

In conclusion, this is a useful, thought-provoking book, but all-too-short and imbalanced. More fully developed examples from remote prehistory and from other world regions would have been useful. At any rate, one hopes that this and other works will help effectuate a rapprochement between anthropological archeology and socioeconomic history.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.02205>

***Oral History Index: An International Directory of Oral History Interviews*, Meckler Corporation, 1990. \$75.00 (Cloth)**

by

Douglas R. Givens
Department of Behavioral Sciences
Saint Louis Community College-Meramec
Saint Louis, Missouri

Meckler Corporation has done a great service to those of us interested in using the vehicle of oral history of aid in the writing of the history of archaeology. There are close to 2000 entries in the volume. Among the entries there are a few archaeologists listed from North America.

The listings of oral histories are alphabetically arranged in the volume. There is also a very handy and informative listing Oral History Centers in the back of the volume that researchers interest in the history of archaeology might find valuable. The Meckler Corporation has not indicated whether this volume will be continually updated. If it is in the future, the volume would be better used in a computerized database format for easy access. If the current effort is indeed continually updated it will be a great source of information to those of us doing work in the history of archaeology in the future.

Recovering the Tracks. The Story of Australian Archaeology, by David Horton, Aboriginal Studies Press, Canberra, xviii + 360pp., illustrations, ISBN 0-85575-1, 1991, (Paper Only)

by

Timothy Murray
Clare Hall, Cambridge/
Department of Archaeology
LaTrobe University,
Bundoora, Victoria 3083, Australia

This history of archaeology in Australia has been pretty well served since Mulvaney's highly influential survey of three hundred years of opinion about the nature of Australian Aboriginal people (1958). Indeed, the long-running debate about the identity of Australian archaeology, particularly about the extent to which it has developed a distinctive style, or whether its fundamental precepts and orientations remain essentially undeveloped derivations from English and North American influences, has tended to provide a ready market for research into the history of Australian archaeology (see e.g. Golson 1986; McBryde 1986; Meehand and Jones 1988; Murray and White 1981, Murray *in press* (a) *in press* (b)).

Other spurs to research such as the need to monitor the development of heritage legislation (McBryde 1985, Mulvaney 1979, 1989;) of major institutions such as the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (Mulvaney 1986; Peterson 1990) or of various of the other Museums or Departments of Anthropology or Archaeology around the country (have created a situation where practitioners seek a more comprehensive understanding of the nature and context of archaeology as a social and cultural institution, as well as a discipline.

On a slightly more abstract level Australian historians of archaeology have focused their attention on the professionalisation of their discipline, on parallel (but sometimes divergent) histories of Aboriginal anthropology and history, and of course on the role of postcolonial science in the building of postcolonial cultures (see Mulvaney 1988; Murray *in press* (c)). To put the matter bluntly, the history of Australian archaeology is also a sociology of Australian archaeologists, as well as a context within which observers of the Australian cultural scene can help to study the genesis and development of Australianess. Naturally these concerns are shared by many historians of archaeology in other parts of the world (see e.g. the contributions of Pinsky and Wylie 1990), and I raise them here because *Recovering the Tracks* pursues a very different course, one that would have seemed mainstream as recently as five years ago. This feeling that we have something out of time, if not out of place, makes reviewing the present work a difficult task.