- Díaz-Andreu, M. 2002b 'Nationalism', in C. Orser (ed.) *Encyclopaedia of Historical Archaeology*, pp. 379–380. London: Routledge.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. & M. Ramírez Sánchez 2001 'La Comisaría General de Excavaciones Arqueológicas (1939-1955): la administración del Patrimonio Arqueológico en España durante la primera etapa de la dictadura franquista', *Complutum*, 12: 325–343.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. & A. Smith (eds.) 2001 *Nationalism and Archaeology. Nations and Nationalism* 7.4. London: Association for the Study of Ethnicity and Nationalism.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. & M.L.S. Sørensen (eds.) 1998a Excavating Women. A History of Women in European Archaeology. London: Routledge.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. & M.L.S. Sørensen 1998b 'Excavating women. Towards an engendered history of archaeology', in M. Díaz-Andreu & M.L.S. Sørensen (eds.) *Excavating Women. A History of Women in European Archaeology*, pp. 1-28. London: Routledge.
- Mora, G. & M. Díaz-Andreu (eds.) 1997 La cristalización del pasado. Génesis y desarrollo del marco institucional de la arqueología en España. Actas del II Congreso Internacional de Historiografía de la Arqueología en España (siglos XVIII-XX). Madrid, Málaga: Ministerio de Cultura, Universidad de Málaga.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. 2003 (forthcoming) 'Britain and the Other: the archaeology of imperialism', in R. Phillips & H. Brocklehurst (eds.) *History, Identity & the Question of Britain*. New York: Palgrave.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.13209

IV. Publications suggested by subscribers

From Richard B. Woodbury:

- Price, David 2003 'Cloak and trowel: should archaeologists double as spies?' *Archaeology*, 56(5): 30–35.
- Van Tilburg, Jo Anne 2003 'Explorer: Katherine Routledge's encounter with the mysteries of Easter Island', *Archaeology*, 56(5): 50–53.

Development of North Chilean Archaeology

Guillermo Focacci Aste (1922–2000) defined several of the archaeological phases in northern Chilean archaeology, and trained a large number of students in the field. While there have been short obituary notices in various journals, Luis Álvarez Miranda, editor of *Revista Diálogo Andino*, the archaeological series of the Universidad de Tarapacá in Chile, has provided a more detailed analysis of his contributions. Álvarez has two short articles 'Homenaje a Guillermo Focacci Aste' and 'Bocetos Biográficos de Guillermo Focacci Aste' in the issue which became available last year. The first article covers comments made in October of 2000 at a session dedicated to Focacci at the 16th Congress of Chilean Archaeology, two months before his death. It focuses more on his contributions to Chilean archaeology, in terms of a little bit of his institution building, with the creation of the Museo Regional de Arica; his work in defining various archaeological phases; and his salvage archaeology work, where he labored tirelessly in preserving important archaeological assemblages in the face of urbanization. Because Focacci was to be honored as this meeting, this article has less analysis of his work, and as an appendix includes Focacci's acceptance speech.

The second article was penned shortly after his death, and includes more of the kinds of information of utility in understanding the context of his contributions. In the second piece, we are given more detail on his training, including new coverage of the intellectual heritage he derived from his professors, lists of what are considered to be his major excavations, and published contributions, and a list of the major congresses that he helped to organize and to define the intellectual components of the sessions. Greater detail is given to his contributions in institution building (both museums and university departments), and to his contributions to Chilean archaeology. Singled out as particularly important are his redefinition of the Late Archaic period in Northern Chile, the development of understanding of the coexistence of Aymara highland colonizers and indigenous coastal Chilean polities during the Tiwanaku cultural phases, and a new understanding of the Inca influence and occupation of the Chilean terrain during immediate pre-Hispanic periods.

Luis Álvarez Miranda

2001a 'Homenaje a Guillermo Focacci Aste en la Sesión Inaugural del XVI Congreso Nacional de Arqueología Chilena, 16–20 Octubre 2000', *Diálogo Andino*, 19: 11–17.

2001b 'Bocetos Biográficos de Guillermo Focacci Aste 1922–2000', Diálogo Andino, 19: 19–32.

David L. Browman Washington University – St. Louis

National Patrimony and Latin American Archaeology

The most recent issue of the *Revista de Arqueología Americana* (Numero 20, 2002), which I discover most of our English-speaking readers don't know about or receive, has a long section on 'Arqueología, Patrimonio Arqueológico y Conservación en Centro y Sur América'. The 150 pages include seven different papers, covering Costa Rica, Brazil, Peru, Chile, and Argentina. While the immediate concern of several of the authors is preservation of the national cultural patrimony, some of the articles, particularly the one dealing with Peru, provide more historical perspective, and deal with changing intellectual paradigms of archaeologists in addressing these concerns.

The first article by Marlin Calvo Mora, Ana C. Arias Quiros, and Elena Troyo Vargas discusses the all too familiar battle of preservation, in this paper in the last quarter century in Costa Rica. The archaeological community had been able to get a national law for protection of archaeological resources enacted in 1981. Various strategies were employed by the archaeologists to encourage implementation of this law, but in 1999, the forces which usually get termed 'modernization', 'progress', or 'development', managed to get new legislation enacted, which essentially removed most protection of archaeological resources in order to facilitate economic development, leaving the archaeologists once again with the problem of trying to develop new strategies to protect the resource base.

The three articles on Brazil by Tania Andrade Lima, José Luiz de Morais and Daisy de Morais, and Maria Cristina Mineiro Scatamacchia and Gilson Rambelli, deal with very similar issues in three regions of Brazil. Andrade's article deals more explicitly with the national plans, beginning with the new agency and its first procedures that local archaeologists initiated in 1936, and the recent incarnation of the archaeological preservation agency under legislations in 1979. Once again this article recounts the ways in which the intent of the law have been circumvented by various political actions, and the types of actions that the local archaeological community has taken to try to address the federal government's failure to enforce compliance with the law. One of the prominent problems at the national level is one which bedevils archaeologists world-wide. That is, cultural patrimony is often seen in terms of 'bricks and mortar', in terms of standing architecture and monuments. Thus in the Brazilian national and regional offices which should be concerned with archaeology as part of the cultural patrimony, more than three-quarters of the professional staff are architects, and most of the rest are historians, with only about 5% being archaeologists of any type. If the resource is beneath the surface, it gets overlooked. The article by the Moraises takes a different tact, detailing the means by which the local archaeological community tried to develop an urban archaeology program in the environs of the city of Piraju, describing the different procedures developed to deal with encroaching urbanization on sites, and discussing the means by which archaeologists attempted to encourage a local interest in urban archaeology. The third article on Brazil by Mineiro and Rambelli has a focus on investigating patrimony at a regional level, but particular interest on the issue of preservation of underwater resources in riverine, lacustrine, and marine contexts. As with the national picture, in this case their argument is that if the resource is underwater, it gets ignored.

James Richardson covers these concerns in Peru. Here in addition to the problems of dealing with general preservation of national patrimony for the last century, and the various mechanisms that the Peruvian archaeological community has tried to implement over the years to preserve national patrimony, he separates adverse human impacts into two different trajectories: the looters, who 'mine' archaeological sites for financial gain, and the developers, who simply view archaeological remains as an impediment to progress. His own area of interest is the North Coast, and he discusses the varying strategies by archaeologists over the last century to deal with these two human factors in that region.

Eliana Durán Serrano's paper on Chile is essentially historical, dealing only a description of the laws and institutions that are currently in place, but Maria Luz Endere's paper on Argentina once again has a more historical bent. Many of the issues she covers are the same ones mentioned above for Costa Rica, Brazil, and Peru, but the history of course is uniquely Argentine. She notes that the models that archaeologists have supported in the past have changed with respect to the audience and the realization of archaeologists that in the Americas, they have two different audiences – the non-indigenous primarily Euro-American populations, for whom the prehistoric patrimony is mainly academic, and the First Nations groups, for whom the archaeology is basically a study of their ancestry. She, like her colleagues in this series of articles, notes that archaeologists have been much more comfortable dealing with archaeology as academic study, rather than recognizing the need to integrate First Nations populations in our thinking and research designs.

While much of the text in the series of articles focuses on current 'real world' issues of protecting cultural resources, the papers do include relevant references and discussions of the historic roots of the programs in each republic, and they do detail the ways in which changing archaeological perspectives of the problems over the last century have changed the ways in

which archaeologists attempt to address the issues, and hence supply us as historians of archaeology with some useful observations.

David L. Browman Washington University – St. Louis

From Dr Jeffrey M. Mitchem, Arkansas Archeological Survey:

- Baca, Keith A. 2002 'Correspondence between James A. Ford and Henry B. Collins: selected letters: 1927–1941', *Mississippi Archaeology*, 37(2): 99–158. Mississippi Archaeological Association.
- Pearson, Charles E., and Fred C. Cook 2003 'Clarence Bloomfield Moore's unpublished excavations on St. Simons Island, Georgia: 1898', *Early Georgia*, 31(1): 25–39. The Society for Georgia Archaeology.
- Lintz, Christopher 2003 'The Stamper Site, 34TX1, Texas County, Oklahoma. Part III: the architecture and features excavated by C. Stuart Johnston', *Oklahoma Archeology: Journal of the Oklahoma Anthropological Society*, 51(4): 14–46. [Report and interpretation of an early 1930s FERA-funded excavation]

V. Special section:

Towards a bibliography of the history of archaeology in Latin America

This special section has been contributed by Daniel Schavelzon as a research tool for those interested in the history of archaeology in Latin America. In later issues I intend to publish important bibliographical research from other parts of the world.

- Anders, Ferdinand 2001 *Los tesoros de Moctezuma: utopia y realidad,* Museum fur Volkerkunde, Wien.
- Aurori, Claude and Alain Monnier 1998 *De Suiza a Sudamerica: Etnologias de Alfred Metraux*, Museo de Etonografia de Ginebra, Suiza (Geneve, Switzerland).
- Auza, Nestor T. 1997 'German Burmeister y la Sociedad Paleontologica 1866–1868', *Investigaciones y Ensayos*, Vol. 46, pp. 137–155, Academia Nacional de la Historia, Buenos Aires.
- Charnay, Desire 2001 'Visiones Oaxaqueñas en "Las Antiguas Ciudades del Nuevo Mundo"', *Acervos*, No. 23, pp. 36–43, Oaxaca.
- Descubridores del pasado en Mesoamerica, Antiguo Colegio de San Ildefonso, Mexico, 2001 (monumental catalog of the exhibition 423 pages, bounded).