

Although Zuni archaeology was a very minor part of Cushing efforts at Zuni, those interested in the spectrum of the history of Americanist anthropology will find this volume a very welcome addition to their libraries.

This book will be of interest to all those interested in Cushing's anthropology.

A New Deal for Southeastern Archaeology, by Edwin A. Lyon, The University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa, Alabama U.S.A., \$24.95, 283 pages, 5 maps, 20 figures, index.

by

Gordon R. Willey, Ph.D.
Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology
Harvard University

In the 1950s, the Era of the Great Depression, archaeology in the United States enjoyed an enormous boost, both in the substance of its findings on the Precolumbian past and in the development of its methods and procedures. Edwin A. Lyon has laid out the story of all this in a book that is a major contribution to the history of the archaeological discipline in this country.

The context of this story is in the American South, most specifically the Southeastern United States, or the 'Old South', that part of the country that was the heart of the Confederacy; and it is important to remember that the South has had a history significantly separate and distinct from that of the rest of the nation. This separateness, rooted in its plantation economy and the associated institution of slavery, was further fostered by the Civil War and its aftermath of hardships. These hardships lasted until the 1930s and the economic depression when they began to be ameliorated by the Rooseveltian political and socio-economic measures known collectively as the 'New Deal'. The policies of the New Deal began those transformations which continued through World War II and beyond. Crucial to these transformations were the building of power dams and rural electrification, soil erosion control and agricultural modernization, and a host of public building programs. All of this went forward with Federal Relief employment. Less tangible but nonetheless important benefits were in the cultural sphere: the arts, drama, writing, history - and of particular importance to us here, archaeology.

Archaeology was particularly well-adapted for the Federal Relief objectives of the 1930s: it was an enterprise that could give work to the large numbers of the unemployed, primarily unskilled laborers. They could be taken on in field excavation projects which were in no way competitive with ongoing industries and businesses. Admittedly, the advancement of archaeological knowledge was not the chief goal of Federal unemployment relief. The primary objectives of archaeology - accurate record-keeping and the reconstruction of the nation's prehistory - often came off second best. In spite of this, our knowledge of the past was advanced to a new level, as Lyon's book recounts in detail.

Lyon begins, appropriately, by relating just what was known of the prehistory of the Southeastern states before the 1930s. Archaeological interests had been pursued here since the latter part of the 19th Century. Much of this had been done by northerners and northern institutions. Jeffries Wyman and F.W. Putnam (Harvard's Peabody Museum), Gerard Fowke and W.H. Holmes (Smithsonian Institution), and C.B. Moore (Philadelphia Academy of Natural Sciences) were some of the most notable. Southerners and local institutions also became involved, including Walter B. Jones (University of Alabama) and W.S. Webb and W.D. Funkhouser (University of Kentucky). These persons and institutions published accounts of their work and findings. These were essentially descriptive. There was little attention given either to taxonomic definitions of archaeological cultures or

'culture complexes' or to the space-time ordering of these. While such procedures had been underway in the Southwestern United States for a decade or more, they were just beginning to be employed elsewhere in the country; the impetus given to Southeastern archaeology by the New Deal would rapidly propagate such ideas to that area.

He follows this with a chapter on the beginnings of New Deal archaeology. Things began with the first of the alphabet agencies, the FERA (Federal Emergency Relief Administration) and then went on with CWA, WPA, and the TVA. Frank Setzler and James Ford worked at Marksville, a site the former had wanted to study since the discovery of Hopewellian-type pottery in Louisiana. A little later, Ford joined A.R. Kelly on what was to be a big and long-running operation based at and around Macon, in central Georgia. Meanwhile, M.W. Stirling, assisted by a number of individual project supervisors, was putting the unemployed to work on various mounds and shell heaps in Florida; Setzler and J.D. Jennings dug in North Carolina at the Peachtree Mound; F.H.H. Roberts did the same at Shiloh in Tennessee; and Webb and Funkhouser, joined by T.M.N Lewis and Charles Wilder carried out explorations in the Norris and Wheeler Basins with TVA funding.

In the third chapter, Lyon breaks off this introductory account of Federal Relief efforts to return to his concerns with the state of archaeological thinking in the United States at that time. The role of the National Research Council in planning and guiding field programs is discussed, as are concepts such as the "Direct Historical Approach", as this related to John R. Swanton's distinguished contributions to ethnohistory in the area, and to the 'Midwestern Taxonomic System' of cultural classification.

Then he returns, in three long chapters, to very detailed examinations of the WPA programs, those sponsored by the TVA, and, finally, to the later, but highly important, role of the National Park Service. There is a complex interlinking of all of these agencies as archaeological field and laboratory work was pursued. In a sense, things suffered from the lack of a central direction in what was going on. An attempt was made from Washington to centralize all WPA-funded archaeology by the appointment of a National Consultant whose task it would be to see that all programs were properly run. This was only partially successful. Actually, most programs were operated by academically well-prepared persons; but, as in all such hastily-conceived human endeavors, their were quarrels and conflicts among the participants. Lyon describes some of these feuds which make interesting reading, perhaps more interested to those of use who were on the scene in those days than to a younger generation of readers. With American archaeology as new as it was, and with a previously unexperienced input of Federal monies and labor, it seems only expectable that there would have been differences of opinion and clashes of ego about how to go about it all.

One of the important things that was done under WPA funding was the establishment of research laboratories as parts of some of the larger projects, notably in Birmingham, New Orleans-Baton Rouge, in Tennessee, and in Texas. The analyses and classifications carried on in these laboratories was the first important step on the way to a published record of the fieldwork. Pottery and other artifacts were studied and classified. There was communication, informal at first, led to the Southeastern Archaeological Conferences. These gatherings, characterized by vigorous discussions and arguments, led to a broadening of the participants knowledge so that a generation of young scholars began to think in area-wide, Southeastern terms. Among the leaders in this 'expansion of archaeological horizons' were, especially, J.B. Griffin, of the University of Michigan, and Ford, at Louisiana State University. National Research Council backing continued with the formation of a Committee on Basic Needs in Archaeology, chaired by Carl E. Guthe and with the collaboration of individuals such as W.D. Strong, Fay-Cooper Cole, and W.C. McKern. Under the TVA, relief-funded archaeology continued to grow, especially in the Pickwick and Gunter'sville Basins.

The National Park Service, entering this 'New Deal for Southeastern Archaeology' in the latter part of the 1930s, brought long-term stabilization to some of the projects. A.R. Kelly, who had been in charge of the FERA, CWA, and WPA operations at Macon, and who had seen the development of the Macon and nearby Lamar sites

into the Ocmulgee National Monument, was appointed as Chief Archaeologists of the National Park Service. He and his Park Service colleagues were instrumental in establishing other Park and Monument areas in the southeast, including Moundville, Alabama, the Natchez Trace region in Mississippi, and historical-archaeological in Virginia. In 1940, the Park Service also aided Phillips, Ford, and Griffin in the Lower Mississippi Valley and my work, with R.B. Woodbury, in northwest Florida.

But this spate of what can be broadly subsumed under Lyon's title of "New Deal Southeastern Archaeology" was coming to a close. America's interests were turning in the direction of what was coming to be World War II, and the big Federal Relief programs were over. They had left behind them, though, a considerable legacy.

Lyon devotes his last chapter to a consideration of this legacy. This included the vast substantive contribution to the archaeology of a large part of the United States and the beginnings of a culture-historical understanding of these data. The Southeastern Archaeological Conferences, the nexus of an important system of intercommunication among archaeologists working in the area, were begun, and these have been maintained ever since. The problems confronted at the ways these were met and solved provided a valuable groundwork for the salvage and contract archaeology which was to begin in the immediately post-World War II years and which continued to be carried on throughout the United States. Finally, as Lyon points out, New Deal Southeastern archaeology was the context in which many of the country's archaeologists had their first professional experiences. Although there were not many of us then, there were more than could have begun archaeological careers under the conditions of the Great Depression without the opportunities provided by the Federal Relief programs.

Lyon leaves us with a question, one prompted by a 1990 article by Robert Dunnell. Why has Southeastern archaeology of the 1960s and later not moved more in the directions of 'New' or "Processual" Archaeology or, later, in those of the 'Post-Processual' counter-trends? Did the very heavy culture-historical emphasis of the 1930s New Deal archaeology set up a tradition that was difficult to break? Perhaps, yet other areas, such as the Southwestern United States had such a tradition, and they moved off in these directions. It remains a question for speculation but no easy answers.

Paradigms of the Past: The Story of Missouri Archaeology, by Michael J. O'Brien, 1995. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, \$29.95, 562 pages.

by

David L. Browman
Department of Anthropology
Washington University - Saint Louis.

A volume this massive (562 pages) contains far more substance than any short review can hope to do justice. One can, however, highlight major themes and directions of the tome. I see significant contributions in three areas: (i) the history of the development of archaeological thinking using Missouri as a foil; (ii) some autobiographical exegesis of the development of the author's understanding of archaeology; and (iii) a strongly stated theoretical argument, repeated throughout the volume, that a variety of neo-functionalism espoused by Robert Dunnell, and now practiced by O'Brien and a handful of his Ph.D. students, is the only scientific archaeology extant.

Of the thousands of books, articles, and gray literature contract reports dealing with Missouri, O'Brien tells us that he has used three criteria for selection for inclusion (pp. xx-xxi): (a) how important he evaluates it for the history of Americanist archaeology; (b) how representative it is of the stereotype for the specific period under