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Reviewed by
Larry D. Banks

This annual bulletin of the Texas Archeological Society is a unique contribution specifically focused upon the history of Texas archaeology in a format that no others have done previously. The volume contains 150 pages, the majority of which consists of interviews (146 pages) conducted by the first State Archaeologist of Texas, Curtis Tunnell. In 1968 Tunnell conceived of the idea of obtaining personal interviews from individuals whom he considered his heroes for their pioneering efforts in Texas archeology. This volume entails the first publication of such information, but more will certainly follow. The remaining four pages comprise two different reviews of other publications important in their own right to those interested in Southern Plains archeology of Texas. These two reviews by Timothy K Pertulla and David T. Hughes, respectively, are of The Coronado Expedition to Tierra Nueva: The 1540-1542 Route Across the Southwest by Richard Flint and Shirley Cushing Flint, and Goff Creek: Artifact Collection Strategy and Occupation Prehistory on the Southern High Plains, Texas County, Oklahoma. The section by Tunnell titled "In Their Own Words: Stories from Some Pioneer Texas Archeologists" contains numerous previously unpublished photographs of people, sites and artifacts referred to the texts. The interviews are from twenty-three different people whose individual names are synonomous with the history of Texas archeology and with archeology on a national and international level. The list reads like a "Whose Who" for the development of archeology in Texas. Others of more recent influence include Fred Wendorf, Edward B. Jelks and Dee Ann Storey. The personal interviews are complemented in most cases with copies of newspaper articles, correspondence with others they considered important, and personal reminiscences of their contemporaries as well as stories about archeology itself. The period of time represented in the stories ranges from 1914 to the 1990s; but, of the twenty-three people represented, most of the interviews are from now deceased archaeologists, which makes these published stories that much more important. It provides an enlightenment of activities and roles of people in Texas archeology that is not duplicated elsewhere. I highly recommend this volume for anyone interested in the history of archeology and especially, of course, for those interested in Texas events.


Reviewed by
Robert C. Dunnell

This collection of ten essays honors the retirement of Dan and Phyllis Morse from the Northeast Regional Office of the Arkansas Archeological Survey and the University of Arkansas system. A brief recounting of the honorees' professional lives is the subject of a well-written essay by Mary Kwas accompanied by a "selected" bibliography and a short collection of anecdotes. An environmental account of the central Mississippi valley from 16,000 BP to 1000 BP (radiocarbon or calendric is significant but not stated) by Paul and Hazel Delcourt and the late Roger Saucier follows. Constructed around Saucier's 1994 mapped reconstructions of hydrology/geology, it is fleshed out by paleovegetation derived from eleven sites in the region, four new (but not described here). The Holocene central valley is as well known now as any area south of the glacial border. Unfortunately, since the article is closely keyed to a series of maps, two of the maps, 2.2b and 2.2c, are mislabeled and likely to cause some initial confusion.
Three essays provide information about Arkansas archaeology not previously available. A paper by Marvin Jeter and Ann Early summarizes the culture history (primarily in terms of phases) of the Saline river basin in south-central Arkansas straddling the Transmississippi and Lower Mississippi Valley culture areas. Their treatment is, however, largely opinion derived from data of disparate origins rather than the data themselves. Andersen’s similar task, albeit done from a single, well-designed project in the Western Lowlands, is more satisfying. Instead of intuitive phase assignments, Anderson summarizes data parameters that allow him to build a coarse-grained, but substantive, picture of occupation of the L’Anguille drainage. Since the circumstances of data generation are explained in detail, others will be able to use these data for their own purposes. Gillam’s expansion of his Paleoindian study (1996) in Northeast Arkansas reinforces his earlier conclusions that Crowley’s Ridge gravel, and not Paleozoic bedrock lithic sources, have played a major role in Dalton settlement and that Morse’s drainage model of Dalton settlement is a better fit to existing data than Schiffer’s hypothesis.

Of particular interest to readers of this newsletter are two papers treating the history of archaeology. Martha Rolingson brings together all of the early documents known to bear upon the Toltec mounds, including the accounts of Louis Bringier (1810-1812), Edward Curtiss (1879), and Edward Palmer (1882-1884) as well as remarkably insightful correspondence generated by a landowner, Mary Knapp. Rolingson’s account demonstrates the value of historical researches as our picture of, and her research at, this important site would have been radically different without the information in these early descriptions. The volume concludes with an interesting essay by Hoffman that uses newspaper articles from the last third of the nineteenth and the first third of the twentieth centuries to elucidate public perception of archaeology in Arkansas. Unfortunately, his survey is not systematic for, as he himself notes, this would require a major research effort with serious funding. Still this taste suggests that such an undertaking would be worthwhile.

The remaining three essays lack a common theme, each tackling different issues in different ways. Mainfort evaluates late Mississippian phases as groups (sensu Dunnell 1971), doing cluster analysis of similarity coefficients derived from frequencies of decorated pottery. Although Mainfort’s approach is empiricist, his use of extant pottery types constrains his result to a cultural historical product (homologous similarity). He finds some current constructions “warranted,” others not. The value of phases in the first instance is unattended and leaves the product with an unfinished feel. By far the longest essay in the volume is Schambach’s detailed presentation of his thesis that the Spiro phase can be linked to the historic Tunica via the Sanders phase. He weaves a plausible scenario out of phonetic similarity and ethnohistoric interpretation which, despite protestations to the contrary, seems no more testable than any other reconstructive account. The tedious presentation requires study, not reading, to mine its full value. The essay by Stewart-Abemathy begins a bit pretentiously for what turns out to be a rather straightforward, informative, and well-done summary of historic archaeology in the Mid-South. The great concern evinced with defining both historic archaeology and the area, while laudable to a classification freak like myself, adds little to the essay and misleads one about its descriptive rather than analytic nature.

All of the authors go to some lengths to refer to the works of the honorees, Dan and Phyllis Morse. The Morses’ careers have made that task easy for there is little of Arkansas archaeology that has not benefited materially from their thirty-year tenure at Jonesboro. And as the volume also demonstrates, though never part of a doctoral program, the Morses have influenced a generation of scholars strongly as well. This volume, like the careers it honors, is greater than the sum of its parts.

Dunne, R. C.
Discrimination and Marginalization

Assembling the Past: Studies in the Professionalization of Archaeology, edited by Alice B. Kehoe and Mary Beth Emmerichs, 1999, University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque. **Please see section VI of this issue for an errata announcement by the volume’s editor.

Reviewed by
David L. Browman
Washington University - St. Louis

The Assembling The Past volume, which focuses upon the issues of discrimination and marginalization in archaeology, is the delayed publication of two 1989 symposia dedicated to the history of archaeology — one in January of that year at the First Joint Archaeological Congress in Baltimore, chaired by Alice Kehoe and Jane Waldbaum, and the other in November at the 88th annual meetings of the American Anthropological Association, chaired by Jonathan Reyman. Because of the time delay, in some cases the chapter authors have already published later papers, building on their presentations, so that the reader may already be familiar with part of the arguments presented. Nevertheless, I evaluate this work as a “must have” for any student of the history of Americanist archaeology.

The papers have been organized into three sections: I - Multiple Pasts (with 7 presentations), II - Professionals May Not Be Women (with 3 papers); and III Southwestern Archaeology As Case Studies (with 2 contributions). Alice Kehoe has written the general volume introduction of 18 pages, plus three short (3 or 4 pages) introductions to each of the three sections. In her general introduction, Kehoe argues that the papers all focus on a central theme, the “marginalization of uncredentialed, members of the wrong social class, women, and those with the wrong regional or academic connection” (p. 1), denying them access of entry into the ranks of professionals in archaeology until very recently. She argues in her introduction to Section II that the real break-through for women into archaeology was the 1964 Civil Rights Act (p. 118). She reiterates her comments from the general introduction in her introduction to Section I, where she once again argues that the cohort of “women, non-Protestants, non-whites, and people from working class origins” (p. 20) were systematically excluded from positions in the early years, because the professionalization of archaeology had been in terms of males, “sons of the old-money upper class”, with advanced degrees from “Eastern Establishment” colleges. Kehoe suggests that this bias was so marked that there is sufficient reason to believe that Franz Boas was denied a position at Chicago after the Columbian Exposition in 1894 because he was Jewish (pp. 7-8, 21, and 22, note 1), but both McVicker (p. 46) and Halpom (p. 131) caution against this assumption, indicating that there is no unequivocal evidence to support that interpretation. Kehoe also highlights several other cases, such of that of the contributions of Alice Le Plongeon, who excavated at Chichen Itza and Uxmal, whose work, Kehoe says (p. 9), has been systematically “purged” and “expunged” from the record of Mayan archaeological studies.