DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.05206

A History of American Archaeology, by Gordon R. Willey and Jeremy A. Sabloff, 3rd edition. W. H. Freeman and Co., New York, 1993. xv + 385 pp.

Reviewed by

Andrew L. Christenson
Consulting Archaeologist
Prescott, Arizona

Those who were waiting to see dramatic changes in Willey and Sabloff will be disappointed. The first five chapters are virtually identical to the previous edition, except that Indians have been transformed into Native Americans and the footnotes have been expanded somewhat to incorporate new publications. I have little to say about this section, which comprises two-thirds of the book, and which does a reasonable job of covering the major archaeologists and themes of the first 100+ years of American archaeology. There are always specific points that one can take issue with but the authors make a real effort to cover American archaeology prior to 1960 in its broadest sense.

The final chapter takes up the story in 1960 and it is here that serious problems arise in the correspondence between the story and reality. Although this chapter is supposed to cover the period from 1960 to 1992, the authors really discuss little of significance that has happened in the field since the publication of the second edition in 1980. They cease to discuss the on-the ground, day-to-day aspect of archaeology that had balanced the discussion of the intellectual side of the discipline in the pre-1980 period. The reason for this change is not hard to find. I think that it is possible (but needs to be demonstrated) that in the first three-quarters of the century, the correspondence between what was published in easily accessible journal and what was actually happening in the field had a vague correspondence and would allow someone to write a history of the field using a major university library. Beginning perhaps in the 1970s and becoming increasingly significant in the 1980s, the gulf between what was happening in the field and what ended up in the journals became so disparate that just reading American Antiquity or a few other major journals would not give a historian even a vaguely representative idea of what archaeologists were doing or thinking. The authors acknowledge this problem at the beginning of Chapter 6 (p. 215), but then proceed on as if the problem was not important.

The authors are prominent members of what could be called the education-oriented, knowledge-for-knowledge's-sake side of archaeology that dominated the field for so long , but that is now in the minority (a part of the discipline with which I have a strong attachment to and sympathy with). American archaeology, both practical and theoretical, is now dominated by cultural resource management (CRM) which receives only brief mention in the epilogue of the book. CRM has been around for over half a century, as the authors point out in earlier chapters. Indeed, the senior author was involved in WPA archaeology during the depression. The authors chose, however, to ignore CRM in the present (their bibliography includes only two CRM reports, one written 10 years ago and one written 20 years ago), in part, no doubt because of their own unfamiliarity with the topic and literature but also because they may never have completed this edition if they had taken CRM as a serious subject for historical research! They refer to the "gray literature" problem in archaeology (p. 315), an issue that makes writing a history of archaeological in the last 15 years a daunting and nearly impossible task. The problem has improved somewhat because many private firms have started publication series, making their CRM reports available to a wider audience than merely government bureaucrats. Unfortunately, because of declining library budgets it is unlikely that complete sets of any of these series get to libraries, so that the task of the CRM historian is only slightly easier than it was ten years ago.

Because archaeologists in CRM are under no pressure to get tenure or to fill their vitas, they are much less likely to publish articles in major journals, with the result that information of CRM work is more localized, even though it often is at the cutting edge of method and theory in the discipline. Thus, the luxury of writing a history of recent American archaeology from what is available in a major library is simply not possible and whoever seriously takes on the task will have to wear out many pairs of shoes and accumulate numerous frequent flyer miles to get it done adequately !

The bibliography of the book is extensive and quite useful, although it needs more careful editing as there are a number of errors or omissions (e.g., Baldwin 1872 is not in the references nor was it in the last edition). Peculiarly, this is the only book that I have ever encountered where the text begins on p. 0.

If you have the second edition of this volume, hold onto it. If you don't have that volume and need a single volume summary of the major trends in American archaeology, this is it, but don't expect to obtain much enlightenment about what was happening in the field in the 1980s and early 1990s.

Arthur Posnansky y su *Obsesión Milenaria. Biografía Intelectual de un Pionero*, by Carlos Ponce Sangines, 1994, La Paz: Producciones Cima.

Reviewed by

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

Ponce proposes to develop an intellectual history of Posnansky, whom many view as the father of Bolivian archaeology, which he hopes will contribute to the establishment of context for the development of local prehistory. However, for the most part, the volume serves more as a foil for Ponce to refer to his own work and publications, as they update, contradict, and improve on the earlier archaeological reconstructions of Posnansky.
Arthur Posnansky (1873-1946) was an important contributor to Bolivian culture history, being not only a pioneer in Bolivian archaeology, but also in Bolivian cinematography, in the development of the national park system, and in the introduction of the first automobile into Bolivia. He was trained as a naval engineer in his native Vienna, a skill which he quickly parlayed into a fortune in Bolivia in the rubber boom, in terms of transporting the latex by river transport. With the loss of Arce to Brazil in 1903, he shifted his focus to other fields. He brought the first gasoline-powered motor boat to Lake Titicaca that year, and while visiting the excavations of the French Crequi-Montfort and Senechal de La Grange Mission, under the direction of George Courty, during trips to the lake, he became very intrigued with the site of Tiwanaku and its place in Bolivian prehistory. Posnansky shortly thereafter began his extensive collection of material artifacts from Tiwanaku, constructing the "Palacio Tihuanacu" in 1917-1918 to house the stela, ceramics and other materials which he collected. This structure and its collections were subsequently sold to the state, becoming the current the Museo Nacional de Arqueologia.

Posnansky's maritime interests led him to understand now isolated strand lines as the remnants of once higher levels of Lake Titicaca. This led him to his theory of catastrophism at Tiwanaku, a theme he kept publishing on through his life, wherein he proposed a seismic cataclysm resulting in the flooding and abandonment of Tiwanaku. Ponce trashes the idea as inappropriate influence of Cuvier style biological catastrophism, but we should remember that Michael Moseley and Alan Kolata, fresh from their work at Chan Chan in the early 1 980s, where seismic factors were extremely critical, also delivered papers invoking seismic disasters for Tiwanaku, although they now invoke other mechanisms for the collapse of this polity.