

resulted in not only the presentation of much significant data but also a valuable segment of the history of Paleolithic archaeology.

Lawrence Breitborde, chair of the Department of Anthropology at Beloit College, and Henry Moy, director of Beloit College Museums, also deserve gratitude for their efforts to restore these collections, artifactual and archival, to public knowledge. Proceeds of the sale of this two-volume set will be reinvested in continuing the Logan Museum's revitalized role. Readers of this *Bulletin* should mark on their calendars the Logan Museum's centennial observances in 1993 and 1994. One event will be the Central States Anthropological Society's 1993 meeting, probably in mid-March, at Beloit: sessions relevant to the history of archaeology will be most welcome (CSAS program chair will be Myrdene Anderson, Department of Anthropology, Purdue University.).

"Who Did Archaeology in the United States Before There Were Archaeologists and Why? Preprofessional Archaeologies of the Nineteenth Century." by Thomas C. Patterson. In *Processual and Postprocessual Archaeologies*, edited by Robert W. Preucel, Center for Archaeological Investigations, Occasional Paper No. 10, Southern Illinois University - Carbondale. 1991, pp. 242-250. (Cloth)

by Alice B. Kehoe
Marquette University

Patterson's paper is a condensation of two he had presented, in 1988 and 1989, at conferences previous to the Carbondale Visiting Scholar Conference of 1989. He characterizes the early United States as harboring two contrasting political philosophies, agrarian versus mercantile capitalism. The agrarians, of whom Thomas Jefferson is of course the most illustrious example, followed the physiocrats in believing agricultural land to be the foundation of societies, therefore the manifest destiny of the new Republic was to conquer, and colonize, more land. The mercantilists, primarily in Boston, emphasized civilization as the refinement of technologies, social order, and tastes. Both philosophies were cast in Enlightenment terms.

It is Patterson's thesis that archaeological activities ("archaeologies," is the fad word in the book) in the United States were rather closely linked to the nation's major political-economic trends. Thus, the "Moundbuilder Controversy" reflected agrarian concerns with land development, while Classical and Biblical archaeology was pursued by Americans abroad, and financed by Americans at home, to uncover evidence of the progressive development of Civilization. The two, Classical and Biblical archaeology, were aspects of this one theme through most of the nineteenth century. After the Civil War, the professionalization of scholarly research on the German university model shifted archaeology into a technician's business where precisely delimited goals extinguished the grand questions of philosophy. "Only when crisis conditions prevail: - World War II and in the late 1980s," have professional archaeologists sought to overcome their standard temporal and geographical research boundaries, says Patterson.

"Preprofessional archaeologies," to use the book's running title for the chapter, has a provocative thesis and brings in a number of interesting data, from the personal ties of William Prescott that (according to Patterson) led him to emphasize the elegance of the sophisticated Tezcocan court conquered by the Aztecs, to the fact, if an 1896 article is

correct, that a majority of Americans auditing Classics lectures in German universities were women. The chapter's fault is its brevity. It appears, from the brevity of all the chapters, that editor Preucel must have insisted on keeping the papers close to their oral-presentation length. Patterson's paper is more a précis of his argument than an argument. We would benefit from a less condensed version.

Parenthetically, it should be mentioned that the book as a whole will one day be grist in the mill of a history of archaeology. Now at the moment, it is perhaps generally more irritating than useful. The glaring problem is that there has not been, to my knowledge, a satisfactory definition of "processual archaeology." With one term of the contrast ill defined, the contrast cannot be productive. The lack of a generally accepted and philosophically adequate definition of "processual archaeology" is, in my view, explained by the need of those who have professed to practice "processual archaeology" to justify their work as science, and this need resulted from their funding sources, primarily the National Science Foundation. As this agency's dominance of research funding diminished in the 1980s, "postprocessual archaeology" arose, addressed to the National Endowment for the Humanities, the new dominating agency. (there are complicating factors, including, as always, challenges by ambitious younger professionals -- what I.C. Jarvie described as "Kill the Fathers!") The sociology of science perspective that highlights these several factors is ignored by most American archaeologists; Patterson is an exception. Preucel's book presents much jawing about philosophies, but precious little grounding in social reality. Archaeologists will debate abstract philosophical positions, yet ignore the lived experience that Patterson has attended to in his paper. Perhaps this is as Guy Gibbon argues in his 1989 *Explanation in Archaeology*, desperate efforts to maintain the status quo that until the late 1970s kept American archaeology the business of WASP men.

"Doctoral Research in Cambridge (1922-1987)", *Archaeological Review from Cambridge*, edited by Sarah Taylor, Occasional Paper 1, Department of Archaeology, Cambridge University. Spring 1989. No Price Given. 47 Pages. (Paper)

by Douglas R. Givens
Saint Louis Community College

The Department of Archaeology, Cambridge University (England) has done a great service to scholars interested in the history of archaeology by issuing Occasional Paper 1 under its umbrella publication the *Archaeological Review from Cambridge*. This compact volume contains a number of short articles by some of the leading archaeological figures at Cambridge on doctoral work and the intellectual climates in which students did their work from 1922-1984. Articles in the volume include the introduction to the volume by S.J. Taylor, "Early Days in the Development of Postgraduate Research in Prehistorical Archaeology at Cambridge," and by J.G.D. Clark; "Postgraduate Research in Prehistorical Archaeology at Cambridge 1950-1970," by C.F.W. Higham; "Advice and Consent: Archaeological Research at Cambridge in the 1970s and 1980s," by Ian Hodder; "The Development of African Archaeology in Cambridge," by J. Alexander; and "Cambridge Archaeology Before the Tripos: The Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology", by D.W. Phillipson. In addition the volume contains a listing of the graduate students at the doctoral level and their dissertation titles from 1922-1987.