Yet, those numbers were high because non-Roman citizens were also taking advantage of the dole. It is believed that under Caesar the number lowered to the 100,000s and that could be because the government was more vigilant. However, this numbered grew again to the 300,000s when Augustus declared himself the first emperor of Rome and took over control. He then decided to restrict the distribution at about 5 B.C. and the numbers lowered to around 200,000. Other emperors also put restrictions on the dole, for example, only those with a ticket were able to get any grain, but the number stabilized there until the end of the empire. The dole system saw many changes under the many rulers that controlled Rome, and in the 3rd century baked bread was distributed instead of grain. There were also other staples like oil, pork, and ham added to the dole under some emperors who came after Augustus. The rulers and emperors made it a priority to keep the citizens content and at ease to make sure there were not many civil unrests. Thus, not only putting a dole system in a play but also by throwing festivities, circuses and the gladiator spectacles. All of these took a massive budget and to be able to keep up with the demand, the government just kept increasing taxes and subsequently causing inflation. During the beginning of the Roman republic, taxes were used for military purposes and only implemented on wealth based on all types of property ownership. By the time of Augustus, taxes were more lenient on farmers and the wealthy. This allowed for growth for the rich, while the poor kept getting government subsidies and not advancing. This continued for many years under different rulers; taxes were used for the construction of buildings, aqueducts, roads, and monuments, and also for the continuation of the dole system. During the ruling on Nero between 54 and 68 A.D. taxes took a different form and was imposed on cash, by the reduction of precious metal of the coins. This, of course, caused inflation and was the beginning of the end to the empire. To combat the consequences brought by the inflation of the economy the government decided to raise taxes on the wealthy and even confiscated assets. Consequently, this brought economic growth to a standstill and the wealthy class diminished immensely. Thus, making the burden of the bills of the state fall on the working class, who were
already experiencing a weakening economy. Since the economy got to its weakest point, taxes broke down, and the government started to appropriate any resources available.

Emperor Diocletian who ruled from 284 to 305 A.D. tried to have a system of reform to combat the inflation of the economy; not all of his efforts were successful, but one that worked for some time was the collection of taxes by goods and services since the money had no value. After Diocletian, Constantine (308-337 A.D.) took power and tried to continue some of the same reform systems to try and keep people in the city but people continued to leave. After, other emperors implemented other taxation systems, but under Julian (360-363 A.D.) “The wealthy effectively were able to evade taxation through legal and illegal measures, such as bribery. By contrast, the ordinary citizen was helpless against the demands of the increasingly brutal tax collectors” (Bartlett 1994). Social inequality continued and the poor kept getting poorer, the ease of tax burden was diminished only on the wealthy.

After all of the reforms to try and reverse inflation and reduced the burden of taxation, the government failed to fix the economic issues. There was no more money to maintain the army or build forts, which left the city with no protection against invaders.

In the end, Ancient Rome met what Colin David Butler (2002) referred to as “carrying capacity: the maximum population at a given level of environmental consumption, supportable by a given area for a given time,” not only in the city itself but also in all of their conquered lands. “Environmental scarcity also contributed to civilization failure in Ancient Rome [since it] was dependent on North Africa for much of its grain” (Butler 2002).

It is hard not to wonder if the city of Ancient Rome could have survived its collapse if the government was more cautious with their welfare or dole system. If they were less afraid of revolt and helped citizens become self-sufficient instead of subsidizing them. Maybe the economic decline could have been reversed.

According to the US Census Bureau, on October 20, 2019, the population of the country was 329,851,540. Of those hundreds of millions, approximately 26% are on welfare. It is estimated that annually the US federal government spends around $700 billion, while state and local governments spend around $300 billion. This means that approximately over one trillion dollars are spent on the welfare system annually, and SSI and Medicaid are not even being measured here.

The US welfare system it’s an umbrella with different programs under it, the major ones being:

- Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)
- Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Programs (SNAP)
- Supplemental Security Income (SSI)
- Housing Assistance
- Medicaid

Since President Lyndon Johnson declared his war on poverty more than five decades ago, welfare programs have cost more than $23 trillion. But the question is, has this benefited the poor?

It just seemed that the programs instead of being mean to help people get out of poverty are just making them stay there and even get poorer. The system is not sustainable, and researchers have even compared it to the dole system in Ancient Rome. They draw parallels and fear that because of the weak economic system of the country, it could cause an economic and social collapse.

For example, Mike Duncan the author of the book “The Storm Before the Storm: The Beginning of the End of the Roman Republic” (2017) explains that the transition of the US labor force from self-ownership to large corporations is similar to that of Rome when the wealthy became owners of everything and the working class became dependent on them. They draw parallels and fear that because of the weak economic system of the country, it could cause an economic and social collapse.
In Mesopotamia, when archaeologists started systematically excavating a lot of damage and looting had already happened, making it harder for them to properly label artifacts and the location in which they were found. The location of artifacts is extremely important because it is the only context that archaeologists have of the period, if things are moved around and some are stolen, then it is particularly hard to know their function and to whom they belonged. This could be a reason by the lack of representation of women, if artifacts were stolen or moved, then the context is lost.

One of the reasons why in early archaeological sites ancient women were overlooked, according to Harriet Crawford, was because there were no women archaeologists in higher positions. Crawford explained that “in the past the relative lack of women in the archaeological profession and their generally junior status contributed to a certain myopia in scholars and to a tendency to overlook the female world of the past” (2013). Nor is there only a lack of women represented and depicted in Mesopotamian society, but the lack of women in the earlier field of archaeology also contributed to the disproportionate history of the lives of men versus that of women in Mesopotamia (Crawford 2013; Wright 1996).

Social-economic differences in Mesopotamia have been understood from “images of men and women conveyed in textual and representational sources [which] suggest that there were great disparities of wealth and status within the society that cut across gender, class, and ethnic lines” (Wright 1996). The class difference was seen in the hierarchical way that the society was divided: there were the royals which included the king, however, in ancient cities where there were writing methods, there can be records indicating the economic, political, and social spheres of the city. Another way that archaeologists and other social scientists have been able to understand ancient societies is through depictions of social life in art and the finding of other artifacts, such as vases, stamps, and other everyday household items (Bernbeck 2009; Wright 1996; Zettler 1996).
the father of the women… the amount paid as brideprice

“the father of the young man first paid a brideprice to price paid to the brides’ father by the husbands’ father, that show that to get married there needed to be a bride age while men did much older. There are also records dictated their lives: appearance, marriage, work, religion, etc. Records show that women, or girls, married at an early age while men did much older. There are also records that show that to get married there needed to be a bride price paid to the bride’s father by the husband’s father, “the father of the young man first paid a brideprice to the father of the women… the amount paid as brideprice vary; most frequent are 5 and 10 shekels in the Old Babylonian period, but (there was evidence) also of 20 or 30 shekels” (Stol 1995). There can be an assumption that the amount paid depended on the economic status of the families. Women were treated as a commodity that could be sold to the best suitor, which furthers the notion of their lower status to men. Some scholars believe that men were able to have multiple views and concubines, but women who committed adultery were harshly punished by the husband and society (Stol 1995).

The social status of women depended on their family and their status. Queens had power and authority and in a certain way they were able to make their own decisions, “the queen who exercised real power both within her sphere and outside it… She exercised this power in much the same spheres as her husband having religious, diplomatic, administrative and economic responsibilities. (However) she does not seem to have had legal or military duties” (Crawford 2013). Women from the elite families most probably did not have to work and they would have been what today we refer to as ‘rich housewives’ who owned slaves who did the housework and other necessities. Other than the slaves who had no saying about their lives, commoner women had no power and because of their poor economic status had to work as well as being housewives (Crawford 2013; Stein 1996; Wright 1996). Slaves, women, and men, made up a huge part of society because free labor was favorable and the kings and elites owned many to work at their properties. However, there was not enough free labor and low wages workers were also employed, “free workers and slaves worked shoulder to shoulder in royal factories, in temple establishments, and in private industries… The slave worked for less than the freeman. But the number of the former was never sufficiently large to replace the latter” (Mendelsonoff 1943).

Industrialization started to grow in the third-millennium as manufactured goods, such as textiles and garments, demand increased. Factories owned by the royals and elites opened up for business and they need its vast amount of workers to satiate their needs (McCorriston 1997). The sprout of factories gave women the chance to work as craft weavers, which was a job mostly done by them during the times “The large surplus-producing workshops attached to landholding institutions employed mostly women” (McCorriston 1997). This allowed them to gain independence from household jobs and also economical self-sustainability. Thus, they were not to depend on a father or husband for money or food, now they could be of economical help for the household as well. However, in all they were being owned by the factories owners and pay less than men, either in silver or food rations, “whatever their work was, they received half of the rations given to men” (Stol 1995). In quoting Gordon Childe, Richard L. Zettler said that Childe “described craft specialists in ancient Mesopotamia as an exploited subject class’ dependent on the (king)” (1996).

Other jobs that archaeological records show that women performed were millers, oil pressers, midwives and even prostitutes (Ambos 2013; Crawford 2013; Stol 1995). During an excavation outside of the city of Susa, archaeologists believed that they had unearthed a brothel because of the depiction of erotica images found on clay pictures found at the site (Ambos 2013; Stol 1995). Some records referred to prostitution as a form of work for women, “literary phrases show that they were found behind the city wall and the laws suggest that a woman appearing alone on the streets was supposed to solicit men” (Stol 1995). Today, in most places around the world prostitution is illegal and the women are most likely the ones who have to pay for the ‘crime’ even if men are involved. Women were not just treated as lower than men in society they were also exploited as workers.

Countrieries that are geographically situated in modern-day Mesopotamia are mostly Arab countries that practice Islam. In these countries: Syria, Iran, and Turkey the treatment of women as second class citizens are rooted in the patriarchal and hierarchical societies that have existed for centuries. The lives of Iranian women had a drastic change after the revolution, “in 1979…soon after taking power, Iran’s new Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini decreed that all women had to wear the veil - regardless of religion or nationality” (bbc.com). There are also rules about swimwear, “Iranian women are forbidden from bathing in public wearing swimsuits” (bbc.com). In Turkey, there are systematic women rights abuse and women and girls are at risk every day. Women are treated as property and the men in the family rule and control them, “last year alone, 640 women in Turkey were murdered by men, and at least 60% of these murders were committed by husbands, boyfriends, former husbands, former boyfriends, family members or relatives, according the 2018 report of the … the murderers of 37% of the dead women went unidentified” (Bulut 2019). Death is the most extreme form of abuse, there are other types of abuse that are physically, mentally, and emotionally damaging to women and girls. For example, there is a new bill that “aims to lower the age at which sexual relations with a child (under the cover of marriage) is considered a crime from 15-years-old to 12-years-old. If it passes, it will “pardon” the underage-marriage offenses of approximately 10,000 men currently serving prison sentences on sexual-abuse charges” (Bulut 2019). Just as in Mesopotamia women and girls are systematically oppressed and their lives have little to no value, they are treated as property and femicide is widespread.
There was a photovoice exhibition, in the lobby of the social science building at the University of South Florida, that caught my attention. Photovoice is a research method used by social scientists, like anthropologists, where participants take pictures to document their experiences and positionality on the research. This specific exhibition was on what the people of a specific community ate for a couple of weeks. Participants took pictures of their meals and then researchers used those photos to document their findings and interpretations. From looking at the pictures and the amount of processed and low-quality food in them, I deduced that the participants came from low economic status and possibly rely on government subsidies. Later on, I found out that those participants live in a food desert; I was not far from the truth.

This is an example of how by looking at what people ate, archaeologists can conclude their economic and social status. Those pictures could be the only remains that anthropologists find in the future of what some groups of people ate in this time-period and in this exact place, and they will have to conduct their research with those photos and any other evidence available to them that could back up their theories.

Zooarchaeologists today are doing exactly that with faunal remains, like animal bones, found during an excavation of ancient cities and civilizations. When archaeologists are excavating, one of the most commonly unearthed materials is faunal remains (Crabtree 1990). This explains why zooarchaeology has grown into such a well-developed area of study and career. Learning about the past and our ancestors has always given us a glimpse of what they were like and how they lived; with the study of faunal remains, we can also learn how they structured their social and economic spheres (Moreno Garcia 2014).

Ancient Egypt and the area of the Nile has always fascinated scientists; from the pharaohs, mummies, and the Great Pyramids of Giza, Egypt has become one of the most studied and researched societies in the world. Thousands of articles and books have been written, and many of them on the topic of social status, mainly about the important and wealthy pharaohs that the pyramids were constructed for. But what about the other cities? Did they also have an importance on social status? Or did they have a very economically stratified society?

The city of South Abydos in the Middle Kingdom of Egypt is located in the Nile Valley of Upper Egypt. It is believed that it was inhabited from 1850 to 1700 B.C. The area comprises the mortuary temple of the pharaoh Senwosret III and an associated settlement. The settlement consists of several...
DID YOU KNOW

Garbology is “the study of modern culture through the analysis of what is thrown away as garbage” (Merriam-Webster).

It was pioneered by the late Dr. William L. Rathje back in 1973. He assigned a homework to his students and two students brought back trash that they had collected in two different neighborhoods: one affluent, the other not so much. This is when he got the idea of the Garbage Project and “immediately grasped the possibility that research on household garbage might yield new insights into modern human behavior… [Dr. Rathje said that] after all, if we can learn about ancient societies from their garbage, then we should also be able to learn about modern societies from their garbage” (Schiffer 2015).

Faunal remains in South Abydos have been studied to try and find if the citizens were divided into social classes and status. Stine Rossel states that “iconographic and textual records of the ancient periods in Egypt suggest that animal products were ranked and those food choices were to some extent related to status” (O’Day et al. 2004; Rossel 2007), although those cannot be assured.

“In Egypt, great social differentiation is reflected in the animal remains” (deFrance 2009), this is seen in the results from the excavations of four spatial contexts in South Abydos. The area was divided into four parts: A – West Block deposit, B – East Block deposit, C – Mayor’s house, and D – large residence. A and B were located outside of the mortuary temple and were refuse deposits, C and D were located more east from the temple. The West Block deposit connected to the priestly and administrative class, while the East Block is connected to the non-priestly temple staff. Over eight thousand bones were surveyed and around twenty-two hundred yielded a “number of identified specimens to genus – NISP” (Rossel 2004). Figured 1 shows the frequencies of the major food animals and the distribution between the four excavated areas.

The examination of faunal remains as an indicator of social status and economic stability has been used by many archaeologists in different parts of the world. In Egypt’s Old Kingdom (Redding 1992), in Ancient Rome and medieval Europe (Van Neer and Eryvnick 2004), in Central Africa (Schmitt and Lupo 2008), in medieval England (Driver 2004) and in Belgium (Pigière et al. 2004) and at the end of long and detailed excavations and research all of them come to a similar conclusion:

“Do faunal remains reflect socioeconomic status differences? […] Based on ethnographic observations and comparisons of comprehensive household material possessions and land with the associated food bones, the answer is yes they do, and rather strikingly so” (Schmitt and Lupo 2008).

Fig. 1 Relative frequencies of major food animals at South Abydos.
Most revolts start because of the discomfort of the lower classes; their discomfort with how the government, or monarchy, are mishandling the economy of the country and how they are becoming worse off economically and socially. Before the revolution, France was a profoundly hierarchical society. There was the highest power of the king (monarchy) and there was a division by states: "the clergy (First estate), the nobles (Second Estate), and the common people (Third Estate)" (Lowery 2014). When the lower states where getting even lower and the clergy and nobles saw that their statues were also changing politically, economically, and socially protests started.

Bastille was a fortress put in place to protect the city from external forces. It was built during the "Hundred Year War" against England in the east. Yet, it later became an internal protection in the city, it became a state prison where the king imprisoned whoever went against him. We can call that extreme monarchical power or just plain abuse by the king.

Before July 14th of 1789 when the Bastille was stormed and destroyed by mobs of discontent Parisians, mostly from the Third State, King Louis XVI was warned that if he did not give full power to the National Assembly (which was called in May of the same year to help and deal with the economic crisis) and limited the power of the monarchy, a revolution would start. The citizens had enough of the financial problems that the monarchy had brought up to the country and they demanded change.

For years before 1789, France was experiencing problems that all boiled down to mismanagement of funds and also abuse of power. During the America Revolution, France got involved and the economy was driving the country to bankruptcy. The monarchy was not sustainable for the country, they economically consumed more than the country could afford and by doing that it also made the citizens unsustainable for themselves, which helped to the decline of the country’s economy. It was a two-edged sword, the economy was bad for the citizens, and the citizens not being sustainable was bad for the economy.

The county was majority agricultural where "twenty out of the twenty-six million inhabitants gained their living in connection with agriculture" (Knowles 1919). Most of the land was worked by the rural peasants, who because of the suspension of serfdom were able to own a large amount of land themselves. The country relied on agriculture so much that when harvests did not reach fruition, famine and starvation impacted the country killing millions. In 1788 there was a failure in grain harvesting, which was followed by an extremely harsh winter, which brought a wave of suffering to the peasants. Also, the poor population of urban Paris had to deal with the massive increase in grain prices. Staple foods to the diets of most Parisians skyrocketed, "wheat prices increased by 66 percent; rye, a common staple, by 71 percent; meat by 58 percent; firewood by 91 percent" (Sutherland 2003). The wages of the Third State in Paris were decreasing while the cost of living, especially food, was increasing.

The peasantry fell into a monotonous and bleak existence prior to the Revolution of 1789, where the dominant classes, being of the First and Second Estate and made up of the clergy and the nobility of France, often took advantage of the Third State, which was the peasantry. These classes also made up the Estates General [it became the National Assembly] which had not been in session since 1614, but were still separated by the class distinction and felt the divide between the classes of French citizens” (Lowery 2014).

The population of the city of Paris, which grew as hardship continued to beat the rural poor, was mostly made up of commoners (Third State). The working class of the city was the one who started voicing their discomfort with the monarchy, with some support from the upper states (Sewell 2014). The working class was hit the hardest with high taxes, high food prices and not much governmental power. They wanted to be heard by the king, they wanted their hardship to be taken seriously and they wanted equality. However, the king decided to assemble the Estates General, which was a move to calm the masses and not done as a way to fix a problem. That was the biggest mistake committed by King Louis XVI. Anger and disdain grew as time continued with no change, "the reasoning behind the beginning of the movement quickly evolved from simply being heard to bringing about true social, economic, and political change to the individuals who have been placed under the boot of oppression for numerous years" (Lowery 2014). Some individuals who fell under the First State and Second State also wanted a true change to the country, they wanted a constitution that would take control away from the king and give it to the citizens. In the Declaration of the Rights of Men, which was approved by the National Assembly of France on August 26 of 1789, article VI reads "law is the expression of the general will. Every citizen has a right to participate personally, or through his representative, in its foundation. It must be the same for all, whether it protects or punishes. All citizens, being equal in the eyes of the law, are equally eligible to all dignities or through public positions and occupations, according to their abilities, and without distinction except that of their virtues and talents.” However, this was just on paper because not every citizen had the same rights and that also propelled the revolution.
After years of turmoil in the entire country, mainly because of economic reasons, the discontent mob of lower-class citizens took into the city of Paris to fight and demand changes to the government and the monarchy. The storming of the Bastille on July 14th of 1789 was just the beginning of a decade long revolution that consisted of a bloodbath, beheadings, and catastrophic destructions of Paris. Although in August 11 of 1789 the National Assembly put out The Decree Abolishing the Feudal System, indicating in article I that "The National Assembly hereby completely abolishes the feudal system. It decrees that, among the existing rights and dues, both feudal and censue, all those originating in or representing real or personal servitude shall be abolished without indemnification. All other dues are declared redeemable, the terms and mode of redemption to be fixed by the National Assembly. Those of the said dues which are not extinguished by this decree shall continue to be collected until indemnification shall take place," the fall of the Bastille was the end of an era, and France as a country changed forever: there were no more kings or queens. The monarchy was eradicated.

There are countries today that still have very important and powerful monarchies. The United Kingdom and Spain are two of those countries. In 2014, when now King Felipe was going to be coronated by his father King Juan Carlos, protesters in Spain called for an end to the monarchy. They wanted a referendum to let the citizens decide if they wanted a king or not, "if the People’s Party and Socialist party think that Felipe has the confidence of the citizens, he should submit to a referendum" (2014) said left-wing party leader Pablo Iglesias. Those who are against the monarchy and want to abolish it say that the monarchy just brings economic losses to the country and see it as a part of the corruption and unemployment problems the country has been facing for years. Just like citizens during the French Revolution saw the monarchy as living lavishly and spending taxpayers’ money inadequately, anti-monarchists in Spain believe the same (Al Jazeera 2014). If the country continues with its economic decline, citizens could form a revolt, that can become violent like that of the French Revolution, and end up overthrowing the monarchy.
“The control of wealth resulted in the formation of classes.”
~ Max Webber