

Silverman's ethnography of her conferences will be most useful for sociology-of-science analyses. What can one say when every conference is predominantly American but held in a subtropical resort? One conference cost as much as half-a-dozen research grants (page 260). Did these conferences, for the most part, advance their topics to a degree that would not otherwise have happened? Were the extraordinary conferences producing "Anthropology Today," "Man the Hunter," "Courses Toward Urban Life," and Washburn's field primatology studies an artifact of the resumption and reconfigurations of anthropology after the World War II hiatus? One notices that these symposia were held at universities (page xii); more select meetings at Burg Wartenstein castle came later. Silverman only very briefly comments, page 246, on choosing participants, mentioning the goal of "a healthy mix by nationality, age/seniority, and gender" without discussing quoting circles, prestige of institutional affiliation, or New York bias. I'll close by contrasting Silverman's conferences with one Osmundsen had supported, a 1977 peripatetic meeting in Mexico organized by David Kelley and myself, to bring Joseph Needham face to face in situ with data adduced for pre-Columbian transpacific contacts. We traveled to the Museo Nacional collections in Mexico City, Teotihuacán, Palenque, Monte Albán, Olmec Park in Villahermosa, and Tajín; at each site Needham and his collaborator Lu Gwei-Djen spoke with archaeologists who had worked with the site and collections as they examined data. As an archaeologist, I can't help wishing Wenner-Gren had continued supporting discussions where major issues could be directly confronted by in-the-field data experience, and local practitioners accommodated.

*Alice B. Kehoe*

Milwaukee WI 532211-3436

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.13105>

**Hilary du Cros 2002 *Much More Than Stones and Bones*. Melbourne University Press. xviii + 204pp. ISBN 0-522-85020-0 (paperback).**

This is a book about the changing authority of archaeology (and archaeologists) in Australia over the last 20 years. It argues that the forces that created archaeology in Australia during the 1960s and 1970s, which are said to be those of the academy and of science, have since lost their sway to the field of heritage archaeology and the interests of indigenous people and of the marginalised in society. Archaeology is now far too culturally and socially significant to be left in the hands of academic archaeologists. Indeed, the interests of this now minority group have to 'managed' by heritage bureaucrats and others in a way that allows for the interests of others be given their due.

This argument is largely made by assertion and exemplified by case studies drawn from some of the most significant heritage sites in the country (both historic and prehistoric) such as Lake Mungo, First Government House (Sydney), Little Lon (Melbourne), and the cave sites of south west Tasmania. The book focuses the bulk of its attention on the growing cultural, social and political significance of archaeology in Australia – on how it has become a lightning rod for debate about the meaning of Australian history and of relationships between indigenous Australians and other members of the society.

There has long been agreement about many of these core issues, even among the small group of academic archaeologists. Indeed the overwhelming impression to be gained from *Much More Than Stones and Bones* is of how familiar much of this territory is. While it might be argued that Du Cros is not writing for professional archaeologists but for others not so steeped in the debates, the fact remains that Du Cros' account is generally shallow and impressionistic. Beginning with a slight and now dated history of Australian archaeology

(with an extraordinary over-reliance on a few sources) and extending through assertions based on interviews with archaeologists whose views do not come close to encapsulating the variety that tend not support the argument, *Much More Than Stones and Bones* can best be thought of as a very partial history of Australian archaeology. It is, instead, a document explaining the *status quo* in heritage archaeology, having little or nothing of substance to say about the practice of the profession outside those bounds.

*Tim Murray*

Achim Leube & Morten Hegewisch (eds.), *Prähistorie und Nationalsozialismus. Die mittel- und osteuropäische Ur- und Frühgeschichtsforschung in den Jahren 1933 – 1945. Studien zur Wissenschafts- und Universitätsgeschichte, Vol. 2. Heidelberg: Synchron 2002. XIV + 674 pages. ISBN 3-935025-08-4.*

Within the complex field of “archaeology, politics and identity”, the case of Prehistoric archaeology in Germany during the National-Socialist dictatorship is surely of considerable importance. Research into this problematic field, however, evolved only very slowly in the past decades. The pioneering studies of Reinhard Bollmus on the “Amt Rosenberg” and Michael Kater on the “SS-Ahnenerbe” from the 1970s hardly had any successors at first (Bollmus 1970; Kater 1974). Since the late 1980s, more and more case studies on individual institutions and scholars were published, but without provoking a general debate, which would have been appropriate in consideration of the importance of the topic. This situation has changed significantly within the last 5 years. The conference on “Prähistorie und Nationalsozialismus” in November 1998 in Berlin, whose papers are now published in the volume on hand, marked a turning point in this respect. The Berlin conference summarized many results, which originated in the decade before, and simultaneously stimulated further discussion. It was followed by a similar meeting at Freiburg in 1999 (Steuer 2001) and by exhibitions at Strasbourg/Metz (2001/2002) and Trier (2002) (Adam et al. 2001; Kuhnen 2002). The role of research on Antiquity and Classical archaeology has additionally been debated at Zürich in 1998 (Näf 2001). The meeting at Berlin was held on the initiative of Achim Leube, now emeritus professor for Prehistoric archaeology at Berlin's Humboldt-University. He not only edited this volume, it was also thanks to him that it represents – like the conference itself – more than an occasion for present German archaeologists to be bound up in themselves and the past of their discipline. There are two reasons why the history of German archaeology during the Nazi period is of direct concern for the scientific communities in nearly all neighbouring countries: First, it covers the development in those areas, which were part of the former German Reich before 1945, and which now belong to Poland or Russia. Second, it also includes the role of archaeology during World War II, when large parts of Europe were occupied by German forces. Against this background it surely was a wise decision of Leube to invite many colleagues from neighbouring countries to the conference and to contribute to the volume, and thus make this important step towards the reappraisal of the darkest period in European archaeology an international venture.

*Prähistorie und Nationalsozialismus* contains 38 articles, divided into 6 sections. They offer a large variety of information, which can be described only very selectively within this review. In the section “opening” (p. 3-17) Johan Callmers (Berlin) contribution on “Archaeology and National Socialism as subject of modern research” (p. 3-9) is most remarkable. According to Callmer future research into the history of archaeology should ideally be conducted both by archaeologists and by historians of science. This conclusion is important as his Berlin colleague Bernhard Hänsel argues in a short commentary for a “priority of history” in this