

However, not all that the neo-Marxists have introduced to archaeology is constructive, argues Trigger. For example, in their attempt to make archaeologists aware of the limits to their own objectivity, some neo-Marxists, (here he primarily means Michael Shanks and Christopher Tilley) developed an extreme relativism which Trigger interprets as "intellectual nihilism." This involves, says Trigger, the abandonment of materialism in favor of an idealist orientation. This is an irony, he suggests, as Marx and Engels argued that such an idealist perspective would eliminate the possibility of an effective theory of change, making a challenge to power of the ruling class unthinkable. Trigger believes that this perspective reduces "all knowledge to the level of self-serving fantasies" (p. 181), which ultimately support the conservative arguments that seek to "discredit Marxism, the social sciences, and ultimately science itself...as an arbiter of truth" (Ibid).

Perhaps Trigger's most essential critique of the fractious schools of thought he defines as neo-Marxism is his insight that "classical Marxism's theory of knowledge is closer to the positivist epistemology of processual archaeology than it is the nihilism of the more extreme neo-Marxist idealists" (p. 186). Although he does not say it in as many words, Trigger is revealing the contradictions between classical Marxism's intimate role in the construction of modernist hegemony, which gave birth to processualism, and neo-Marxism's role in the postmodern critique, which has resulted in the partial dismantling of that hegemony. Trigger implies that this contradiction is insurmountable when he suggests that idealist explanations should forfeit the right to bear the name neo-Marxist.

Although Trigger is quite critical of those archaeologists he identifies as "hyperrelativists," his prognosis for Marxism in Western archaeology is cautiously optimistic. Accepting the neo-Marxist argument that a system of thought will be influenced if not determined by a dominant political system, Trigger suggests that the decline of the corrupt socialist regimes of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union could result in a wider acceptance of Marxist philosophy in the West. In a slightly veiled censure of political conservatives like Frances Puyama who predicted that the so-called "fall of communism" signaled the final victory of capitalism and the end of history, Trigger pronounces that the growing economic, social and political crises of Western societies leave the future of capitalism somewhat in doubt. Trigger's final and somewhat optimistic thought seems to be this: Classical Marxism has been widely discredited as a result of its manipulation by corrupt and tyrannical political regimes; with the dismantling of those regimes, it may yet experience a process of renewal as a materialist philosophical system, provided that it can survive the challenge of the neo-Marxists.

Trigger's article is a timely and important consideration of the sometimes tenuous relationship between Marxism and the postprocessual critique of mainstream archaeology. He is rightly concerned that the hyperrelativism and exclusively idealist perspectives that have developed within postprocessual neo-Marxism can be self-defeating. While it is important to recognize that archaeologists are and always will be influenced by their particular socio-political milieu, the argument that there is no subjectively knowable past can both paralyze and discredit archaeological pursuits. In order to overcome potentially disabling nihilism, Trigger challenges neo-Marxist archaeologists to integrate classical Marxist thought more directly into their work. As Trigger argues, Marxism is at its core an empirical and materialist system of understanding the operation of the world. I find that I must agree with Professor Trigger; if it is to remain a viable system of archaeology, Marxist archaeology must return to Marx.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.03204>

"Archaeology at the University of Kansas: Williston, Eiseley, Spaulding, Smith", edited by Marlin F. Hawley. *The Kansas Anthropologist*, 13(1 and 2):1-72, 1992. \$5.00 (Paper)

by

Richard B. Woodbury  
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Histories of archaeology on a national or continental scale can include only the briefest details of individual contributions. By contrast, a history focused on a region or state, in this case Kansas, can provide substantial information on the careers and achievements of its people and thus make a valuable contribution to archaeological history. Somewhat comparable publications are *Essays in the History of Plains Archeology* by Waldo R. Wedel and *Conceptions of Kentucky Prehistory* by Douglas W. Schwartz. There are essays here on Samuel Wendell Williston by John D. Reynolds, on Loren C. Eiseley by Marlin F. Hawley, on Albert C Spaulding also by Hawley, and on Carlyle C. Smith by Carlyle C. Smith. Williston was at the University of Kansas from 1890 to 1902, teaching geology and anatomy. He did extensive geological research and limited archaeological field work, which included El Cuartejejo pueblo ruin. Most importantly, he reported the association of a stone projectile point with the bones of *Bison occidentalis*. Not until 1937 was there an anthropologist-archaeologist at Kansas, Loren Eiseley, who taught in the sociology department. He carried out the first excavation of an Archaic site in the state and laid the foundation for archaeology's and biological anthropology's permanent places in the curriculum, though excavation plans were frustrated by World War II. (His first budget request was for \$3200, for a full summer of fieldwork.) In 1944 he accepted an invitation from Oberlin College to chair its sociology department. His successor, Spaulding, was at Kansas only 18 months, but accomplished a great deal: extensive archaeological site surveying, establishing good relations with local collectors, and initiating productive cooperation with the new River Basin Surveys. He also taught and served as the anthropology curator in the Natural History Museum. In 1947 James Griffin invited him to the University of Michigan. Carlyle Smith was at the University of Kansas from 1947 until retirement in 1980. His accomplishments are far too numerous to summarize briefly. He immediately began field work, first at the Kanopolis Reservoir, and later developed a major interest in tracing the historic Arikara back to their Pawnee affiliation. Probably best known is his extensive work at the Talking Crow site in South Dakota. He also spent a season with Thor Heyerdahl's archaeological expedition to Easter Island, as well as becoming an expert on gun flints and

antique firearms. Besides extensive archaeological information, there are biographical sketches here of these four individuals who began archaeology in Kansas and carried it forward with such success. Much of this information came from the extensive archives at the University of Kansas. Histories of archaeology in other states would be welcome and this one can serve as a demonstration of how much can be done when the original documentation has been preserved.

*The Tainos: Rise and Decline of the People Who Greeted Columbus*, by Irving Rouse, Yale University Press, New Haven. 1992.  
\$27.50 (cloth), \$12.00 (paper)

by

James A. Delle  
Department of Anthropology  
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

There are few people who can claim to command as much knowledge of the prehistory of the Caribbean as Irving Rouse. Professor Rouse began his field work in the Caribbean in the mid-1930's; this book is his synthesis of the vast amount of information he has accumulated on the region in the half century that has elapsed since that time. In order to accomplish the tremendous task of interpreting nearly 6000 years of the region's prehistory, Rouse focused this book on the culture history of the Native American group known as the Tainos, the name given to the people who occupied much of the Caribbean upon the arrival of Europeans to the area in the 15th century A.D.

Professor Rouse utilizes an evolutionary approach to construct his culture history of the Tainos and their ancestors that is based upon the tenets of cultural ecology, e.g., "Classic Taino culture appears to have been evolving toward full civilization..." (p. 19), "To what extent these resemblances are the result of interaction or of parallel adaptation to similar ecological conditions remains to be determined" (p. 21). His analysis proceeds from the argument that there were three distinct ethnic groups inhabiting the Caribbean at the time of contact, the Guanahatebeys in western Cuba, the Island-Caribs in the south-western islands of the Lesser Antilles, and the Tainos themselves in the Greater Antilles and the Bahamas. This argument (presented in the introductory chapter) is based on Rouse's analysis of ethnohistorical information provided by the 15th and 16th century chroniclers of the Caribbean region and corroborated by the available archaeological evidence.

In Rouse's model, ethnic groups and subgroups are distinguished by their cultural, linguistic and biological heritages. He seeks to define these heritages and thus to form a culture history for the peoples of the Caribbean by considering their archaeological, linguistic and biological records. The resulting culture history, based primarily on ceramic analysis, suggests that the ancestors of the Tainos originally migrated into the Caribbean from the Orinoco Valley of mainland South America at about 2000 B.C. eventually assimilating and/or replacing groups that had migrated through the region several thousand years earlier; he suggests that the scarcer linguistic and skeletal evidence corroborates this theory of Taino ancestry, as well as subsequent migrations through the Caribbean.

The middle three chapters of the book, chapters III, IV and V, present Rouse's culture history of the Caribbean. He uses a taxonomic system to distinguish between groups and subgroups of people, which is based primarily on ceramic sequences and augmented by other classes of material culture. His scheme must be commended for its comprehensive spatial and temporal coverage; however his presentation of the culture history sequences can be difficult to follow at times. For example, someone not well-versed in Caribbean prehistory could easily confuse the Casimiran Casimiroid, Courian Casimiroid and Corosan Casimiroid subgroups. Such complexity would not necessarily be a problem, except that Rouse states in his preface that the book "is addressed not only to...colleagues in academia but also to the interested public" (p. xi). Someone with no background in taxonomy or ceramic analysis could find this section of Rouse's book extremely challenging to follow. Similarly, his presentation of Archaic Age and subsequent Ceramic Age migrations could have easily been made more lucid by the inclusion of maps outlining the migratory schemes he proposes.

In the sixth and final chapter of the book, Rouse presents his version of the European conquest of the Caribbean, which he calls "the second re-peopling." While his chronology of events surrounding the voyages of Columbus is solid, I must disagree with his conclusion that the genocide of the Tainos in the 15th and 16th centuries "resulted from circumstance." Rouse takes exception to revisionist scholars of the Caribbean who blame Columbus and the Spanish conquistadors for causing the genocide of the Tainos (e.g., Konig 1976; Sued-Badillo 1992a, 1992b). Rouse maintains, rather, that the genocide of the Tainos "resulted from circumstance; all the parties to the event had to adapt to the natural, cultural, and social conditions in which they lived" (p. 139). While this interpretation of the events of the late 15th and early 16th centuries does try to elevate the Tainos from the role of passive victims, it naturalizes the violent demographic crisis initiated by the Europeans. It would not be a far leap to suggest that because the Tainos were unable to adapt to conditions of slavery and widespread violence, it was only natural that they should become extinct. Although based in cultural ecology, such an interpretation dangerously resembles social Darwinism. Furthermore Rouse equates the depopulation caused by the European colonization of the Caribbean, which took decades, with the cultural expansion of the Saladoid peoples, which took centuries.