Each volume is concise yet highly detailed as to each contribution. The editors of the series did an excellent job in their solicitation of contributions. Some of the pieces presented in the series actually provide a discussion of the intellectual climate in which discoveries and contributions were made, thusly enhancing the usability of the volume series for the reader.

Departments of Anthropology at both universities and colleges should acquire this source as a reference tool for their students. Reference departments in libraries in both colleges and universities should acquire this volume series for the benefit of their patrons. It is indispensable! Finally, those scholars to are intimately involved with writing the history of Near Eastern archaeology add this source to their own personal library. What a valued and “searchable” source it will be found to be.

Eric Meyers, his editorial board, and the contributors to the volume should be congratulated on a job well done. This series should be considered a mandatory addition to any historian of archaeology's library. It will remain one of the most important tools of the historical development of Near Eastern archaeology for many years to come.


By

Charles C. Kolb

**Disclaimer:** The opinions expressed herein are those of the reviewer and not of his employer or any other federal agency.

This volume, one of the initial publications in the Harcourt Brace “Case Studies in Archaeology” series edited by Jeffrey Quilter, is designed, the editor writes, for broad appeal as an inexpensive textbook for students enrolled in beginning and intermediate courses in anthropology, archaeology, history, and related disciplines. The books in this series focus upon selected areas of archaeology, including method and theory. Quilter states the truism that “archaeologists have not done a very good job in discussing the history of their own discipline” (p. vi). The series, therefore, is also designed to address this issue.

In this carefully crafted volume, Tom Patterson reviews the historical development of archaeological method and practice in the United States and points out that “this book is a sketch map, a guide that points out major features of a complex terrain. The landscape is still poorly known, and what seem to be major features still appear hazy on the horizon” (p. vii). However, his work goes beyond a historicization of the development of archaeology and is both an invocation and a cry for archaeologists to consider from a holistic perspective the position and effect that our discipline has on American culture. In his conclusion, Patterson states (p. 144) that

this book is a call for archaeologists to situate their work and to understand its implications for the cultural debates of the late twentieth century. It is also a call to participate honestly and with integrity in the construction of a genuine politics that challenges a social order that has entrenched racism,
sexism, oppression, and exploitation as integral aspects of everyday life and uses the metanarratives of archaeology to maintain their existence in an increasingly unstable and globalized society.

Patterson, professor of anthropology and history at Temple University, is the author of more than a dozen books and one hundred other publications dealing, in the main, with state and class formation, comparative political economy, historical materialism, and the historical development of archaeology and anthropology as professions in the United States and Latin America. He is well known for his research in Peru and syntheses on western civilization, and is an excellent choice to prepare an introspective and critical assessment of the discipline.

I shall initially comment on the organization of Patterson's book and briefly assess the contents of this slim (191-page) paperback, which is packed with precise and detailed information and documentation, and is accompanied by a superb bibliography (742 references) and a detailed 13-page index. Several tables elucidate memberships in professional societies, however, the book has no graphics or other illustrations. This volume is an expansion and elaboration of Patterson’s two better-known articles on the history of archaeology (1986, 1990): “The Last 60 Years: Toward a Social History of Americanist Archaeology in the United States” and “Some Theoretical Tensions within and between Processual and Postprocessual Archaeologies.” In an essay entitled “Revising and Revisioning the History of Archaeology: Reflections on Region and Context,” historian Curtis Hinsley summarized (1989:81) that

... Thomas Patterson, drawing on the analytical categories of Antonio Gramsci and Nicos Poulantzos, argues that a fracture occurred after 1890 within the politically dominant class in the United States (Patterson 1986). One fraction, dominated by international monopoly and finance capital, he calls the Eastern Establishment; the other dominated by “national capitalists,” is identified as the Core Culture. Patterson reviews the political and economic dynamics of twentieth-century U.S. history, through the New Deal to the post-Vietnam era and attempts to correlate changes in archaeological focus, method, and theory with these elements of the dominant class and the institutions, such as the Carnegie Institution of Washington, the Smithsonian Institution, and the Institute of Andean Research, which served as their agents.

In a chapter entitled “Marxism in American Archaeology,” Antonio Gilman (1989:70) commented that Patterson’s (1986) article was an attempt to synthesize a general account of the “class character” of American archaeology, contending that there are two interpretive communities among American archaeologists in the United States. These communities reflect the “cultures of the national and international capitalists and their allies: the Core Culture and the Eastern Establishment, respectively.” The two concepts are retained in Patterson’s latest writing.

The reader will also discern immediately that Patterson’s book is not structured similarly to John Brew’s One Hundred Years of Anthropology (1968), Glyn Daniel’s A Short History of Archaeology (1981), or Willey and Sabloff’s A History of American Archaeology (1993). These three volumes emphasize the exemplars of the discipline, archaeological sites, procedures, paradigms, and major inferences and explanations. Patterson’s treatise differs by emphasizing methods, theories, and interpretations as a component of a dynamic social and intellectual milieu. He considers the changing sociocultural contexts in which archaeology developed as a scientific discipline and the responses of archaeology to those contexts. In addition, he seeks to make us understand the “context of the making and remaking of the United States itself” (p. 1). Hence, the emphasis is on the formulation of archaeology as an intellectual exercise rather than as a litany of archaeologists and sites. Patterson has stepped back and assessed the development of the discipline by promoting context, placing archaeology within the larger economic and sociocultural milieu. His historically holistic approach is skillful, insightful, compelling, both provocative and evocative, and — at times — sobering and disenchanting, particularly as he considers the history of archaeology during the last several decades.
In the most recent edition of *A History of American Archaeology* (1993) — currently the most used general textbook on this subject — Willey and Sabloff characterize five chronological periods on the basis of changes in methods and/or theory marked, in the main, by major publications. Each period is defined on the basis of historic events and the chapters have geographical or, more commonly, topical subdivisions, and the volume is profusely illustrated. The reader may recall that Willey and Sabloff's chronological units include: 1) "The Speculative Period (1492-1840)," 2) "Classificatory Descriptive Period (1840-1914)," 3) "Classificatory-Descriptive Period: The Concern with Chronology (1914-1940)," 4) "Classificatory-Descriptive Period: The Concern with Context and Function (1940-1960)," and 5) "The Modern Period: New and Continuing Ways of Explaining and Understanding the Past (1960-1992)."

Patterson divides the history of archaeology in the United States into four chronological periods: 1) "Archaeology in the United States before 1877," 2) "The Professionalization of Archaeology, 1877 to 1932," 3) "Archaeology and the Corporatist State, 1933 to 1968," and 4) "The New Archaeology and the Neoliberal State, 1969 to 1993," with a concluding chapter entitled "Archaeology and Multiculturalism: Race, Class, and Gender in the Neoliberal State." He strives to explain the "socially situated character of archaeological practice and knowledge in the United States" in the context that American society has undergone a "series of significant structural and cultural transformations" (p. 1). His chronological divisions are based upon the development of archaeology as a science and, he comments that "I adopt a materialist conception of history — which treats complexities — rather than one or another overly deterministic formulation that attributes massive causality to demographic, environmental, technological, economic, or other factors" (p. 2). Each chronological period is introduced by a cogent historical summary about major sociocultural and economic aspects of American society.

In an introductory chapter, Patterson considers the shifting meanings and use of the term *archaeologia*, outlines the historical and intellectual contexts of his essays, and defines terminology. In the subsequent chapter, "Archaeology in the United States before 1877," the author comments upon the effects of social class and regionalism, and archaeology in the eastern Mediterranean and in the United States ("preprofessional" and antiquarian exemplars and the founding of the major professional associations). Patterson argues that the practice of archaeology was molded increasingly by the ideology of Manifest Destiny and by the emergence of "scientific racism" (p. 37). In a third chapter covering, in the main, the years 1877 to 1932, Patterson considers the impacts of the Civil War (1860-1865), including "imperialist" economic expansion, an augmentation of federal bureaucracies, Social Darwinism, immigration, the growth of educational opportunities, and the development of new professions. Archaeological research from 1875 to 1900 was primarily government related (e.g. SI, BAE, USNM, USGS) and directed by geologists or natural scientists (such as Powell, Holmes, and Mason), but after 1900 there was a professionalization of the discipline, increased specialization (technicians replacing amateurs), the emergence of professional archaeologists (Cushing, Fewkes, and Uhle, among others). Patterson argues that early twentieth-century archaeologists were concerned with acquiring collections for museums and investigating regional variations in mound building, the origins and antiquity of American Indians, and the nature of ruins in the American Southwest. The expansion of educational opportunities to the middle class, the private sector funding of archaeology, and a reconstitution of Classical and Biblical Studies, and the reformulation of concepts of and interrelations between New and Old World civilizations are also discussed. The influences of the Core Culture and Eastern Establishment are specified.

The following three chapters covering the past six decades constitute a revision and an expansion of his 1986 article in *American Anthropologist*. He emphasizes the rise and decline of the Core Culture and Eastern Establishment and observes that the differences between them became blurred by the 1980s (p. 106). The Great Depression marks the beginning of Chapter 4 and, he posits that the New Deal is opposed by the Core Culture. New Deal economic relief programs (CWA, FERA, WPA, TVA, and CCC) and their
impact on archaeology are reviewed and modifications in professional organizations, such as the founding of the SAA, the reorganization of the AAA and the AIA, are documented. For a more comprehensive account of the critical period from 1930 to 1945, readers should also consult two recently published books, both revised from dissertations, which elaborate the era: *Digging for Dollars: American Archaeology and the New Deal* (Fagette 1996) and *A New Deal for Southeastern Archaeology* (Lyon 1996). In a section entitled “Archaeology and Anthropology,” Patterson considers Steward, R. McAdams, Rowe, and Binford, then moves to a discussion of American archaeologists in the eastern Mediterranean and the Indo-European problem. This period is characterized by the reorganization of the discipline, an influx of students, an expansion of universities and departments with archaeology programs, and ethnic, gender, and racial changes in the makeup of practitioners.

The subsequent period, evaluated in a chapter entitled “The New Archaeology and the Neoliberal State, 1969 to 1993,” is marked by a slowing of economic growth, a shift from extractive industries to service economies, the Vietnam War, and banking industry deregulation. Archaeologically, Patterson covers shifts in the composition of professional societies, changes in academic tenure and hiring, the increase in interdisciplinary research, the slowing of employment opportunities, the impact of federal legislation (such as the National Register and NAGPRA), changes in federal funding, the privatization of archaeology, and the traffic in antiquities. Major exemplars and research projects are mentioned in relation to processual and post-processual archaeology. In his final chapter, Patterson considers a number of topics including the impact of immigration (ten million legal immigrants entered the United States from 1969 to 1993), multiculturalism, and new social hierarchies. He discusses a number of major issues in archaeology (gender, racism, sexism, Native Americans, and Marxism, for example), and suggests that archaeologists must become more aware of the implications that the discipline and its practitioners have had and will continue to have on American culture and contemporary social issues.

Patterson considers the period from 1930 to 1945 as critical in the history of the United States and also in the development of archaeology as a discipline, setting the stage for a “Gilded Era.” He also notes that just as terms such as civilization, prehistoric, formative, etc. have been modified through time, archaeology and its perceptions both inside the discipline and viewed externally have also changed. The author also relates the changes in archaeology to shifts in sociopolitical conditions.

The book’s geographic/geopolitical content is uneven. Patterson covers admirably the discipline as practiced within the continental United States. His attempt to integrate the work and impact of Americanist archaeology as practiced elsewhere in the world — the eastern Mediterranean, for example — is superficial and could be augmented. In addition, Americans working in Mesoamerica and the Andean countries during the past century and, especially, the post-World War II era are mentioned briefly. American archaeologists conducting research in Central, South, and Southeast Asia and in Northeast Africa — many of whom are materialists, or politically correct (or less than politically correct) — might also have been cited. As a personal bias, I would have chosen to concentrate even more on the United States component in order to create a more full account of the social history of archaeology in the United States. Nonetheless, Patterson’s important synthesis of the history of the development of archaeology is not a standard history of the discipline. It is a hard-hitting and introspective review and should be valuable to professionals and graduate students in the social sciences and humanities. I am less certain if the messages the volume sends can be appropriately interpreted by unsophisticated or neophyte students. In this well-written and evocative volume, Patterson presents a sobering and compelling analysis of archaeology from the vantage point of a materialist conception of history in an attempt to interrelate complex topics and develops a social history of archaeology. The initial word in the book’s title — “toward” — suggests that he has not completed his explication, so that, like the 1986 article, this volume may be a statement of his current views.
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