The Great Southwest of the Fred Harvey Company and the Santa Fe Railway, edited by Marta Weigle and Barbara A. Babcock. The Heard Museum, Phoenix (printed by The University of Arizona Press, Tucson, for The Heard Museum), 1996, vii-xvii+254 pages. $24.95.

by

Douglas R. Givens
Department of Anthropology
Saint Louis Community College-Meramec

One of the more colorful eras in American Southwestern archaeology is reflected in *The Great Southwest of the Fred Harvey Company and the Santa Fe Railway*. Marta Weigle and Barbara A. Babcock, editors of the volume, have done a superb job weaving in early Southwestern archaeological activities with the role of the Fred Harvey Company and the Santa Fe Railway in bring the American Southwest to those "east of the Mississippi River." Many early Southwestern archaeologists made their way throughout the Southwest on the Santa Fe Railway while the "outposts of civilization" that the Fred Harvey Company provided in many railroad stations served as a "bit of home" to the traveler. This book describes the collaboration of both Fred Harvey and the Santa Fe Railroad on tourism in the American Southwest and provides an excellent look into the Native American artists and their communities which were transformed on a massive scale by the Fred Harvey Company as it bought, sold, and popularized Native American art. Also part of the volume is an excellent discussion of the network of major museums that hold art collections which were purchased through the Harvey Company's Indian Department. Artwork from Native American groups from the Plains, the Southwest, California, and the Pacific Northwest are represented in the Harvey collections which were acquired by the Fred Harvey Company and later bought by the Smithsonian Institution, the American Museum of Natural History, the Field Museum in Chicago, the Carnegie Museum, the Denver Art Museum, and many other institutions. The collected essays in the volume reveal the range and uniqueness of the Indian Department's relationship with these museums. In 1978, the Fred Harvey Fine Arts Foundation made the decision to make the Heard Museum the permanent repository for more than 4,000 objects which were formerly part of the Indian Department's collection. Of particular interest to historians of archaeology is the contributed article to the volume by Marsha C. Bol, "Collecting Symbolism Among the Arapaho: George A. Dorsey and C. Warden, Indian." The volume is richly illustrated and the photographic archival material used in the volume is of exceptional quality. This volume would be an excellent addition to a university or museum entity having an interest in American Southwestern artwork.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.07215

***Colonial Indology: Sociopolitics of the Ancient Indian Past*, by Dilip K. Chakrabarti, Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers, New Delhi, India, 1997. xi + 257 pages, references, index. Rs 350 (cloth).**

Bruce G. Trigger
Department of Anthropology
McGill University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

Colonial Indology **is the first extended critique of the premises underlying the Western study of ancient Indian history and archaeology and, as such, fills a major gap in the history of archaeology. It complements Ronald Inden's *Imagining India* (1390), a general critique of Western Indological scholarship, which asserts that it has portrayed India in terms of static essences in a way that minimizes the creativity of the Indian people. *Colonial Indology*'s author, the renowned Indian archaeologist Dilip Chakrabarti, who has long been interested in the history of archaeology in his homeland, argues that views of Indian history that were**

created to serve the interests of Western colonialism are still accepted not only by Western scholars but also by many prominent Indian archaeologists who wish to associate themselves with the international archaeological community, as well as by India's modernizing establishment, who prefer to emphasize their country's mystical, rather than its historical, past. More recently world attention has been drawn to Indian archaeologists who have been using their discipline to promote the cause of Hindu nationalism. Some of these played a major role in urging the attack on the 16th century mosque at Ayodhya in northern India in December 1992.

In a long introductory chapter, Chakrabarti surveys growing worldwide awareness of the political uses that have been, and still are, being made of archaeology. His position is that of a moderate relativist who believes that archaeological data have a significant role to play in determining the accuracy and inaccuracy of historical interpretations. Chapter 2 provides an extensive and intensely interesting review of concepts of race, language, and culture in the Western study of ancient India from the 18th century to the present. As colonial regimes were established, India ceased to be romanticized as a source of ancient wisdom. Instead it was caricatured as a racially inferior and culturally backward region, whose many peoples lacked ethnic and cultural unity and were unable to govern themselves. At the same time, European scholars recognized that languages closely related to those of Europe were spoken throughout much of South Asia. They used this knowledge to try to divide Indians further and to reconcile the Indian upper classes to British rule by arguing that successive waves of IndoEuropeans and other northern peoples had penetrated India, temporarily uniting the country and reinvigorating Indian civilization, and survived as India's higher castes and Muslim rulers. According to this interpretation of history, these were the Indians most closely related, both physically and culturally, to India's European masters.

In Chapter 3, Chakrabarti urges the need for an alternative, unifying view of Indian history that would study the subcontinent as a developmental continuum that has "remained exclusively Indian throughout its entire term of duration" (p. 167) and treat the Indian past and present as embracing all "regional, caste, tribal, religious, sectarian and a whole host of other affiliations" (p. 208). Chakrabarti believes that this can best, and perhaps only, be done by focusing on the changing ways in which Indian people have interacted with the land; thus making archaeology an integral part of the environmental sciences.

While r greatly admire Chakrabarti's solution to sectarian strife over ancient monuments (which is based on the principle of coexistence), his dismissal of the Ayodhya incident as a local "law and order" problem seems to contradict his previous assertion that archaeology is pervaded by specific political and cultural prejudices and willingly or unwillingly becomes involved in political action. I would have appreciated being told as much about the political agendas of those who are using archaeology to promote Hindu nationalism as about the divisive politics of the internationally-oriented, post-independence Indian establishment.

Charkrabarti's own Indocentrism clearly is as far removed from the divisive politics of Hindu nationalists as it is from those of modernizers. The issues that he raises are also ones of great importance that confront archaeologists everywhere. Specifically, Chakrabarti disapproves of the Indian version of the ethnically-oriented, culture-historical archaeology that once dominated Europe and North America and currently seems to be staging a modest revival in Europe. This kind of archaeology is the disciplinary incarnation of European romanticism's preoccupation with ethnic diversity and cultural specificity. Opposed to it, since the 1960s, has been neoevolutionary, ecologically-oriented, processual archaeology, which is the most recent embodiment of the rationalism and universalism of the enlightenment. Elsewhere, because of its unacceptable pretense to political and ethical neutrality and its denial of human agency, I characterized the original formulation of processual archaeology as a reflection of post-war U.S. imperial values; a view that I still hold. Yet, by downplaying ethnicity and encouraging the investigation of the creative adaptations of human beings in every part of the world, processual archaeology inadvertently has helped to purge the discipline of much of the racism and ethnocentricity that had been rampant in culture historical archaeology. In aligning

himself with an ecological approach, Chakrabarti is consciously trying to achieve the same goal for Indian archaeology.

No archaeological practice is free from social and political bias; furthermore, ethnicity, being a purely cultural concept, is far more difficult to study than archaeologists once believed. Yet I doubt that people anywhere will ever stop insisting that archaeologists try to answer their questions about ethnic prehistory. Movements of people and changing concepts of identity are in any case legitimate problems for historical investigation. Finally, it is erroneous to conclude that a particular approach in archaeology inevitably is linked to a specific ideology. Evolutionism has at various times been tied to racist as well as universalist viewpoints; while romantic approaches have both celebrated cultural diversity and encouraged bigotry and ethnocentrism.

I agree, however, with Chakrabarti that a sound understanding of the ecological and social development of India, which is more accessible to archaeological investigation than are issues of ethnicity, would provide a solid background against which questions of ethnicity might be studied. I hope that a processual approach, such as is being advocated by Chakrabarti, K. Paddayya, and others can help to promote among Indians the sense of communal solidarity that Chakrabarti values so highly.

Digging through Darkness by Carmel Schrire, 1995, University Press of Virginia. 286pp. ISBN 0-8139-1558-9, Cloth. $29.95

by

Tim Murray
Department of Archaeology
LaTrobe University
Bundoora, Victoria, Australia

It is a great pity that archaeologists tend not to write like this. Over the last decade with the rise (and the eagerly awaited fall) of post modernist perspectives in the discipline we have become accustomed to archaeologists proselytising about the aridity of much archaeological writing, supposedly brought about by a lack of critical self-reflection, or by an outmoded adherence to the subject-object distinction. But answering the call for a more "humane" archaeology has instead simply led to the replacement of a "positivist" aridity with even more vapid, abstracted, and disconnected discourse about archaeology, with interpretation stalled in abstractions of poorly understood and even more poorly applied perspectives from the human sciences or from "cultural studies". Instead of the passion and high principle which is evident in best of Gordon Childe's writing or even, surprisingly, the closing chapter of more conventional works such as Lubbock's *Prehistoric Times*, we have regular rehearsals of the elite sensibilities of archaeologists from centres of academic over-production in England and the United States. These have proved not to be very interesting, either as archaeology or as fiction.

Perhaps the problem stems from the fact that if archaeologists want to dispense with a meaningful grappling with the empirical and to substitute this with discourse about archaeology or a pastiche of abstractions about the meaning of the past, then they have to share this market with a great many others who have much experience at telling interesting stories, or who produce the perspectives that archaeologists so assiduously borrow. Thus far the bulk of archaeologists have not been equal to the contest.

Carmel Schrire's *Digging through Darkness* is an exception to this not so wild overgeneralisation. Part (or whole?) antobiography, part discussion of some of the consequences of colonialism in South Africa and