

review are sent on a first-come-first serve basis. Reviews of the volume selected are due to the Editor generally one month before (April or October) the publication of each issue of the BHA (May and November):

Birmingham, Robert A and Leslie E. Eisenberg
2000 *Indian Mounds of Wisconsin*, University of Chicago Press,
Chicago.

“Cultural Resources and the Interior Department: An Overview”
2000 *CRM*, 22(4), National Park Service, Washington D.C.

“Dam Good Archeology”
2000 *CRM*, 23(1) The Bureau of Reclamation’s Cultural Resources Program,
National Park Service, Washington D.C.

Fox, Edward
2001 *Sacred Geography: A Tale of Murder and Archeology in the Holy Land*,
Metropolitan/Holt, New York. - Richard B. Woodbury. (Volume explores the
mysteries surrounding the death of Glock who was a founder of the archaeology
department at Bir Zeit University on the West Bank. Glock wanted to establish an
archaeological program that would emphasize the Palestinian presence in the Middle
East.)

Historical Perspectives on Midsouth Archeology
2001 edited by Martha Ann Rolingson, Arkansas Archeological Survey
Series 58, Fayetteville.

Watkins, Joe
2000 *Indigenous Archaeology: American Indian Values and Scientific Practice*,
AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek.

Whalen, Michael E. and Paul E. Minnis
2001 *Casas Grandes and Its Hinterland*, University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

V. Book/Journal Article Reviews

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.11203>

Archaeology in Latin America, by Gustavo G. Politis and Benjamin Alberti, editors, 1999,
Routledge, London

by

David L. Browman
Washington University
Saint Louis, Missouri 63130

The two editors argue in their preface to the volume that the particular sociopolitical context of Latin America has led to a regionalism not seen in North America or Europe, resulting in a unique variety

of archaeology. They particularly conceive "Latin American archaeology" in this case to be only that archaeology done by individuals who are citizens of the countries of the region, and they exclude from consideration as being considered "Latin American archaeology" the work of foreign scholars such as North Americans and Europeans who do research in the region.

One of the three defined sections in the volume is explicitly devoted to the history of development of contemporary archaeology in Latin America by Latin Americans. In all, six of the thirteen chapters in the volume address issues and components of the history of Latin American archaeology, while the other seven are mainly regional data synthesis papers.

Gustavo Politis starts the work out with a chapter on an "inside view" of the development of Latin American archaeology. He maintains that two main features characterize the majority of recent archaeological enterprises by Latin Americans, no matter the local region: first a strong emphasis on empirical studies, and second a basic culture-historical orientation. What cultural-processual studies there are, he argues, are at best modest, and are usually explicitly tied to nationalist programs. To provide a bit of Latin American historical development flavor, Politis identifies and summarizes the influence of the work of a series of individuals whom he considers to be major regional archaeologists, from the late 19th century through the 20th century, including Florentino Ameghino and Alberto Rex Gonzalez from Argentina, Jose Toribio Medina from Chile, Gerardo Reichel-Dolmatoff from Colombia, Manuel Gamio and Jose Luis Lorenzo from Mexico, and Julio C. Tello from Peru.

The separate chapters by Pedro Paulo A. Funari, Jose M. Lopez Mazz, and Eduardo G. Neves all provide commentaries on the history of the development of Amazonian archaeology. In the first of these chapters, Funari limits the scope of reference in his study to Brazil, and proposes dividing the history of Brazilian archaeological growth into six periods of development, including a commentary on how archaeology developed for each of the time frames: The Colonial period (1500-1822), The Brazilian Empire period (1822-1889); The Early Republic period (1889-1920s), The Intenvar period (1920s-1940s); The Inception of University Research period (1950s-1964), and The Military period, including the constitution of an archaeological establishment (1964-1985). He also incorporates commentary on the historical evolution of Brazilian developments in specific topical areas, such as First American colonization, cultural ecology studies, rock art, and historical archaeology.

Lopez Mazz embraces a wider Amazonian focus, including both Brazil and Uruguay, in his chapter. His focus is upon how various exogenous trends impacted regional development, particularly those emanating from European sources. Thus he starts out with an evaluation of French influence on the development of late 19th and 20th century studies, particularly focusing on Paul Rivet and his contributions. Lopez then segues into the influence of topical studies on the historic development of Amazonian archaeology: how the search for possible late Pleistocene occupation sites and materials impacted local archaeological trends, again identifying a strong French influence, and how the structuralist theoretical paradigm from social anthropology particularly impacted the studies of rock art.

Neves focuses his chapter on Amazonia primarily on the evolution of 20th century developments in this region, and in his case, perceives the major exogenous influences to have come from North American scholars. He details his view of the changing perspectives in the interpretation of Amazonian archaeology during that time frame, with a particular concern on how issues of cultural ecology, chronology, and linguistic studies have impacted the field archaeologists working in the region.

Iraida Vargas Arenas and Mario Sanoja Obediente elaborate their view of Latin American social archaeology and its origin. This paradigm, which is clearly oriented towards Marxism, emerged, and attracted proponents in several areas from the 1960s onward, including such major advocates as Felipe Bate and Manual Gandara in Mexico, Luis Guillermo Lumbreras in Peru, Marco Veloz Maggiolo in the Dominican Republic, Oscar Fonseca in Costa Rica, and Vargas and Sanoja in Venezuela. A significant part of Sanoja and Vargas's argument is that any archaeology must be a fundamental part of the national consciousness, and must be informed both by the history of the country and its contemporary destiny. Their social archaeology involves historical materialism as applied to archaeology, the interpretation of archaeological data using an historical materialist approach. Vargas and Sanoja start out by tracing what they believe to be the intellectual roots of Latin American 'social archaeology' which they see as a good counter foil to "processual archaeology". This school of thought emerged from isolated roots in several Latin American countries in the 1960s, which coalesced at a meeting of the International Congress of Americanists in Peru in 1970, growing more coherent and specific in objectives and agendas in meetings at Oaxtepec, Mexico in 1983 and 1987; at Lima and Cusco, Peru in 1984; and at Caracas, Venezuela, in 1985, all of which encounters are often subsumed under the umbrella term "the activities of the Grupo Oaxtepec". Vargas and Sanoja go on to identify educational institutions and journals in Venezuela, Mexico, and Peru, where the archaeology conducted is exclusively 'social archaeology'. In addition, as promoters of the method, they spend part of the rest of their chapter laying out the justification, and the basic assumptions and techniques of Latin American social archaeology, suggesting means by which it should and has informed archaeological research in the region. This chapter and its bibliography is the best mini-synopsis of this paradigm that I have seen in English.

Cristobal Gnecco also summarizes the development of a new variety of Latin American archaeology, one he terms "hegemonic archaeology", which he sees developing in Colombia. He is concerned about the "otherness" of both European-American processual archaeology and Latin American social archaeology, and is interested in trying to define an archaeology wherein the voices of the indigenous people who are being studied have a place. Although he terms this inclusion as "historical multivocality" and uses exclusively Colombian examples, for many of the readers of this journal, the majority of the concerns and issues that he identifies and raises are the same ones that are associated with the discussion of NAGPRA policy in the United States. As an example, Gnecco argues forcefully for the integration of indigenous origin myths as part of the non-Western systems of knowledge that must inform "hegemonic archaeology."

I originally picked up this volume because one of my interests is prehistoric Latin American archaeology. However, as noted above, in addition to several empirically-based culture-historical papers, I find that the volume also has a significant component of papers which deal with the historiography of our discipline exclusively from a Latin American perspective. It has an extensive index that includes both names and topics, as well as good bibliographies with each chapter, so will be useful for a number of historical studies.