menschheit: geschichte der erforschung der natur und der verwertung der naturraffe im dienste der volker (Berlin: Bong, 1902-1904) and his travels in Central America are related in Mittelamerikanische reisen und studien aus den jahren 1888 bis 1900 (Braunschweig: Vieweg und Sohn, 1902). Sapper’s publications in the natural sciences include a pioneering work on Guatemalan physical geology, Grundzuge der physikalischen geographie von Guatemala (Gotha: Perthes, 1894); geography and physical geography, Uber gebirgsbau un boden des nordlichem Mittelamerika (Gotha: Perthes, 1899); on Central American volcanoes and earthquakes, In den vulcanengebieten Mittelamerikas und Wesindien (Stuttgart: Schweizerbartsche, 1905) and Die vulkane (Breslau: Hirt, 1925); and he authored El infiemo de Masaya (Saale: Niemeyer, 1925) about a volcano in Nicaragua. Other major writings include Geologischer Bau und Landschaftsbild (Braunschweig: Vieweg und Sohn, 1922), a treatise on climatology, Klimakunde von Mittelamerika (Berlin: Borntraeger, 1932), and a work on Mexican economic conditions entitled Mexico: Land, volk und wirtschaft (Wein: Seidel und Sohn, 1928).

Lehmann, who published 17 major works, is not well known for his Central American writings. His efforts focussed on a number of Mexican codices (Aubin and Chimalpopoca), the Aztec site of Colhuacan, and Mexican and Peruvian art. Among the publications are Geschichte der Azteken: Codex Aubin und verwandte Dokumente (reprinted Berlin: Mann, 1981), Altmexikanische kunstgeschichte (Berlin: Wasmuth, 1921), and Aus den Pyramidenstädten in alt-Mexico (Berlin: Hobbing, 1933). Franz Termer published nearly a dozen major works on Central America including a history of Guatemala to 1821, Quauhtemallan und Cuzcatlan (Hamburg: Heitmann, 1948), a study of mariner John Cockburn, Los viajes de Cockburn y Lievre por Costa Rica (San Jose: Editorial Costa Rica, 1962); and geography, Deutsche und nordamerikanische Auslandsforschung in den ibero­amerikanischen Landern (Hamburg: de Gruyter, 1936) and Die Halbinsel Yucatan (Gotha: Geographisch-Kartographische Anstalt, 1954). He also prepared a monograph on John Jewitt, a captive of the Nootka Indians of British Columbia, which was published as Der Sklave der Nootka: Leben und Abenteuer des John Jewitt (Stuttgart: Franckh, 1954).

Lastly, I wished that there had been a discussion about the process employed to select these particular nine contributions while excluding others. The reader may assume that these are representative publications of the work of these scholars but it also reflects the research interests of the translator, editors and commentators. Nonetheless, these are valuable to scholars of Mesoamerican and Central American prehistory and culture, and a tribute to the efforts of Ted Gutman.
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"An old and reliable authority" is how George Benjamin Hartzog, Director of the National Park Service (1964-1972), characterized the Antiquities Act of 1906. And it has been quite a reliable
authority - and a remarkable one. Since its inception, presidents have used it to establish 36 historic areas as national monuments and 51 natural areas; special acts of Congress have authorized another 28 national monuments (pp. 251-253). President Theodore Roosevelt signed the Antiquities Act bill into law on June 8, 1906 (p. 241). Just 22 days later, on June 30, 1906, Roosevelt signed the bill to establish Mesa Verde National Park, the first national park specifically created to protect antiquities (p. 243). The Antiquities Act of 1906 also served as the basis for later federal legislation, e.g., Historic Sites Act of 1935, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the 1979 Archaeological Resources Protection Act, and the creation of National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings in 1957 (pp. 193, 316).

Raymond H. Thompson provides an excellent account of the history and political activities surrounding the Antiquities Act of 1906. The volume has an Introduction and three parts. The Introduction is mainly a short biography of Ronald Freeman Lee (19051972). Lee was Chief Historian of the National Park Service (1938-1951), Director of Interpretation (1953-1960), Director of the Northeast Region from 1960 until his retirement in 1966, and author of “The Antiquities Act of 1906” for the NPS. This history - perhaps political history is a better term - of the Act was printed and distributed in 1970, but never actually published. Now Thompson has edited it for publication as Part One of this volume (pp. 198-269). Reading Lee’s account for the first time here, it clearly deserved wider distribution than it initially received, and we are indebted to Thompson for making it generally available.

Thompson wrote Part Two, “Edgar Lee Hewett and the Political Process.” This long essay (pp. 272-318) repeats many of the facts and events in Lee’s paper but adds considerably to them and provides additional contextual data, background, and discussion. The principal focus, as the title indicates, is Edgar Lee Hewett. I am familiar with Hewett’s life and career, but Thompson’s essay significantly expanded my knowledge and understanding of Hewett’s accomplishments, both in terms of the 1906 Antiquities Act when Hewett was part of the “antiquities bill alliance” (pp. 284-289), and also with regard to Hewett’s ideas about the nature of archaeological remains. Equally illuminating is Thompson’s discussion of Hewett’s political skills and maneuvering.

Part Three is a surprise and a delight - 25 wonderful black-and-white photographs by George Alexander Grant who, from 1929-1954, was the first official NPS photographer. Taken from the late 1920s through the mid-1940s, these photographs of early national monuments in the Southwest are not only aesthetically pleasing, but also provide useful data. For example, the photograph of Chetro Ketl (Fig. 18) shows features of the pueblo and the immediately adjacent ground that are no longer visible today; Keet Seel (Fig. 21) looked much better in 1935 than when I last visited it in the 1980s. Unfortunately, the small format of this volume (6” x 9”) required that many of the photographs be printed across two pages. The vertical page division lessens the visual impact of Grant’s photographs of Keet Seel, Chetro Ketl, Long House, and other sites, and especially of natural areas such as Bryce Canyon.

Passage of the Antiquities Act did not come quickly or easily. As Lee notes, Senator George F. Hoar of Massachusetts presented the first petition to Congress to preserve antiquities in New Mexico and Arizona; the date - May 8, 1882 (pp. 202-205). The petition failed to get out of committee, and it was not until 1889 that another archaeological preservation proposal - protection of Casa Grande - reached the floor of both houses and was passed on March 2, 1889 (pp. 205-209). Another 17 years and several failed proposals later, the Antiquities Act finally became law in 1906, 24 years after Hoar’’s initial effort failed.
That antiquities even came to the attention of Congress was due in no small measure to five significant developments that occurred in 1879: 1) The establishment of the Bureau of Ethnology (later named the Bureau of American Ethnology) and the appointment of Major John Wesley Powell as its first Director; 2) Publication of Frederic Ward Putnam’s, *Report Upon United States Geological Survey West of the One Hundredth Meridian*; 3) the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), for the first time, elected an anthropologist as its president - Lewis Henry Morgan; 4) the Anthropological Society of Washington was founded under the leadership of Otis Tufton Mason; and 5) Charles Eliot Norton and others founded the Archaeological Institute of America (pp. 198-200).

The first project sponsored by the AIA, as suggested by Morgan, was a survey and study of the Pueblo area, to be undertaken by Adolph Bandelier (p. 201). Lee does not mention that the groundwork for this study had already been laid earlier by Powell in his 1871-1872 survey of the Grand Canyon and the Southwest, though in citing Putnam’s 1879 report (above), he recognizes the importance of Hayden’s 1874-1879 survey of the Western Territories. 1879 was also the year that Colonel James A. Stevenson, urged by Powell and sponsored by the Bureau of Ethnology, led his famous expedition to the Southwest.

The ethnologist on this expedition was Frank Hamilton Cushing, only twenty-two and about to become nationally prominent. Stevenson’s wife, Matilda Coxe Stevenson, also took part and eventually surpassed her husband in public recognition and in the quality and quantity of her scholarly contributions.

The events of 1879 laid the intellectual groundwork for, and stirred public interest in antiquities preservation. Bandelier’s first report (1881) with his description of the vandalism done to Pecos Pueblo was the major impetus for Senator Hoar’s petition to Congress (noted above). As noted, it failed to receive a full hearing, but it laid the groundwork for subsequent site preservation. In 1885, Putnam was able to rescue the great Serpent Mound in Adams County, Ohio; in 1889, Casa Grande was put under federal protection through the efforts of Mary T. Hemenway and others, though the actual reservation was not finalized until President Benjamin Harrison signed the executive order on June 22, 1889 (pp. 206-209).

Congressional and public interest in antiquities and their preservation grew noticeably after 1889. Popular and professional books appeared on the subject, and the World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago (1893) and the Louisiana Purchase Exposition in St. Louis (1904) further fueled this interest (pp. 209-213). The increasing commercialization of archaeology - the selling of antiquities - and the destruction and vandalism of ruins were part of this interest, and concern. Until passage of the Antiquities Act, the federal government’s “chief weapon” (p. 219) to protect ruins on public land was to withdraw from sale or entry the land on which they were located (pp. 213-219). This process did not always sit well with the people of the western states and territories, nor with their state officials and congressional representatives. A new “weapon” was needed - a federal law to protect antiquities.

The actual passage of the Antiquities Act occurred in three stages over seven years. In 1899, the AAAS established a committee to petition Congress to protect antiquities on federal lands. The AIA set up a similar committee that same year (p. 223). These and other political activities resulted in three antiquities bills. Binger Hermann, Commissioner of the General Land Office, found all three unsatisfactory for various reasons and proposed a substitute bill. Congress took no action on it, nor or on any of the other three (p. 227).
In 1904, the Records of the Past Exploration Society and the Smithsonian proposed competing bills, and each obtained strong congressional support for its version from such powerful politicians as Massachusetts Senator Henry Cabot Lodge and Iowa Representative John Fletcher Lacey, chairman of the House Committee on Public Lands. Despite this support, neither bill passed (pp. 230-235).

Enter Edgar Lee Hewett. Hewett had been studying the Pajarito Plateau in New Mexico since the early 1890s (pp. 219, 278-280) and had worked hard to have Congress establish Pajarito National Park (p. 219). As Thompson notes (pp. 275-284), Hewett joined with Alice C. Fletcher and Matilda Coxe Stevenson and built upon their efforts in this endeavor. Hewett eventually turned his main attention away from the Pajarito Park efforts and toward passage of the Antiquities Act, but Fletcher’s, Stevenson’s, and Hewett’s earlier work was recognized and at least partially fulfilled with the establishment of Bandelier National Monument in 1916 (p. 251).

The failure of Congress to pass antiquities legislation in 1904 reflected deep divisions over the use of federal lands and competition between the private and public sectors of archaeology over control of research - between academic archaeologists in the great eastern universities and museums and those archaeologists employed by the Smithsonian and the Bureau of American Ethnology. W. A. Richards, who had succeeded Hermann as Commissioner of the General Land Office, asked Hewett to review the problem of antiquities preservation on federal lands (p. 237). Hewett submitted his review and recommendations to Richards on September 3, 1904 (P. 237).

In 1905, Hewett was appointed to the American Anthropological Association’s committee to work on antiquities legislation, and he soon became its secretary. His 1904 memorandum became the basis for a paper that he presented on December 28, 1905 to a joint meeting of the AAA and the AIA in Ithaca, New York (p. 238).

Hewett quickly recognized that a key to successful antiquities legislation lay in solving the jurisdictional problem created by passage of the 1905 Forest Transfer Act. Indeed, as Thompson notes, Hewett, more than any other archaeologist, recognized that the struggle to pass antiquities legislation was not a scientific issue but a political one (p. 274). It was Hewett’s recognition of this basic fact, combined with his diplomatic ability to make his points forcefully but delicately, that laid the groundwork for passage of the Antiquities Act. It was also his modesty regarding his own accomplishments that has resulted in his central role and importance in the preservation of antiquities in the United States being less widely known, understood, and appreciated than they should be among both historians of archaeology and archaeologists (pp. 273-274).

Hewett, of course, did not act alone, nor could he have accomplished passage of the Antiquities Act without the sponsorship and support of many archaeologists and politicians. Thompson refers to the core group of supporters as the “Antiquities Bill Alliance” (pp. 284-289), but notes that it was informal and ephemeral, albeit highly successful (p. 318). Among Hewett’s colleagues in this work (but not limited to them) were Binger Hermann and W. A. Richards of the General Land Office, Iowa Representative John Fletcher Lacey and Massachusetts Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Alice C. Fletcher and Matilda Coxe Stevenson, Frederick Ward Putnam of Harvard, William Henry Holmes, Chief of the BAE, Ethan Allen Hitchcock, Secretary of the Interior, President Theodore Roosevelt, and many others. Passage of Lacey’s 1900 federal Bird and Game Act established a precedent for federal protection of natural resources, and this act served as a model for Hewett in drafting the text for the Antiquities Act (p. 302).

The third phase - the final push for passage of antiquities legislation - began early in 1906. The paper
that Hewett had read in December, 1905 was accompanied by a revised draft of an antiquities bill that was unanimously endorsed at the joint business meeting of the AAA and AIA (p. 238). On January 9, 1906, Representative John Fletcher Lacey introduced it as H.R. 11016, and Senator Thomas MacDonald Patterson of Colorado introduced it as S.4698 (pp. 238-239). It was reported favorably out of committees in both Houses, and was signed into law on June 8, 1906 by President Roosevelt. Not a single word had been changed from Hewett's original draft that Lacey and Patterson had introduced (p. 241). Because of Lacey's strong support, the Antiquities Act was, for years afterwards, "familiarly called the Lacey Act" (p. 242). Clearly, Hewett's friendship and working relationship with Lacey, and Lacey's political skills, were critical to passage of its passage (p. 312).

The bill was law. Thompson notes (p. 312), "Just 24 years and a month separated Senator Hoar's petition to save Pecos and the passage of a law that protected the archaeological resources on 'all lands owned and controlled by the United States.'" We should bear these "Just 24 years and a month..." in mind next time the media or we complain about legislative gridlock.

Thompson states (p. 315) "The most fundamental principle underlying the Antiquities Act is the assertion of a public interest in the federal ruins and the congressional acceptance of the responsibility to protect the public's interest." This is "basic to all other national historic preservation policy" (p. 316). Another basic principle was Hewett's belief that "every site and its contents are a repository of information about the past" (p. 314). Thompson further states that Hewett also laid the intellectual groundwork for both salvage archaeology and cultural resource management "because he gave priority to the information in the site rather than to the site itself" (p. 317). Thus, in Thompson's view, this enables archaeologists to respond rationally to economic and political realities; they do not have to save everything and can focus on recovering the data that make "the ruins valuable in the first place" (p. 317).

The problem here is not so much in what Thompson writes, but in how CRM contract work has been implemented. Too often the goal of such work has been simply recovery of data without a theoretical perspective and accompanying methodology. Materials are recovered but frequently neither analyzed nor reported because of lack of funds for anything other than fieldwork, per se. Furthermore, the rapidity of the fieldwork is such that the context in which the materials are found is poorly understood, or even ignored. When reported, most often in the so-called "gray literature," the data and analyses, if any, are not widely available for use by others.

Finally, there are a few errors and omissions worth noting. A major omission is the lack of an index that would help the reader to find specific references to particular people and events. The Hyde Exploring Expedition was not excavating at Chaco Canyon in 1904 (p. 217); its archaeological work at Chaco had effectively ended there with the close of the 1899 field season, though Richard Wetherill did continue to do some minor work and to purchase Navajo and Pueblo textiles and other materials for sale in the Hyde Brothers' stores. S. J. Holsinger's 1901 report condemning (often unfairly) Richard Wetherill's archaeological activities at Chaco Canyon is cited (pp. 218, 220) but not listed among the references. Charles Lange's last name is incorrectly spelled as Laog (p. 288/line 21), though correctly spelled elsewhere on the same page.

In summary, Thompson and Lee have provided a fine overview and analysis of the Antiquities Act of 1906 and the central role of Edgar Lee Hewett in its creation and passage. American archaeology owes Hewett a great debt in this regard, and we owe Raymond Thompson and the Journal of the Southwest our thanks for making this volume available. It is "dirt-cheap." Every archaeologist should own it.
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There have been two previous volumes published on Great Archaeologists, one for young adults (Daugherty 1962) and one a collection of articles from the *Illustrated London News* (Bacon 1976). What really distinguishes this two volume set from the earlier books is that who was included was decided by archaeologists, rather than by educators or journalists. Archaeologists whose lives are considered great for didactic or journalistic reasons are most likely to be active in spectacular fieldwork and the Gordon Childes or James B. Griffins are less likely to be included.

Tim Murray, with the assistance of an editorial board, had the daunting task of putting together a list of individuals that met the criteria of great and then, not insignificantly, finding someone to write the biographies. The volumes under review contain articles on 58 archaeologists and represents a unique resource for those of us interested in the history of the discipline (*BHA* 10[1]:41-44) gives a complete list of the subjects and authors). Because who is considered great is very much the result of one’s training, one’s first reaction to the volume could be to carp about who isn’t included. The editor gives his own list of significant omissions in the introduction (my personal nominee is Sergei Semenov, whose work on stone tool function probably had more influence on the development of archaeology than any of the Russian or Soviet archaeologists included), but the focus should be what is in the volume rather than who isn’t.

*The Great Archaeologists* begins with William Camden born in 1551 and ends with David Clarke born in 1935. Sandwiched between these two in order by date of birth are 56 other mostly European, male archaeologists. Kathleen Kenyon and Dorothy Garrod are the only women included. When a volume of great archaeologists is done a century from now the representation of women will certainly be much greater. Non-Europeans are scarce as well, with only three Chinese and one Indian represented.