



aspice, quam longi temporis acta canam

VOLUME 18

# THE REVIEW OF ARCHAEOLOGY

FALL 1997

NUMBER 2

The *Review of Archaeology* has as its only purpose the critical evaluation of the many kinds of records that affect the conduct of archaeology and the interpretation of prehistory. As a journal devoted to the review of archaeological literature, its basic commitment is to the profession.

Materials for review are selected by the contributing editors. In general, these will be drawn from the usual categories in which are found the great part of archaeological publication, site reports, articles, monographs, and these—in their various levels of formality. Popular presentations on archaeology may occasionally be reviewed. Older publications as well as those of recent issue will be considered. From time to time contributing editors may invite review articles from other scholars. Special thematic issues covering one area or topic may appear periodically.

The *Review of Archaeology* is printed on acid-free archival paper.

## Contributing Editors

HANS-GEORG BANDI (Universität Bern)	Palaeolithic art; Arctic	C.C. LAMBERG-KARLOVSKY (Harvard University)	Near East; Central Asia
OFER BAR-YOSEF (Harvard University)	Palaeolithic; Neolithic	YAROSLAV V. KUZMIN (Pacific Institute of Geography, Vladivostok)	Geoarchaeology; Siberia and the Russian Far East
PETER BELLWOOD (Australian National University)	Southeast Asia; Pacific	MICHAEL E. MOSELEY (University of Florida)	South America
AMILCARE BIETTI (Università di Roma)	Palaeolithic; Mesolithic; Mediterranean	HANSJÜRGEN MÜLLER-BECK (Universität Tübingen)	Western Europe; Arctic
JOHN R. F. BOWER (University of Minnesota)	Sub-Saharan Africa	MICHAEL J. O'BRIEN (University of Missouri - Columbia)	Mississippi Valley
JEFFREY P. BRAIN (Peabody Essex Museum, Salem)	Southeast U.S.; Historical	STANLEY J. OLSEN (University of Arizona)	Zooarchaeology
WARWICK BRAY (University of London)	Isthmus; Northern South America	G. PHILIP RIGHTMIRE (State University of New York, Binghamton)	Palaeoanthropology; Sub-Saharan Africa
ROY L. CARLSON (Simon Fraser University)	Northwest Coast; Western Canada	DEREK A. ROE (University of Oxford)	Palaeolithic; W. Europe; British Isles
KWANG-CHIH CHANG (Harvard University)	Asia	RALPH S. SOLECKI (Texas A & M University)	Near East
PAUL A. COLINVAUX (Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute)	Palynology	ROSE L. SOLECKI (Texas A & M University)	Near East
DENA F. DINCAUZE (University of Massachusetts)	Northeast U.S.	JAMES B. STOLTMAN (University of Wisconsin)	Central U.S.
WILLIAM F. FARRAND (University of Michigan)	Stratigraphy; Geoarchaeology	KENNETH B. TANKERSLEY (Kent State University)	Palaeoindian; Geoarchaeology
RICHARD I. FORD (University of Michigan)	Environmental archaeology	R. E. TAYLOR (University of California, Riverside)	Archaeometry
GAI PEI (Academia Sinica, Beijing)	North China; Upper Palaeolithic	PAUL TOLSTOV (Université de Montréal)	Mesoamerica
JOSEPH H. GREENBERG (Stanford University)	Historical Linguistics	CHRISTY G. TURNER II (Arizona State University)	Physical anthropology
R. DALE GUTHRIE (University of Alaska)	Pleistocene palaeontology	FREDERICK H. WEST (Peabody Essex Museum, Salem)	Subarctic Northwest America; Beringia
FEKRI A. HASSAN (University College London)	Geoarchaeology; North Africa	J. PETER WHITE (University of Sydney)	Pacific; Australia
JOHN F. HOFFECKER (Argonne National Laboratory)	Palaeolithic; Russia; Beringia	W. RAYMOND WOOD (University of Missouri)	Great Plains
ARTHUR J. JELINEK (University of Arizona)	Palaeolithic; Levant	WILLIAM B. WORKMAN (University of Alaska)	Northwestern North America
DAVID H. KELLEY (University of Calgary)	Mesoamerica; Epigraphy		
MARY ELIZABETH KING (Los Angeles County Museum)	Textiles; Southwest U.S.		

Editor-in-Chief Frederick Hadleigh West  
Associate Editor Mary Lou Cuitan

The *Review of Archaeology* appears twice a year. The annual subscription is \$18.  
Published by The *Review of Archaeology*, Inc. 10 Liberty Street, Salem, Massachusetts 01970.  
ISSN No. 1050-4877

All editorial correspondence should be addressed to the Editor,  
The *Review of Archaeology*, 10 Liberty Street, Salem, Massachusetts 01970.

All subscription correspondence should be addressed to the Subscriptions Manager,  
The *Review of Archaeology*, P.O. Box 430, Williamstown, Massachusetts 01267

Postmaster: Send address changes to *The Review of Archaeology*, P.O. Box 430, Williamstown, Massachusetts 01267

Copyright © 1997 All rights reserved

Fall 1997

The REVIEW OF ARCHAEOLOGY

1

## Politics and Archaeology Colonialism, Nationalism, Ethnicity, and Archaeology Part 1 by C.C. Lamberg-Karlovsky

*Colonial Indology: Sociopolitics of the Ancient Indian Past* (1997). DILIP K. CHAKRABARTI. Munshiram Manoharlal, New Delhi.

*The Archaeology of Ethnicity* (1997). SIÂN JONES. Routledge, London.

*Nationalism, Politics, and the Practice of Archaeology* (1997). PHILIP KOHL AND CLARE FAWCETT, editors. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

*There is no a priori reason for thinking that when we discuss the truth that it will be interesting.*  
— C. S. Lewis

Colonialism, nationalism, and ethnicity are filled with oppression, violence, and hatred. The works of Edward Said, Ernest Gellner, Stanley Tambiah, to mention but a few, join those of Martin Bernal, and Cheikh Anta Diop to cover a spectrum of approaches ranging from the historical to the hysterical. Colonialism, nationalism, and ethnicity form a trilogy of gargoyles at the gates of the apocalypse, each attracting a great deal of attention in archaeology. To a certain extent a concern for the above themes is an extension of post-processual concerns in archaeology, concerns that highlight the role of interpretation, hermeneutics, and ideology. It is hardly possible to approach any of these books without an opinion in place, an opinion which, in dialectical fashion, forms a play with the text under study. Everyone holds an opinion, fixed or flexed, concerning the role and impact of colonialism, nationalism and ethnicity. It hardly needs to be stated that opinions concerning the above are all too frequently couched in terms of "political correctness." However, none of the above authors would join Samuel P. Huntington (1996) in endorsing this triad as important mechanisms for forestalling the future "Clash of Civilizations."

The book by Dilip Chakrabarti is passionate, opinionated, condemnatory, and interesting. The author sets out the agenda on the first page of the Preface: "an elaborate racist framework, in which the interrelation-

ship between race, language, and culture was a key element, slowly emerged as an explanation of the ancient Indian historical universe;" "Mere dismantling of the current racist structure of our perception of ancient India and all that implies will not lead by itself to an Indian perception of the ancient Indian past;" and, "The book underlines the total inadequacy of ancient Indian texts to offer fine resolution of historical images in chronological and geographical order, and argue [sic] that this goal is unlikely to be achieved by combining our historical texts with social science theories." For Chakrabarti several themes run throughout his book: a) "Western Indology," that is, scholars from the West who studied the ancient texts were all, without exception, racists; b) the ancient texts are unequivocally useless in reconstructing an ancient Indian past; c) an Indian perception of an Indian past is needed to replace the Western hegemonic interpretation; d) the colonial experience has distorted the "true" understanding and appreciation of India's complex past; e) colonial Indology has portrayed India as socially static while its populations are seen as debased and degraded, while f) diffusion from the more civilized regions of Mesopotamia, Egypt, and Europe was seen to explain progress in South Asia.

In writing about India, British authors by and large did not consider the natives part of their audience; they were addressing "us" not "them." India was seen as different from the West but similar to what the West used to be like. Thus, India's present was the European past, India was a prehistorical entity of what the West was like in an earlier stage of cultural evolution. In inventing anthropology the colonial experience discovered a time-machine; one could systematically travel into various stages of the past through the study of select "primitive" peoples. Today ethnoarchaeology continues this tradition; the study of living cultures, now referred to as "traditional" no longer "primitive," but still changeless, permits one to understand the cultures of the remote prehistoric past.

It is of interest to compare this recent volume to two books of related nature by the same author, *A History of Indian Archaeology from the Beginning to 1947* (1988) and *Theoretical Issues in Archaeology* (1988). Both of these books are conspicuously devoid of the strident tone evident in *Colonial Indology*. In the first volume Chakrabarti would have us believe that "by



the middle of the eighteenth century one detects an element of objectivity in the records of the monuments and there was also the beginning of historical-geographical researches in this period" (p.21); and "there were two basic theoretical traditions in the beginning. On the one hand were explorers and surveyors [Colin Mackenzie is offered as a praiseworthy example]...interested in objective reporting and plotting of sites, and on the other hand were scholars like William Jones whose basic problem was to link the history of India to the other centers of civilization in the light of the biblical theory of creation" (p.44). In *Colonial Indology* both Mackenzie and Jones become racist. Throughout his *History of Indian Archaeology* the author is consistently appreciative of the efforts of colonial administrators and scholars. John Marshall is praised as an indefatigable worker with an astonishing breadth of knowledge; one who from the very beginning of his General Directorship of the Archaeological Survey of India associated with young Indian scholars from the universities and "was gradually able to Indianize the survey and turn it into an excellent centre of primary scholarship in Indology in general" (p.170). That same Indology and its colonial participants are castigated in his *Colonial Indology* where he writes that the ideas rooted in the period of Western dominance are "ideas which have denied all originality to Indian experience and infused sufficiently corrosive racist ideas in our sense of history. The least we can do is to demonstrate how the study of ancient India has been, and is still being, vitiated by an essentially racial and anti-Indian approach which has its roots deep in Western Indology" (p. 3). Neither "Western Indology" nor "colonial Indology" are ever defined; however, one can readily assume from the vitriolic context in which they are situated that they refer to the racist perspective of Western scholars who interpret the ancient texts, archaeological artifacts, and historical documents.

*Theoretical Issues in Archaeology* addresses two of the issues that the author returns to in *Colonial Indology*: the role of diffusion and attempts to correlate archaeology and the ancient texts. Chakrabarti, as we shall see, has neither patience nor tolerance for the role of diffusion. Agriculture, urbanization, metallurgy, civilization, et al. are all independently invented in India. In *Theoretical Issues* the author advances his argument as to why diffusion is a non-player in

the archaeology of South Asia. His arguments are based upon a reading and interpretation of the archaeological evidence. There is room to disagree. In *Colonial Indology*, there is little room for disagreement. The use of diffusion is a tool of oppression, calling it into play is to subordinate India's originality, it is a colonialists' tool to deny India's creativity. Both *Theoretical Issues* and *Colonial Indology* are adamant in expressing the view that the correlation of ancient texts with the archaeological record is destined to failure! In the former volume, an extended chapter well worth reading concludes, "As our review has tried to demonstrate, this is precisely what such hypotheses are [those attempting to correlate texts and archaeology]: based mostly on faith rather than on academic logic of any kind." The works of B. B. Lal, Romila Thapar, H. D. Sankalia, B. D. Chattopadhyay, R. S. Sharma, among others, are reviewed in an attempt to show the futility of relating archaeology to the Vedic texts.

Although *Theoretical Issues* and *Colonial Indology* share many of the same concerns, the perspective differs. The former engages in a critical dialogue with specific themes while the latter addresses the same themes as a political polemic. Thus, in reference to the views of Shareen Ratnagar (1981), pertaining to Indus-Mesopotamian commercial relations, the author simply states in the first volume that "sharp dissatisfactions have been expressed with her handling of the data" (p. 132). In *Colonial Indology* it is not the handling of data that is troublesome but the interpretations derived from that data. According to Chakrabarti these interpretations have "a very clear implication that in relation to Mesopotamia the Indus civilization stood on the same level on which India stood in pre-Independence period in relation to Britain" (p. 169). It is to be noted that this is the "implication" that Chakrabarti derives from Ratnagar's volume; it is not, in fact, what Ratnagar has written. In this manner Ratnagar becomes a colonial Indologist serving the imperialist interests of the West's unchanging view of India.

If David Lowenthal believes that *The Past Is a Foreign Country* (1985), Dilip Chakrabarti believes the Indian past, as reconstructed by Western scholars, is portrayed as an evil empire. The facts are far different. Since the time of William Camden (1551-1623) information was collected on current conditions, history, and antiquities of the different localities of Great Britain.

Central to this endeavor was the recording of buildings, ruins, and ancient settlements. This approach was transferred to colonial India where the "survey" meant the systematic and official investigation of the natural and social features of India. Colin Mackenzie, who in the last half of the eighteenth century was the first person to undertake a major excavation in India, was one of India's great surveyors. He devoted over 20 years to the systematic survey and recording of ancient monuments and ruins in south India. It was only in 1859 that another great surveyor, Alexander Cunningham, convinced Lord Canning, the Viceroy of India, to establish the Archaeological Survey of India. Its purpose was to undertake topographical research; to locate, preserve, excavate sites, and to develop on-site museums. There can be little doubt that the powers to define the nature of the past, to classify and date its remains, to determine preservation needs, and to determine the priorities in uncovering a record of past civilizations, as well as to propound the canons of taste, are extremely significant instrumentalities of rulership. While the above is undeniably true it must also be recognized that it was British rule that introduced, in a systematic fashion, each of the above concerns into India. For many Europeans India was a vast museum; a countryside filled with the ruins of past ages. These ruins could in turn be compared with the feudal, biblical, and classical periods familiar to the European environment. India was a living fossil upon which the British could engrave their own visions of its past. The British were to provide India with a linear history along the lines of nineteenth century positivist historiography. Dilip Chakrabarti finds all of these aspects of British colonialism to be objectionable. British colonialism in India may have been political oppression, but it was also a conquest of knowledge, albeit for political ends! The political importance of knowledge was well recognized by one of the earliest and most influential of colonial officers, Warren Hastings, who wrote in 1784: "Every accumulation of knowledge and especially as is obtained by social communication with people over whom we exercise dominion founded on the right of conquest is useful to the state...it attracts and conciliates distant affections; it lessens the weight of the chain by which the natives are held in subjection; and it imprints on the hearts of our countrymen the sense of obligation and benevolence." Today a few miles

up the Hoogly River from Calcutta a headless statue of Hastings lies abandoned in the tall grass. Nevertheless, Hastings realized long ago what Chakrabarti fails to understand today—namely, colonialism had both positive and negative effects on both the colonized and the colonizers. It is ironic that the author of *Colonial Indology* fashions the British as active and the Indians as largely passive actors in the theater of the Raj. The author fails to understand that the epistemological universe that motivated British scholars and their Indian disciples was part of a European world of social theories and classificatory schema that was designed to shape the lives of subjects in both Britain and India. The disciplines of anthropology and archaeology were handmaidens of the colonial experience and the social theories and approaches that were inherent to each were foreign to India. Warren Hastings' administration was distinguished by a tolerance for native customs and a manifest cultural empathy. His administration characterized the current vogue of "Orientalism" which rested on an understanding that an efficient administration required both a knowledge and an appreciation of Indian culture. Underlying Orientalism was a policy of reverse acculturation; the training of British administrators into the native way of life. Opposing Orientalism was the counter-movement of "Anglicism" which opposed the Orientalists policy of accommodating to native culture. In advocating Western instead of Eastern languages and literature and holding a more tolerant view toward Eastern religions Anglicism came into sharp conflict with Orientalism. The conflict between the two characterized the entirety of the colonial experience and continues to reverberate in post-colonial discourse (Viswanathan 1997; Prakash 1997).

Nineteenth-century exploration of India took place at a time in which Europeans were examining their own past. The search for a European antiquity focused upon the classical civilizations of Greece and Rome. Coming to understand ancient India consisted of two primary comparisons: 1) its similarities to and/or differences from classical civilization, and, 2) the nature of its religion compared to Christianity. In these comparisons India consistently came off as second best. India was static, Europe was progressive; the Indian state was epiphenomenal without political order; India was dominated by village and caste; India was a land of Oriental despotism. Already in



the eighteenth century Lord Minto, Governor-General of the East India Company, expressed a view that continued to be held throughout the nineteenth century by British administrators and scholars:

It is a common remark that science and literature are in a progressive state of decay among the natives of India. From every inquiry which I have been enabled to make on this interesting subject that remark appears to me but too well founded. The number of the learned is not only diminished but the circle of learning even among those who still devote themselves to it appears to be considerably contracted. The abstract sciences are abandoned, polite literature neglected and no branch of learning cultivated but what is connected with the peculiar religious doctrines of the people.

When Queen Elizabeth chartered the East India Company in 1600, she permitted the merchants "exclusive" rights to undertake business in an area twenty times the size of Britain, containing over six hundred princely estates, with fifteen languages and thousands of dialects, and ruled by the Moghuls; it was an Islamic empire with an annual income more than a hundred times the revenue of the British Crown. John Company, as it would be known, initially had few European rivals, little focus, and certainly no ideas for military expansion. John Company was to lay the foundation for what two centuries later was to become the jewel in the British colonial crown. Initially, however, India was the consolation prize compared to what the Dutch had already secured, namely, control over the Java trade and the Spice Islands.

In *Colonial Indology* Dilip Chakrabarti views the colonial experience as dominated by racism and oppression. There is hardly a single British scholar or administrator given favorable notice. This is quite a different perspective from the one he offered in *History of Indian Archaeology from the Beginning to 1947*. In the latter work Chakrabarti offers a fully appreciative commentary on many of the scholar-surveyors that served the colonial administration. He acknowledges the fact that the ancient monuments of India suffered greatly from what Lord Curzon generously referred to as "comparative neglect until British rule transformed the Buddhist, the Brahmanical, and the Moslem—to a state of perfection which rendered them the best preserved series of monuments in the world" (Chakrabarti 1988:170). In the *History of Indian Archaeology* Chakrabarti states that "prehistory till 1947 had a chequered history but the breakthrough achieved within the first few years

(1861-67) [of the founding of the India Archaeological Survey] was splendid and speaks a lot for the basic caliber of the people involved." The basic character of the British participants changes in *Colonial Indology*; they are all racist, exploitative imperialists. Perhaps both perspectives contain a grain of truth. Perhaps both books deserve to be read within the author's own changing political and social contexts: *A History of Indian Archaeology* was written in India and contextualizes an appreciation of British administrators and scholars while *Colonial Indology* was written in England where proximity appears to have bred contempt.

The author is critical of Indian students who take an interest in things foreign whether these be theories or attempting to be educated abroad. In bothering to find out about new theories in the social sciences students followed a "blind fetishism" that might "lead to a theoretical position undermining the national identity." On the other hand, students attempting to study abroad are portrayed as sellouts "trying to set themselves apart from their compatriots with a 'foreign degree.'" Scholars, such as the accomplished A. L. Basham, who taught in England (as does Chakrabarti) and trained Indian students, are diminished because they do not exhibit a sufficient "nationalist fervour" to suit the author. What is curious about all this, that is the author's criticism of Indian students and scholars working abroad and his portrayal of Western Indology as, at worst, a racist undertaking and, at best, an invidious intellectual enterprise that offers an "ever-present feeling of superiority assumed by Western historians in relation to India and Indians," is that *nowhere* in the book does it indicate Chakrabarti's academic affiliation. While Chakrabarti admires those Indian students that did not sellout for a "free drink" and steered clear of foreign institutions and learning, he has situated himself squarely in the center of the enemy camp, one of the central institutions of Western Indology, the Faculty of Oriental Studies at Cambridge University. This is not without relevance, as will be shown below, both within the context of the author's scholarship and his admiring mention of his Cambridge colleagues, Professors Raymond Allchin and Lord Renfrew. This, in spite of the fact that both of these colleagues have advocated what Chakrabarti detests, namely, the role of diffusion in the formation of South Asian civilization. In an early work Allchin (1968) argued that the role of diffu-

sion was the primary mechanism for bringing about the Indus civilization, while Renfrew (1987) has argued that it was not only diffusion but the Indo-Aryans that brought agriculture to South Asia. Within the pages of *Colonial Indology* the views of his Cambridge colleagues concerning ancient India, rather widely known within the academic community, are almost as invisible as is the author's academic affiliation. In a book that addresses the sociopolitical context of archaeology, such sins of omission are not without relevance.

While the author condemns the use of archaeology for political purposes, in specific instances he either condones it or offers an apology for its use. Thus, with respect to the use of the archaeological site of Masada in Israel, as a "national symbol of resistance and heroism," we read that "it is not the truth in its most untarnished form which is at stake here" but because of Israel's security needs "they had rightfully the need to possess a national symbol" (p. 38). Thus, if the author finds the cause appropriate, the archaeological site can be (mis)used for political purposes. With respect to the Ayodhya controversy, the destruction of a mosque that was allegedly built over an earlier Hindu temple, the author offers an apology, "The poor can be driven to frenzy by interested parties to kill another set of poor in the name of faith...." Poverty is blamed for the killing, which is as assuredly untrue in the Indian setting as it is in Ireland, Zaire, Serbia, and Israel, to name but four places where religious and ethnic violence takes precedence over poverty in leading to bloodshed.

Chakrabarti suggests that within the American archaeological community "the issue of reburials of pre-colonial skeletons has taken a form bordering on downright hostility to the 'Indian' attitude in this matter" (p. 42). Not so... the "downright hostility" is a vocal but very small minority of archaeologists in this country. Furthermore, Chakrabarti appears to lack an appreciation of the complexity of this issue. He is wrong in suggesting that there is a singular "Indian attitude" regarding reburial; being apparently unaware that some Native Americans do not wish their skeletal remains to be reburied. Quite understandably, Chakrabarti's analysis of the political reaches a political conclusion, one that might agree or disagree with the reader's bias or, as in the above instance, be based on an incomplete or erroneous understanding of the political circumstance under review.

That the author enthusiastically endorses the views of Edward Said and Martin Bernal comes as no surprise. Chakrabarti shares their contention that Western scholarship is racist and Eurocentric. What is of importance to all three authors is the dismantling of Western political hegemony which, in turn, requires the subordination of Western intellectual traditions. In their agenda of deconstruction a single mechanism is given priority: the tarring of all Western scholarship as thoroughly racist. Chakrabarti, however, totally ignores the important and voluminous works that attempt to balance, if not counter, the monolithic edifice constructed by Said and Bernal (see Hourani 1991; Lefkowitz (1996); and Lefkowitz and Rogers 1996).

In a lengthy chapter entitled "The Interplay of Race, Language, and Culture" Chakrabarti touches upon a myriad of authors, both Western and Indian, that confused these independent variables. During the last half century the word "race" has undergone significant changes of meaning, at least in most Western languages. Until the middle of this century the word "race" was commonly used to designate what today we would call an ethnic group. As Bernard Lewis (1990:16) points out, until quite recently the British used the word "race" to designate the differences between the Irish, Welsh, Scots, and English while "India was inhabited by a great variety of so-called races, speaking different but closely related languages and sharing a common civilization." In current usage the word "race" is used exclusively to denote the major divisions of Caucasoid, Mongoloid, Negroid, Australoid, and the like. Throughout the nineteenth century and earlier, Chakrabarti discerns racial tension, hostility, and outright racism. Such feelings certainly did exist, but in the context of race as an ethnic or national group, not within the modern context of race as Caucasoid, Negroid, and/or Mongoloid. The nineteenth-century Englishman was little different from "the ancient Middle Eastern people who harbored all kinds of prejudices and hostilities against those whom they regarded as the 'other'" (Lewis 1990:17). A dislike of the "other" can be traced back to the ethnic slurs that appear in the third millennium texts of Mesopotamia and Egypt. The ancient Egyptians, characteristically thinking of themselves as superior to all "other," consistently referred to the peoples inhabiting the Levant as "Asiatic dogs" or "vile Asiatics." Until quite recently differences in language, culture, and religion were para-



mount features in identifying the "other"; these differences, however, were ones of ethnicity, not race. Historical context, the definition of terms, and the changes in the meaning of words are tropes of considerable importance in reconstructing the past. Chakrabarti, and it might be pointed out Martin Bernal whom he frequently cites, fails to recognize the changing nuances in the use of the word "race"; Chakrabarti's use of the word "race" where "ethnicity" is more appropriate, or "racist" where "ethnic hatred" is meant, distorts the nature of his reconstructed past. It would be wrong to refer to the recent conflicts in Serbia and Bosnia as violence motivated by racism. Most assuredly there is an abundance of ethnic violence among those self-identifying entities. Chakrabarti, while painting most "colonial Indologists" with a racist brush, offers a similar confusion. The difference between racism and ethnic hatred is a distinction with a difference, one carefully delineated by Gerhard E. Lenski (1984).

Even the icons fall before Chakrabarti's pen. He asks why Sir William Jones's discovery that Sanskrit was related to Latin and Greek was readily accepted while his suggestion that it was also related to Peruvian and Japanese was refuted. In seeking an answer Chakrabarti finds little advantage in employing Occam's razor wherein the simplest explanation is often the correct one. Instead he suggests that the reason for accepting the above affinities "was related to the premise of the origin of the Caucasian racial group somewhere in the high mountainous region in the East" which naturally would eliminate Peru and Japan (p. 69). Sir William Jones is portrayed as a conservative racist with exploitative motivations; a most objectionable caricature! In reality during his day he was a reforming liberal who, in 1780, stood for Parliament representing the district of the University of Oxford. He withdrew from the contest for he had no chance of success owing to his Liberal party opinions concerning the slave trade, the American Revolution, the condition of the poor, and the practice of the law. When he went to India in 1783 as a judge of the Supreme Court in Calcutta, he was convinced of the importance of Hindu and Islamic law and began the colossal task of compiling a digest of their judicial procedures in order to incorporate them in court proceedings. Sir William Jones pioneered the field of comparative philology which promised answers to the incessant European quest for the ori-

gins and relations of things...in this instance, languages. The "genetic" or "genealogical" relations of different languages could be studied and reconstructed. The origin and relations of languages were depicted as a tree with root, trunk, branches, and twigs all illustrating the interconnections of the family of languages and their descent groups. Significantly, the trees were invariably Northern European ones: oaks and maples. European scholars never seemed to think of using the most typical of South Asian tree, the banyan, which grows up, out, and down all at the same time. Clearly, this would have led to a different, if not erroneous, conceptualization of historical linguistics. *Neither* tree, however, portrays an inherently racist perspective.

Chakrabarti's *Colonial Indology* approaches colonialism as a collision wholly without merit and offers up an unobtrusive appreciation of the dialectical aspect of the colonial experience. He subscribes to the postmodernist attitude in which learning can never be devoid of concerns with power; behind any and every effort to accumulate knowledge there is an agenda. Thus, once again, Sir William Jones's "personal interest in botany cannot be considered as the outcome of only a dispassionate scientific interest." Jones's entire purpose behind the founding of the Asiatic Society in 1785 "came up not merely for the sake of learning but also for the sake of knowing the ways of putting the products of India to good use" (p. 68). For Chakrabarti knowledge derived within the colonial context is invariably intertwined with the levers of power and control. The above quote from Warren Hastings demonstrates that knowledge and power were frequently wed, and understood to be so, as they are today. However, the dialectical relationship of power and knowledge requires a careful examination of the good, bad, and indifferent, results that emanated from their linkage. Chakrabarti typifies the alienation derived from the colonial experience. Such alienation results in a separatist reading of Indian culture, both for its past and its present. Chakrabarti is an avid foe of diffusion, arguing for an indigenous, "separatist" origin for the Indus civilization, while for the present his "separatist" stance suggests that only Indians can write a meaningful Indian history. The role of foreign influence and diffusion is read out of existence while nationalism and nativistic movements are encouraged. Throughout this volume the author maintains a "positional" nature of

objectivity; he pretends to stand outside the Western tradition, is condemnatory of that tradition, while championing the ill-defined perspective of "Third World archaeology." The "positional" nature of his stance directs him to invent an interpretive reality that neither the West nor colonial India would recognize.

The author frequently puts forth a generalization without further documentation, i.e., his statement that eighteenth century historical linguistics was directly linked with racist perspectives (p. 68), or he offers a conclusion negated by his own discussion. As an example of the latter he states that a "strain of racist elitism, although professedly ignored in the modern Western academia, does burst forth from time to time" (p. 85). This statement follows his discussion of the contemporary views of Loring Brace, Ashley Montagu, George Stocking, and Nancy Stepan, to name but a few Western academics whose writings even Chakrabarti acknowledges are consistently opposed to "racist elitism."

The racial classifications of J. F. Blumenbach, J. C. Prichard, R. Knox, A. Gobineau, E. A. Hooten, the linguistic trees of William Jones, Max Müller, and the perceptions on Indian culture, race and language of J. A. DuBois, James Mill, Brian Hodgson, Robert Caldwell, George Campbell, James Fergusson, H. H. Risley, and S. S. Sarkar are among those given extended commentary. Numerous other authors are alluded to with briefer commentary. Chakrabarti's review of the unpalatable goulash presented by both Western and Indian scholars concerning the racial and ethnic diversity of India makes for an excellent read. The author shows how H. H. Risley's idea that anthropomorphic indices reflected caste hierarchy and that that hierarchy, from the Aryan to the non-Aryan races, formed the cornerstone of anthropological thought in India. The racial typologies advanced by B. S. Guha, R. P. Chanda, and S. S. Sarkar are all concisely reviewed. It is extremely difficult to understand the significance, indeed the relevance, of most of these racial classifications. Repeating the results of these studies serves to point out that racial classification informed by craniometry was (and remains today?) an absurdity. What are we to make of the fact that at Harappa the skeletal materials showed "Armenoid affinities" (p. 137) or that the skeletal materials from Tekkalakota revealed a "Mediterranean-Proto-Australoid complex" (p. 143), or at Nal excavators recovered a

"Caspian or Nordic Type of skull" (p. 142), or that a few of the skulls from Brahmagiri were "Scytho-Iranian" (p. 145), etc. et al.? Chakrabarti dutifully records this nonsense and makes it clear that he does not follow the faith of those who employ the calipers.

Chakrabarti's hostility to the belief of an Aryan invasion is a constant theme throughout the book. Those who believe that the ancient texts contain a historical dimension, who attempt to correlate those texts with the archaeological record, or who devise schemes of Aryo-Dravidian syntheses are all adhering to "a racist model, visualized as a triumph of a dominant race over the other weaker/inferior/decadent/degenerate races. The way in which this phenomenon has been depicted differs from historian to historian, but the phenomenon itself is always there." Attempts to define or reconstruct the historicity of the Aryan invasion, or the social world of the Vedic Age, have been an academic industry inhabited in equal measure by scholars from Europe as well as Asia, particularly India. In this regard colonial Indology and Indian Indology share an identical intellectual background and if the former is racist so is the latter. The racial histories of H. H. Risley and Biraja Shankar Guha or J. H. Hutton and Sesanka Sekhar Sarkar may all differ from one another, but their differences pale in light of their similar goals: the reconstruction of a South Asian racial history. They all, without exception, share a failed methodology. Their work can be dismissed out-of-hand; their results shed no understanding on the historical processes that gave birth to the biological diversity of South India.

Chakrabarti is correct in dismissing phrenology and craniometry as elucidating racial history. Somewhat more surprising is his dismissal of the promise that molecular biology and genetics hold in elucidating a history of biological diversity. The author casts a gray shadow over the work of L. Cavalli-Sforza by stating, without documentation, that he has a "long history of belief in the concept of race." Even an elementary perusal of the work of Cavalli-Sforza (1994) and his colleagues indicates their search for the degrees of biological diversity *within* such regions as Europe and Africa as well as *between* them. The massive tome in which they report their preliminary results details the similarities and/or differences within ethnic groups, i.e., the French, Spanish, and Basques, as well as within and between races, i.e., Caucasoid, Mongoloid, and Ne-



groid. Chakrabarti appears to either confuse or fear the results of examining biological diversity, implying that all such efforts are racist. Granted the history of such efforts is steeped in racist ideology, but that does not mean that studies of biological diversity are destined to be forever racist. Chakrabarti would have us ignore the categorizations which people themselves create in order to establish themselves as different from the "other." His approach is direct and forthright: "We certainly do not need a concept of the past based on ethnic categories" (p. 238). Nor, according to Chakrabarti, do we need a past based on linguistic palaeontology, biological diversity, or an understanding of the archaeological record in light of textual correlations! To ignore the ethnic categories that inhabited the past is to construct a distorted and puerile history. What would a history of the modern era appear like without acknowledging the identity of those that identify themselves as Uzbek, Maori, Zuni, Seikh, Uighur, Chechen, Zulu, Slovak, Tibetan, Lithuanian, Inuit, Serb, or, for that matter, Hindu or Muslim? To ignore, or eliminate from historical consideration, the categories by which individuals place themselves in opposition to others is to create a fiction. Recognizing an historical reality is not the same as endorsing it.

As we shall see, a central, although not entirely consistent, theme in the writings of Chakrabarti is his opposition to the role of diffusion. In this regard he remains a strong advocate for the indigenous and essentially independent origin of cultural complexity in South Asia, specifically in reference to the Indus civilization. Chakrabarti's reaction against diffusion(ism) is entirely understandable in light of earlier views that depended entirely upon diffusion for an understanding of cultural evolution in India. In the mid-nineteenth century William Taylor, a missionary in Madras, advanced the then influential thesis that Indian culture was entirely derived from Chaldean and Egyptian origins. India was seen as a poor imitation of a common antediluvian culture that existed throughout the Near East. An equally influential contemporary, James Fergusson, thought the study of Indian architecture an important source of ideas for architecture in Britain, but he also advanced the notion that the history of India consisted of five major invasions of foreign peoples, beginning with the Aryan invasion of 2000 B.C. (an approximate date still advocated by many today) and concluding with the British.

Fergusson's idea that the architecture of India was strongly influenced by the Greeks, Persians, Egyptians, and Assyrians was countered by Rajendralal Mitra. Mitra wrote a number of books that countered the diffusionary perspective and advocated an originality in the art and architecture of India. Fergusson's response to Mitra, surprisingly left unmentioned by Chakrabarti, typified one form of British-Indian relationship, that of master and servant. Fergusson doubted whether an Indian was intellectually equipped to master the methods and scholarship necessary for an understanding of Indian architecture. Today the distant influences that touched the art of ancient India are still much debated. John Boardman (1994:111) in a masterful overview of the topic states:

The Indo-Greek kings penetrated far into India, even if only momentarily and superficially (their stronger influence in the northwest we shall consider later); in the first centuries BC/AD there were intrusions by the Sakas, from Central Asia, by Parthians, and ultimately by the Yueh-chi who had first displaced the Greeks from Bactria and who by the first century AD founded a major dynasty in India, the Kushan. All these peoples, their religions, and, to a degree yet to be determined, their arts, contributed to the development of Indian art.

Boardman goes on to clarify the "degree" to which specific categories and/or objects of Indian art and architecture were influenced by (largely) Persian and/or Greek craftsmanship. Needless to say Boardman's appreciation of the complexities of cultural interaction does not detract from the originality of any of the cultures that came into contact.

The strong reaction against the role of diffusion, which has characterized archaeological thought in the past three decades, has a great deal to do with a reaction against the colonial era. Colonial powers thought of themselves as bringing "civilization" to those they ruled. In like manner colonial powers conceived diffusion as the *deus ex machina* of cultural evolution; it was considered the primary mechanism that brought civilization to a lesser developed "barbarian" world. The statue of Sir William Jones in St. Paul's Cathedral offers a three-dimensional metaphor for both the role and the concept of diffusion. Jones, dressed in toga with pen in hand, is seen leaning upon two volumes of law: a visual reminder of the British as the inheritors of Roman destiny; the bringing of law and civilization to the distant frontiers. Within the archaeological community an adverse reaction to modern colonialism led

to the subordination, if not the elimination, of the role of diffusion in bringing about cultural change. Negating the role of diffusion projects an illusory past, as does portraying colonialism as a wholly negative undertaking. Decades ago Rabindranath Tagore and more recently Wilhelm Halbfass recognized a common thread within the colonial experience of India. For Tagore an "irreducible diversity is perhaps the most important feature of Indian intellectual traditions" that resulted from the colonial experience (quoted in Sen 1997). Tagore correctly appreciated the fact that the relationship of master to subject distorted the nature of both...not all masters were racists nor were all subjects degenerate, ignorant, and unclean. In a more recent and provocative work Wilhelm Halbfass (1988) echoes these thoughts by reviewing the different approaches and diverse impacts that the colonial experience had upon the formation and understanding of *both* Indian and Western intellectual traditions.

In the earlier volume *Theoretical Issues in Archaeology* and in *Colonial Indology* Chakrabarti is at pains to firmly discredit the role of diffusion in bringing about cultural change. Diffusion is viewed by the author as the opposite side of the coin of independent invention. Thus, a cultural attribute, whether it be the invention of agriculture or the origin of a civilization, is restricted, in its origins, to two mechanisms: it may be brought about by diffusion or by independent invention. Needless to say the limitation of an either-or choice is overly determined, leaving little in the way of more subtle and complex processes of cultural interaction. Reacting against the incessant reliance upon diffusion from western Asia and Europe the author argues for 1) the independent invention of agriculture, 2) the autochthonous development of the Indus civilization, and 3) an essentially independent development of metallurgy (particularly iron). Although he acknowledges the role of "interaction" its role is entirely passive in the formative processes that brought about the above three phenomena. The role of diffusion can, and often is, viewed through a political prism. If one brings diffusion into play one is not being sufficiently nationalist, that is to say, one is subordinating native Indian ingenuity in calling upon diffusion and foreign agency to inspire Indian development. This is a situation too reminiscent of colonial days. Thus, anyone who advocates the role of diffusion is

looked upon with "grave suspicion." Accordingly, Romila Thapar is castigated for criticizing "earlier attempts at proving the indigenous origin of all things Indian... a trend which continues to be supported by certain historians to this day" (p. 11).

I shall not dwell upon the author's contention that agriculture and metallurgy were independent inventions of South Asia. The archaeological evidence supports neither view. The earliest Neolithic site in South Asia is Mehrgarh in Pakistan. Agriculture is evident in its initial settlement which, on analogy to similar and contemporary sites on the Iranian Plateau (Sang-i Chahmaq) and Central Asia (Jeitun), should date the settlement to ca 6500 B.C.

In *Theoretical Issues in Archaeology* Chakrabarti strongly endorsed the view of the excavator of Mehrgarh, Jean-Françoise Jarrige, that agriculture was independently invented in South Asia. In his more recent book *The Archaeology of Ancient Indian Cities* Chakrabarti correctly acknowledges that Mehrgarh is but part of that larger agricultural ecumene which by the mid-seventh millennium was diffused from the Balkans to the northern reaches of South Asia. Today it is an established archaeological fact that the adoption and diffusion of an agricultural lifeway were initiated in the lands bordering the Levantine coasts of the eastern Mediterranean almost three millennia(!) before it diffused and was adopted by the settlement at Mehrgarh!

When it comes to dealing with the origins of the Indus civilization, Chakrabarti asks whether it is to be seen in the light of an "Indian Perspective or a Near Eastern One?" He states:

However, I am one of those who would argue that although such contacts [foreign] must have enriched and contributed to the texture of the Indus civilization, they do not account for the basic phenomenon itself. That remained exclusively Indian throughout its entire term of duration. The Indus civilization was not a mere episode in Indian history that was fertilized by something from west Asia." (p. 167)

It is difficult to understand what the author means here. On the one hand there was diffusion and foreign contact with the Indus civilization (the archaeological record offers an extensive documentation for this fact!), yet, on the other hand, whatever the nature of that contact was, and the author does not review the extensive evidence that brought the Indus civilization into contact with the distinctive cultures of Mesopotamia, the Per-



sian Gulf, the Iranian Plateau, and Central Asia, the Indus civilization remained "exclusively Indian." In eliminating the influence of the outside world Chakrabarti offers a self-contained vision of Indian (pre)history:

As I have argued, the basic texture of the later Indian culture was the result of interaction between the plough agriculturalists who belonged to the Indus civilization and the various hunting-gathering and apparently incipient farming communities in various parts of India. In this sense there is a steady continuity between the Indus civilization and the later day India. This model also brings to light the unique character of the evolution of the cultural process of India in which the incipient farming and hunting and gathering communities all over the land played as crucial a role as the dissemination of an advanced plough agriculture rooted in the Harappan tradition did. (p.167)

There are very serious flaws in this "model." Firstly, there is simply no archaeological evidence for the interaction of the Indus civilization with contemporary hunting and gathering communities; secondly, there is very little, if any, evidence in the archaeological record for the "steady continuity between the Indus civilization and the later day India" and finally, if *either* the hunting and gathering communities or the Indus civilization played a role in "the evolution of cultural process of India" it has yet to be demonstrated! The fact of the archaeological matter is that continuity is NOT the hallmark of the Indus civilization; quite the contrary, discontinuity is its trademark: the cultures that precede and follow the Indus civilization bear very little relationship to it! Note also that the author will not permit foreign diffusion to affect the Indus but allows for "the dissemination of an advanced plough agriculture rooted in the Harappan tradition"; a "dissemination that took 5000 years from its inception in Mehrgarh (Baluchistan) to the southernmost reaches of India! Diffusion *within* the territorial boundaries of India is permitted but diffusion from outside those boundaries into India is verboten!

Chakrabarti advocates a primordial model: that is to say that everyone and everything that ever was found on the land of what constitutes the India of today (which of course includes Pakistan) was always in the past and ever shall be Indian! The Mesopotamian world, the Greeks, the British, and anyone else for that matter were interludes of little consequence to the indigenously singularly of the Indianness of the

subcontinent. The primordial model is shared by virtually all nations that endured colonialism and forms an essential element of their nationalist ideology. In order to construct this primordial vision Chakrabarti chooses to deconstruct what he refers to as the "Near Eastern perspective." This perspective shares two components: 1) diffusion played the major role in the formation of the Indus civilization and, 2) Indian history takes as its earliest fixed point the coming of the Aryans and the composition of the Vedic texts. Both are red herrings!

It must be said without equivocation that the archaeological record strongly supports the notion that cultural complexity, what others might refer to as civilization, emerges in a context of a very *considerable* increased contact with other cultures. Cultural complexity is never an isolationist phenomenon; diffusion and interaction are co-occurring features. The archaeological record offers a consistent pattern of this, whether we are dealing with the formation of Egypt, Mesopotamia, China, the Maya, the Inca, the Minoans, OR the Indus. In recent years a thematic element in detailing the emergence of cultural complexity, in each of the above areas, is the role of expansionism, diffusion, culture contact, and even colonialism (Algaze 1993). To deny the important role of diffusion, culture contact, acculturation, and assimilation is to fly in the face of a consistent pattern of archaeological evidence which relates the above processes to the emergence of cultural complexity. It is most ironic that Chakrabarti selects Maurizio Tosi as the representative of the "Mesopotamia-centered approach" (p. 171). Few archaeologists are less suited to fill this role. Tosi, over the course of three decades, has done significant work in Iran, Oman, and Turkmenistan. In each area, and on each site excavated, Tosi's approach has been consistent: to document the significance of *indigenous* cultural processes and to relate them to a pattern of (primarily) economic interaction. Even the cursory examination of Tosi's research underscores his opposition to what years ago was termed a "Mesopotamocentric perspective" (Lamberg-Karlovsky and Tosi 1973). However, recent archaeological research, as Tosi (1992) correctly notes, requires us to rethink the nature and role of diffusion. Beginning in 1970 archaeologists working in the Near East began to uncover an extraordinary "event," referred to as the "Uruk Expansion," the phenomenon that consists of the diffusion of the earliest ur-

ban and literate civilization from southern Mesopotamia, the Sumerian, deep into central Turkey with distant reverberations felt in Egypt (von der Way 1987; Stein 1996). The unexpected and extraordinary extent of cultural diffusion, documented by the Uruk Expansion, ca 3300 B.C., came at a time in which diffusion was an unfashionable concept. In light of this Tosi is utterly correct in stating that the Mesopotamocentric perspective must be reconsidered, for "there is at present no good reason to dismiss it" (Tosi 1992:366). In quoting this phrase Chakrabarti places it in italics for it once again raises the specter of the many-headed Hydra of diffusionism which Chakrabarti wishes to decapitate. In acknowledging the importance of the Uruk Expansion, and the important role it must have played in bringing disparate cultures into contact, Tosi concludes the above quote (cited by Chakrabarti): "Assuming that such widespread changes [brought about by the Uruk Expansion] could not have occurred without profound disruptions of preceding socio-political realities, one can expect that the shock waves reached Baluchistan's eastern fringes, along the Indus Valley western margins." Thus, Tosi (1991) predicts that the "shock waves" of Mesopotamian expansion may reach the fringes of the Indus Valley. It is clear that Chakrabarti cannot abide this challenge to his "primordial" model and is sufficiently ungracious as to suggest that Tosi attempted to secure support for his "partono[sic]-genetical mode of birth....of the Indus civilization" by hosting a seminar in Bologna "where a number of important Indians were invited with free airfare and hospitality." Once again the author castigates his Indian colleagues for taking advantage of Western associations. This is nothing less than hypocritical, as the author must have made a self-conscious effort to avoid making a single acknowledgment of his permanent affiliation with Cambridge University.

The fact is that Tosi's comment is nothing less than prophetic. Roland Benseval (1994 and pers. comm.) has uncovered the "shock waves" in Baluchistan! In his excavations at Miri Qalat, in archaeological strata directly beneath that of the Indus civilization, he has recovered a considerable number of bevel-rimmed bowls. The diffusion of this type of ceramic, dated to the last centuries of the fourth millennium, is one of the archaeological signatures of the Uruk and Proto-Elamite Expansions; a cultural diffusion that has been traced over the entirety of the Iranian

Plateau and now can be seen reaching Baluchistan. Diffusion, assimilation, acculturation, culture contact, cultural interaction, trade, exchange, etc. are all distinctive processes of culture contact; their existence does not diminish the integrity of any culture in contact. It is simply wrong to assume that colonial or imperialist interests are alone in motivating diffusion. Rather than simply dismissing the role of diffusion, and adhering to the simplicities of a primordial model, it is necessary to investigate the causes for, and the nature of, cultural interaction. Chakrabarti remains adamant that diffusion did not exist at any time prior to, during, or after, the Indus civilization. His primordial model is nothing if not consistent! The author appears at times to intentionally misunderstand, or misrepresent, the conceptions and ideas of others, particularly when they conflict with his own. The discoveries of the 1960s and 1970s on the Iranian Plateau, the Gulf, and Central Asia are placed within a negative perspective; more precisely, the theoretical conceptions attempting to understand the nature of an expansive period of cultural interaction that brought these regions into contact are found wanting. Chakrabarti wishes to isolate the Indus civilization and deny that its contact with an outside world held significance. He diminishes the role of maritime contact between the Indus and the West, ridicules scholars who attempt to point out the location of places mentioned in the written texts, namely Dilmun (Bahrain and north-west Arabia), Magan (Oman), and Meluhha (the Indus), and objects to calling any cultural entity between Mesopotamia and the Indus a "civilization" (pp. 166-183). There is an abundant literature attesting to the archaeological realities of each of the above, well summarized by Christopher Edens (1993). The "interaction spheres" that were postulated in the 1960s for the Iranian Plateau, the Gulf, and Central Asia remain with us, and their understanding greatly enhanced. Chakrabarti totally misrepresents what was written concerning the role of trade within these interaction spheres. Such "central places" as Shahr-i Sokhta and Tepe Yahya were never conceived of as offering "a spurt in the growth of the Indus civilization" nor did it ever become "fashionable to conceive Indus external trade as exerting a kind of independent leverage on the genesis and sustenance of this civilization" (p.169). Trade was considered an independent variable, a mechanism whose dialectical process



affected both the region of supply and demand, thus:

It appears likely that a trade mechanism was established which in recognizing the value of local resources brought the Iranian highlands into a supply-demand relationship with resource poor Mesopotamia... This relationship as in a feedback mechanism would have in turn aided in bringing about the developing complexity of the socio-political and economic structure of the Late Uruk Mesopotamian city-state. (Lamberg-Karlovsky 1972:228)

Today there is a new archaeological actor that appears to be playing a role in the Indus; the Bactrian-Margiana Archaeological Complex (BMAC), also referred to as the Oxus Civilization (Hiebert 1994). Recent archaeological evidence indicates that this civilization had a significant impact on the last phases of occupation of a number of Indus sites (Jarrige 1994). Needless to say, Chakrabarti is having none of this, the Indus must not only be primordial it must be pristine, like an upper-caste Brahmin unpolluted by contact with the foreign.

Chakrabarti should relax. No serious scholar considers the Indus civilization the by-product of cultural diffusion. That does not mean, however, that the Indus was not an active partner in an extensive interaction that reached as far as Mesopotamia, the Gulf, and Central Asia. Scholars no longer believe, as Chakrabarti's Cambridge colleague Professor Raymond Allchin (1968) once did, that diffusion played the determining role in the formation of the Indus civilization. Nor do most scholars use the Vedic texts so cavalierly as to suggest the absurd, namely, that agriculture was a gift of the Aryans who brought it from the West to Mehrgarh around 6500 B.C., a suggestion also made by his Cambridge colleague Lord Renfrew (1987). In *Colonial Indology* the diffusionary ideas of Chakrabarti's Cambridge colleagues go as unnoticed as his own Cambridge affiliation.

Nationalist archaeology, as pointed out by several authors in the book edited by Philip Kohl and Clare Fawcett, requires an indigenous origin, a type of immaculate conception uncontaminated by foreign contact, as well as an early and long (the earlier and the longer the better) chronological span for its ancient past. It should come as no surprise that Chakrabarti wishes a more ancient beginning and a longer duration for the Indus civilization. In order to effect this he must suspend belief in radiocarbon dating by making the cryptic statement, with-

out clarification, that "the sociopolitics of the interpretation of radiocarbon dates may be as important as the dates themselves" (p.177). Is the author immune from "sociopolitics"? Hardly! Without presenting a single shred of evidence he suggests that the Indus endured for 1500 years, beginning around 2900/2800 B.C. A shorter chronology, constricted at both ends (2500-1800 B.C.), is favored by the majority of archaeologists. Chakrabarti cannot accept this consensus for, "the point is that if one accepts a short chronology for the Indus civilization, for which we believe there is no justifiable argument, it is easier to push the claim of its being a mere episode in the history of India, which then can be linked to a short-lived external stimulus." A longer chronology is better suited to his "sociopolitics" and thus a longer chronology it must be. If you are a foreigner and Chakrabarti disagrees with you, you represent "neocolonial, and racist ideas," while, if you are an Indian and disagree with his views, you are among "a large body of cringing historians and archaeologists wanting to be counted not as one of the land [an Indian] but as one of 'them'" (p.177). Such paranoia naturally concludes with a "we" vs. "them" attitude: "We regret that we have to put Western scholars as a group in this context" (p. 177). Such thinking is considered "racist" if perpetuated in the West, in the Third World it is merely nationalist; in any world it remains perverse to caricature diversity as unity.

The self-identity of post-colonial culture is deeply affected by its colonial experience. Self-conscious attempts are made to distance oneself from Western traditions and to recover a distinctly native past. Chakrabarti's prescription for who can study India's past is deeply etched, if not scarred, by the colonial experience. He writes:

Although a significant portion of this scholarship was under the colonial auspices and developed by the colonial field-scientists, we claim this tradition as our own in which the question of the nationality of the scientist does not come in at all. Whether Indians or Britons, they worked in the same landscape, and irrespective of nationality, fell in love with it. It is this element of love for the same Indian land which joins them together. (p. 240)

At this point it is well to interrupt the author's change of heart. Toward the end of the book he completely contradicts an earlier theme, one in which colonial authors were depicted as racist, portrayed India as degenerate, and despised the landscape and

its people. Bernard Cohn (1996:93) in reviewing the influential mid-nineteenth-century theories of James Fergusson, theories that were "compounded out of seventy years of British Orientalism," states that Fergusson concluded "that the only way to survive and flourish in India is to remain totally separated from the degenerate races who inhabit the country, and they should live in such a fashion as to minimize the effects of the climate" [and land]. Unfortunately, the views of Fergusson were thoroughly typical of his day. It would be hard to support Chakrabarti's contention that the British "fell in love" with India because they "worked in the same landscape." Those who did not work in the landscape are offered no reprieve, those

Western Indologists and historians do not at all fall in this category [that is love of India's landscape] and must be viewed, from the Indian point of view, as paternalists at their best and very superior in relation to the natives at their worst." (p. 240)

Thus, the study of the Indian past should be in the hands of the Indians. Foreign scholarship should go the way of colonial powers: be abolished! India for the Indians, past and present. The colonial British can be forgiven for at least they loved the land whereas modern Indologists are merely "paternalist" and/or "very superior" in relation to the natives. Unwittingly, Chakrabarti reverts to the dangers of an eighteenth-century Romanticism, as adumbrated by J.G. Herder. The "volk" (people), the "land" (country) and the "Gemeinschaft" (community) are portrayed as idealized entities that offer exclusionary attitudes for both group identity and opposition, if not outright dislike of the "other." The fundamental congruence between Romanticism and racism has been pointed out by many. On the one hand, Chakrabarti states that "we certainly do not need a concept of the past based on ethnic categories" (p. 238) while, on the other hand, he is in full accord with Tagore, whom he quotes: "We shall rescue our own history from the hands of others" (p. 239). Indian history can only be written by Indians for they alone have contact with the land, Chakrabarti writes:

All inhabitants of the land have a share in this image, because the land they see around them has been lived and shaped by their ancestors and the ancestors before them. While evolving a new image of the ancient Indian past we should concentrate on, and elaborate, this archaeological image, with all the help that can be mustered from the archaeological sciences. We have agreed

throughout in this volume why such a new image is necessary." (p. 241)

Paradoxically, Chakrabarti opposes an ancient history written along ethnic lines, yet, modern history, specifically Indian, can be written only by Indians. Thus, ethnicity in the past is irrelevant, but in the present only members of an ethnic group (from India) can write meaningful histories of India. Even so the author characterizes "the scheme of Indian historical education as neo-colonial" (p. 212) and thunders against the "mainstream establishment historians" who "make the right kind of political noises" and, "After all, it is only power for the elite which matters" and, "That is why, institutions on the national level have to be captured and filled up with stooges of various kinds." Finally, he believes that archaeology "has not been allowed to be part of Indian mainstream historical education... because there is no deep-felt need to work out a different concept of the ancient Indian past." It is clear that the "different concept" must be structured by a different sociopolitical ideology; one formed and written exclusively by Indians, in which the past is an independent invention wholly devoid of foreign, thus colonial, involvement. Once freed from the contamination of foreign pollution, its product, the history of India, must be both earlier and at least as grand as that of its neighbors. If Chakrabarti wishes to advance the notions of this newly invented history he should be aware that sociopolitical action at a distance, namely from Cambridge University, is far more difficult than being directly on the scene. Even though he is severely critical of "Indian history students trying to set themselves apart from their compatriots with a foreign degree" (p.14), he might consider his cause better served were he not to set himself apart from his compatriots in India, resign his elite position at Cambridge University, and get on with his agenda by confronting, preferably replacing, the "stooges" back in India who continue with their wrong-headed teaching of history.

Within the archaeological discipline there is a genre of retrospective, or retroductive, colonialism. Within this interpretive milieu colonialism is advocated as existing within the remote past in order to establish the importance of an ethnic group that has colonized a foreign region. The arguments pertaining to Iron Age I in Palestine offer a case in point. King David, leading the Israelites, is said to have conquered the indigenous populations and consolidated the first state



of Israel. Unfortunately, the archaeological evidence does not coincide with the biblical account. Israel Finkelstein (1988) has undertaken systematic archaeological survey within Judea and finds neither evidence for a colonization by a foreign entity nor a sufficient size and density of settlement to suggest a state polity. As to whether there was, or was not, a Davidic kingdom which colonized a specific region is a lively concern in the sociopolitics of the present (Shanks 1997). The formation, territorial boundaries, and sociopolitical structure of ancient Israel's colonial past have a direct bearing on, as well as being a legitimizing force, to the formation, territorial boundaries, and sociopolitical process of Israel's colonial present. In this instance the retrodictive interpretation for the existence of Israel's colonial past affirms the territorial rights of a modern nation-state. In response the Palestinians have recently claimed descent from the Canaanites who inhabited the land before the arrival of the Israelites. The manipulation of archaeology by both Palestinians and Is-

raelis fashions a mythical history. Both sides stumble over each other in a race to legitimize their claim to priority over the land.

There is a bit of irony in the fact that the discipline of archaeology was born in the context of colonialism and during the period of emergent European nationalism, but until recently archaeologists paid scant attention to either. Processual archaeologists concerned themselves with economics, social organization, environment, and subsistence strategies, with little time left for other issues. It was left to the post-processualists, reacting against the stern materialism of the processual "new archaeologists," to discover and examine the social context in which archaeology unfolds. Thus, in the past decade, great attention has been given to the socially and politically contingent nature of archaeology.

The second and concluding part of this essay will appear in the next issue, considering further, via the works of other authors, the matter of politics and archaeology. References for the entire essay will be cited following the second part. □

*Northwest Coast, America*  
**Early America B.C.: The**  
**Prehistory of British Columbia**  
**from ca 10,500 to 5,000 BP**  
 By William B. Workman

*Early Human Occupation in British Columbia* (1996) ROY L. CARLSON AND LUKE DALLA BONA, eds., University of British Columbia Press, Vancouver. 261 pages, illus. Hardcover. \$65 Canadian. ISBN 0-7748-0536-6. Paperback. \$34.95 Canadian. ISBN 0-7748-0535-8.

This large-format handsome volume deals with the early human history of the vast province of British Columbia, with excursions into southeastern Alaska, far western Alberta and the northwestern United States. Eighteen chapters by twenty-three authors range in length from four to twenty-eight pages and provide descriptive data and varying amounts of interpretation and synthesis. Roy Carlson's Introduction outlines the conceptual framework used to organize the volume. This chapter also explains and defines key archaeological concepts used and palaeo-environment basics in rather general terms, presumably for the benefit of the

nonspecialist reader. I suspect that that legendary creature will find the contents of this volume to be rather heavy going, despite the user-friendly introduction. To be honest, the attempt to wring meaning from the meager leavings of early Holocene humans, which leads authors quite understandably into detailed discussions of lithic technology, the implications of fluctuating sea levels, and a virtual element by element discussion of the sporadically preserved faunal remains, is likely mainly to endear itself to the specialist. The general reader may be more interested in the concluding chapter, where Carlson attempts to relate the hard-won data from the early traditions to the spectacular developments of the last 5000 years, which culminated in the distinctive Northwest Coast cultural patterns of historic times.

This volume is based on revised versions of 15 papers presented at the Canadian Archaeological Association in 1988, to which have been added two papers on the Queen Charlotte Islands and one on the obsidian industry at Namu. The 29-page bibliography indicates that a significant percentage of the references cited (some 85 items) postdate 1988, indicating the authors were diligent in expanding and updating their contributions. The editors are justified in their opinion that deferred publication resulted in a stronger volume.

By fortunate chance, publication of this compendium coincides with that of a considerably heftier and more wide-ranging tome summarizing evidence for early humans in northeastern Asia and Alaska (West 1996). In combination these two useful volumes should provide convenient access to summary statements about the early prehistory of a very extensive area in northwest North America and northeast Asia. Whether such encyclopedic summaries will result in an elevation of the level of discussion regarding Old World roots and the peopling of the Americas remains to be seen.

British Columbian material predating 7000 years ago is grouped into five cultural traditions, with special reference to projectile point forms and the presence or absence and general nature of microblade technology. Three of these entities, the Fluted Point, Plano and Intermontane Stemmed Point Traditions, are only suggested at present, with the latter two not yet found in datable British Columbian contexts. The two major players here in the early Holocene are the Pebble Tool Tradition (termed the Old Cordilleran Culture or Tradition by some authors) and the Microblade Tradition. The Pebble Tool Tradition, characterized by simple leaf-shaped projectile points and an abundance of choppers and large scrapers made on cobbles, is largely found in coastal settings from the central British Columbian coast (perhaps from as far north as the Queen Charlotte Islands) to Oregon. Carlson suggests an origin in the Nenana complex of interior Alaska dated between ca 11,800 and 11,000 years ago, citing presence in the Nenana complex of stemless bifaces, and scraper plane pebble tools and apparent absence of the microblade and burin technologies as indicators of this relationship. This interesting suggestion would be considerably strengthened by the isolation on the northern Northwest Coast of datable Pebble Tool Tradition assemblages which clearly lack the microblade technology. Carlson sees the Pebble Tool Tradition subsistence economy as having emphasized sea mammal hunting and fishing rather than terrestrial game, a view which may be correct in light of the coastal site location, but which does not appear to be totally supported by the meager mammalian fauna from Namu on the central coast (Cannon, this volume) and the Glenrose Cannery site further to the south (Matson, this volume).

The other major entity, the Microblade

Tradition, has a northern center of gravity on the Queen Charlotte Islands and in southeastern Alaska. Carlson reasonably suggests that some microblades functioned as side blade insets in organic weapon heads, a projectile point technology very different from that of the other traditions. This argument is strengthened by the finding of such points in Siberia and (very rarely) in Alaska and the relative scarcity of bifaces in most microblade contexts. Few would dispute the proposition that all northwestern North American microblade technologies (and the perhaps related burin technology) are of ultimate Asian derivation, although one could raise a lively argument about the details and implications of such a scenario, and simple-minded interpretations that all microblade technologies are self-evidently similar and closely related are to be avoided. Microblade technology eventually spread down the coast where it was accepted into Pebble Tool contexts as early as ca 8500 years ago at Namu, and it persisted in some areas until after 5000 BP. The way of life suggested by Microblade Tradition site location probably did not differ significantly from that of the Pebble Tool folk.

In Carlson's view, technologies predating ca 7000 BP in uncalibrated radiocarbon years can be clearly assigned to one of these major traditions. After 7000 BP the situation became more complex, with evidence suggesting intermingling of previously discrete technologies and accelerated culture change. Most of the evidence for solid architecture, village life, growing social stratification, intersocietal violence, and other emblems of developing cultural complexity postdate 5000 BP. The concluding section of the book, labeled "Transitional Cultures," accommodates three papers on such cultures. Although Carlson freely admits that there are some difficulties and anomalies entailed in the use of this rough organizing framework, it appears to do the job. The categories employed are made clear only in Carlson's Introduction and the Table of Contents; for some reason the book is not visibly divided into sections, and the individual chapters to which we now turn are unlabeled.

Knut Fladmark summarizes previously reported and recent work at the important Charlie Lake Cave site in northeastern British Columbia in Chapter 2, and Jonathan Driver reviews the implications of the fauna found there in Chapter 3. Attention focuses on the meager material recovered from Stratigraphic Zone IIa at a depth of ca three



by Charles Ewen who joined the project after the significance of the site was recognized and a major archaeological effort was organized. Ewen codirected the project with Jones and thus is intimately familiar with all aspects of the fieldwork and laboratory analysis.

The criteria that had to be met to prove a De Soto connection have already been stated. To wit, the evidence must establish the presence at the site of a camp of an early sixteenth-century Spanish military expedition. Furthermore, it must be able to exclude the Narváez expedition of only ten years before and possible other contemporary Spanish contacts. The camp must also be within the larger context of a late prehistoric native village, presumably Anhaica which was seized and occupied by the army.

The Martin site was clearly part of a large late prehistoric village, a component of the local Fort Walton culture. This was the dominant occupation of the site. Within this context were some unusual features that may have been built with sawn posts. Additional evidence of European construction was the presence of wrought iron nails in these features. The identity and age of the European presence is indicated by other associated artifacts. The military nature of the intrusion is revealed by the arms and armor: specifically a crossbow quarrel and more than 2000 links of chain mail. The nationality is clearly manifested by the Iberian ceramics and the Spanish and Portuguese coins. The presence of faceted chevron and Nueva Cadiz glass beads is significant since they are now recognized as markers for early Spanish contact in the New World. The chronology is best established by the coins which all date to the end of the fifteenth century and the beginning of the sixteenth. The latest coin may have been minted during the reign of the Portuguese King João III whose reign of 1521-1557 still leaves the door open for Narváez.

A De Soto identification, however, is supported by two other pieces of evidence. First, there are the chain mail links; the large number correspond to the historical reference that chain mail was discarded in Apalachee when it was found to be ineffective against native arrows (pp. 196-197). The second specific coincidence of the documents and the archaeology that indicates De Soto rather than Narváez was the recovery of pig bones and teeth at the Martin site. Unlike the ill-prepared earlier expedition, De Soto brought along a herd

of pigs: a traveling larder that served as an emergency food supply.

While we cannot say beyond doubt that the Martin site was part of De Soto's first winter camp, only the severest critic would deny the probability. It is certainly the best, and still only, candidate we have for a De Soto site. As such, it is the datum against which all future such candidates must be measured.

In Part Three, John Hann offers new translations of the four principal chronicles. The passages are restricted to the Florida leg of the journey since they are meant to add historical background to the discussion of the first winter camp. Hann provides the long-sought modern historiographic analyses of the documents, although they are not in the original language as recommended by Galloway. Nevertheless, the heavily annotated translations are valuable contributions, especially since they are "tailored to the needs of archaeologists" (p. 117) and thus make this book a truly integrated study of *historical archaeology*.

Together, these two books do provide the foundation from which all future De Soto studies must proceed. And since those studies are increasingly couched within the native context — in fact they make no sense outside of that context — we may expect refinements in our understanding of southeastern archaeology. Whether, or not, we will ever be able to use with confidence the descriptive information about the Indians contained within the documents, the broad sweep of the expedition throughout the southeast is an important threshold separating prehistory from history, a single historical event that ties together the entire region and provides a datum that initiated the protohistoric period during which such dramatic changes occurred in the native societies. □

#### REFERENCES CITED:

- Brain, Jeffrey P. (1975) Artifacts of the Adelantado. *The Conference on Historic Site Archaeology Papers* 8: 129-138.
- (1985a) The Archaeology of the De Soto Expedition. In *Alabama and the Borderlands: From Prehistory to Statehood*, R. Badger and L. Clayton, eds., pp. 96-107. University of Alabama Press, University.
- (1985b) Introduction: Update of De Soto Studies since the United States De Soto Expedition Commission Report. In *Final Report of the United States De Soto Expedition Commission*, J. R. Swanton, pp. xi-lxxii. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C. (Reprint of Swanton 1939 edition listed below.)

Brain, Jeffrey P., Alan Toth and Antonio Rodriguez-Buckingham (1974) Ethnohistoric Archaeology and the De Soto Entrada into the Lower Mississippi Valley. *The Conference on Historic Site Archaeology Papers* 7: 252-289.

DePratter, Chester B., Charles M. Hudson and Marvin T. Smith (1985) The Hernando de Soto Expedition: From Chiaha to Mabila. In *Alabama and the Borderlands: From Prehistory to Statehood*, R. Badger and L. Clayton, eds., pp. 108-127. University of Alabama Press, University.

Hudson, Charles M. (1990) A Synopsis of the Hernando de Soto Expedition, 1539-1543. In *De Soto Trail: De Soto National Historic Trail Study*. National Park Service, Washington, D.C.

Hudson, Charles M. (1993) Evidence for a New De Soto Route West of the Mississippi River. In *The De Soto Expedition in the West*, G. Young and M. Hoffman, eds. University of Arkansas Press, Fayetteville.

Hudson, Charles M. (1994) The Hernando de Soto Expedition, 1539-1543. In *The Forgotten Centuries: Indians and Europeans in the American South, 1521-1704*, C. Hudson and C. Tassar, eds., pp. 74-103. University of Georgia Press, Athens.

Hudson, Charles M., Chester B. DePratter and Marvin T. Smith (1989) Hernando de Soto's Expedition

Through the Southern United States. In *First Encounters: Spanish Explorations in the Caribbean and the United States, 1492-1570*, J. Milanich and S. Milbrath, eds., pp. 77-98. University of Florida Press, Gainesville.

Hudson, Charles M., Marvin T. Smith and Chester B. DePratter (1990) The Hernando de Soto Expedition: From Mabila to the Mississippi. In *Towns and Temples Along the Mississippi*, D. Dye and C. Cox, eds. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.

Hudson, Charles M., Marvin T. Smith, David Hally, Richard Polhemus and Chester B. DePratter (1985) Coosa: A Chiefdom of the Sixteenth-Century Southeastern United States. *American Antiquity* 50: 723-737.

Milanich, Jerald T., and Charles M. Hudson (1993) *Hernando de Soto and the Indians of Florida*. University of Florida Press, Gainesville.

Smith, Marvin T. (1987) *Archaeology of Aboriginal Culture Change in the Interior Southeast: Depopulation During the Early Historic Period*. University of Florida Press, Gainesville.

Swanton, John R. (1939) *Final Report of the United States De Soto Expedition Commission*. United States House of Representatives Document no. 71, 76th Congress, 1st session. Washington, D.C.

### Politics and Archaeology Colonialism, Nationalism, Ethnicity, and Archaeology Part 2 By C.C. Lamberg-Karlovsky

*Colonial Indology: Sociopolitics of the Ancient Indian Past*, (1997) DILIP K. CHAKRABARTI. Munshiram Manoharlal, New Delhi.

*The Archaeology of Ethnicity*, (1997) SIÂN JONES, Routledge, London.

*Nationalism, Politics, and the Practice of Archaeology*, (1997). PHILIP KOHL AND CLARE FAWCETT, editors. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

*There is no a priori reason for thinking that when we discuss the truth that it will be interesting.* — C.S. Lewis

What is the role of archaeology in constructing cultural identity? This question has been superbly addressed by a number of authors in the book edited by Kohl and Fawcett and theoretical underpinnings in the construction of ethnicity are scrutinized by Siân Jones in *The Archaeology of Ethnicity*. In the modern

world ethnicity cannot be disassociated from politics and the politics of ethnicity have all too frequently led to bloodshed. Jones writes, "The emergence of the concept of ethnicity as a major taxonomic category in the classification of peoples was partly stimulated by a theoretical shift away from fixed, reified categories of 'race', 'culture', 'society', and 'tribe' toward a processual analysis of ethnicity as a form of social interaction" (p.54-55). The shift to concepts of ethnicity and away from such terms as 'race' and 'tribe' has more to do with political correctness than with a "theoretical shift". Ethnicity is tightly wed to the demands of specific groups to achieve power and rights.

To Jones, "ethnic identity is based on a shifting, situational, subjective identification of self and others, which is rooted in ongoing daily practice and historical experience, but also subject to transformation and discontinuity" (p.13) and "The idea of a bounded, monolithic, cultural cum ethnic unit is also a modern classificatory myth projected onto all human history" (p.104). Are these statements true? It strikes me that there is much in them that seems ideological and distantly academic from the real world. That ethnic identities are "shifting",



"subjective", and a "classificatory myth" are both true and untrue. True in the sense that they are "shifting"; we no longer have Picts, Celts, or Assyrians in our midst. But we do have Hutu, Tutsi, Chechen, Tibetan, Bosnians, Serbs, Georgians, Zulus, Kashmiris, Abkhazians, to mention but a few, who have been willing to die in the service of their ethnic nationalism. This renders the nature of ethnicity as a "classificatory myth" that is "subjective" and highly dubious. Telling the above peoples that their ethnic identity is a "myth", entirely "subjective", or that it is not "bounded" and "monolithic" would be telling them something which daily experience informs them is utterly untrue. Furthermore, it is quite probable that the creation of ethnic identities is not a "modern classificatory myth projected onto all human history". Even in remote antiquity peoples distinguished themselves from one another, often seeing and calling the "other" in pejorative fashion. Unfortunately, the author does not review the ancient texts of Mesopotamia, Egypt, or the later classical world. Had she done this, ethnicity would not be perceived as a "modern classificatory myth". Mesopotamian and Egyptian texts are populated with numerous foreigners, all given an ethnic identity. Name-calling sets one group off against another. The Egyptians referred to the inhabitants of the Levant (whose real names they well knew) as "Asiatic dogs" while the Akkadians referred to the Guti as "dog-headed monkeys". Ethnic hostility appears not to be a recent invention. From a synchronic perspective ethnicity appears to be both bounded and fixed; wedded to social action and wary of the "other", while from a diachronic perspective ethnicity is transient and subjective. All too frequently Siân Jones diminishes the significance of ethnicity and sees it entirely within its synchronic context as situational and subjective; a construction of social identity. The author's theoretical constructs do not make the ethnic category less real to those who identify and live within them. That politics and social interaction construct ethnicity is not a new recognition. As we have seen, Warren Hastings realized it within the context of British colonialism in India and more recently it was explicitly recognized by T.E. Lawrence. In reflecting upon the negotiations that created the modern nation states of the Near East he states:

The necessary revision of this agreement is a delicate matter, and can hardly be done satisfactorily by

England and France, without giving weight and expression also to the opinion of the third interest - the Arabs - *which it created.* (emphasis mine)

Siân Jones contends that once the historically contingent nature of ethnic identity is understood one "has the potential to subject contemporary claims about the permanent and inalienable status of identity and territorial association to scrutiny". Does this mean that the archaeologist can tell the people that they are not who they think they are? or that they come from some other place than the lands they have inhabited for centuries? Can the archaeologist, in fact, determine that the Pre-columbian culture known as Hohokam is today's Zuni?, Hopi?, none of the above? Or is there an archaeologist who can define the boundaries of ancient Israel during the time of the Kingdom of David? and does that territorial boundary, which cannot in fact be archaeologically drawn, bear any relationship to the territorial boundaries of modern Israel? Just precisely how an appreciation of the historically contingent nature of ethnicity leads to "the potential to subject claims" of modern ethnic groups to their own "identity" and "territorial association" is left unexamined. The promise the author holds out to archaeologists, of being able to deconstruct ethnicity, to identify its formation and changing nature, is a promise which, unsurprisingly, is never fulfilled.

In chapter two the author addresses "Archaeological identification of peoples and culture". It is a clearly written and concise synopsis of a predictable cast of characters: Kossina, Childe, Kidder, Hawkes, Binford, Hodder, et al. The author points out, rather critically, that archaeologists have been all too quick in assuming that their bounded cultural entities correspond with particular peoples, cultures, tribes, races, and/or ethnic groups. Throughout this chapter the author offers the reader the impression that we are dealing with old fashioned archaeological habits, that is, culture history and classification, which are much in need of revision if not liquidation. The way to the future is promised in the following chapters. However, neither the remaining chapters, nor the distance future, can resolve a fundamental epistemological problem which the author introduces but leaves unexamined. How does the archaeologist examine *any* aspect of social organization without first structuring a cultural entity?

This entity is an archaeological culture, i.e., Hohokam, Anasazi, Bell Beaker, Shang, Harappan, Uruk, etc. The unmistakable fact is that an archaeologist must have a recognizable entity to work with, an assemblage of co-occurring material remains whose construction is referred to as an archaeological 'culture', before questions of cultural process can be addressed. To take that element away from the archaeologist is to render him/her utterly speechless! Upon confronting an archaeological site and/or region the archaeologist must first define the recovered remains in space and time, classify and type the materials, and offer them a context; that is to say an archaeological 'culture'. Only when such a 'culture' has been identified, described, and defined can one begin to look at processual problems, i.e., subsistence strategies, or such post-processual problems as ethnicity. The author does not like the untidy methods of culture history, or the arbitrary nature of classificatory systems, preferring instead the promise of the new archaeology whose newfound clarity is promised in the final chapter.

Chapter three is concerned with "Taxonomies of Difference: the classification of peoples in the human sciences". There is no secret in the fact that classification is not its own goal; we classify for a purpose. Chakrabarti reminds us that the British classified India as a deprived and debased culture much in need of enlightened rule. In this short chapter Jones offers a critique of 19th century classificatory schemes of race, language, and culture, and the emergence of ethnicity, the subject of her fourth and fifth chapters: "Ethnicity: the conceptual and theoretical terrain" and "Multidimensional ethnicity: toward a contextual analytical framework".

The author asks if the "creation of ethnic identities in the contemporary world resemble those that took place in the past?" (p.101). The question is an excellent one but never answered. It is in fact unanswerable. The essential nature that creates and sustains ethnicity is not determinable in the archaeological record, namely, the distinctive qualities of myths, memories, symbols, and values. It is precisely this quartet that forms individual consciousness so fundamental to the formation and perpetuation of community identity. Of the above items only symbols survive in the archaeological record and then only their style not their meaning. And style, as we shall see, is the singular approach to identifying ethnicity in the archaeological

record. In discussing the conceptual and theoretical terrain the author reviews the thoughts on ethnicity of such authors as Bourdieu, Barth, Narroll, Eriksen, Bromley, Shils, Smith, Glazer, Moynihan, and Bell, to mention but a few. In discussing how these authors have approached ethnicity, their theoretical and substantive approaches, the reader is never given a clear definition, or identification of, ethnicity. Siân Jones identifies ethnic groups as economic and/or political action groups, as emerging in the context of colonialism, or as created by a western hegemony in which groups search for a distinctive identity. It is difficult to see how any of these can relate to the archaeological record. In my opinion the most serious drawback of this book is the author's failure to offer an analytical framework for the study of ethnicity within the archaeological record. Its strength is in reviewing for the archaeologist how ethnicity is perceived by social scientists in the present. If we could identify those which form the essential features of 'ethnicity' perhaps we could then approach these categories in the archaeological record. Thus, I would argue that the salient features that incorporate the dimensions of what we call 'ethnic' are: (1) the existence of a collective name, (2) a shared origin myth, (3) a shared history [one that is commonly believed and serves an integrative purpose, needless to say this history need not be 'authentic'], (4) an association with a specific territory, perceived as a 'homeland' with symbolic and/or sacred centers, (5) a sense of group solidarity that overrides such divisions as class, (6) a shared belief in that which incorporates the sacred and the profane, and (7) a shared material culture including food/diet/cooking. In the absence of written texts the sole attribute left for the archaeologist to examine is the last item on the list! I have argued elsewhere that if adequate texts are available, as they are in third millennium Egypt and Mesopotamia, it is possible to identify all of the above features that signify the presence of distinctive ethnicities (Lamberg-Karlovsky 1996).

In the final two chapters Jones grapples with "Ethnicity and material culture: towards a theoretical basis for the interpretation of ethnicity in archaeology" and "Conclusions: constructing identities in the past and present". The author positions herself at the midpoint of conflicting approaches. On the one hand she is constantly pointing to the intuitive, arbi-



rary, and constructed nature of archaeological classification. Given this approach the author makes it clear that the identification of ethnicity is far beyond the boundaries of archaeology. In this vein she is impressed by the work of Ian Hodder whose well-known work suggests that mundane material and decorative items may, or may not, express ethnic identity while distinctive ethnic identities may, or may not, exist without reference to material remains. On the other hand, she directs her attention to the works of Binford, Sackett, Wiessner, and Conkey who find in the isolation of 'style' and 'symbol' an opportunity to identify 'ethnic' groups. In the final analysis "style is a form of communication and social marking in certain, usually highly visible, artifacts, and in certain social contexts" (p.113). Unfortunately, the author overlooks the important contributions of Dorothy Washburn's (1990) study of style, with reference to ethnicity, and Whitney Davis' (1992) in reference to state-formation. There is also a very considerable literature in the works of former Soviet and eastern European scholars pertaining to the identification of 'style' and its relationship to ethnicity.

After much see-sawing Jones concludes that ethnicity is highly contingent and variable, being dependent upon pre-existing cultural realities, processes of interaction, and power relations between groups. All of this is well and good but offers little clue, or even hope, as to how the archaeologist can control the contingent, comprehend the variable, or approach the "pre-existing cultural realities". Finally, "The relationship between ethnicity and material culture thus appears to be intangible and fleeting, and particularly problematic for archaeologists" (p.124). Such a pessimistic statement needs to be qualified in two respects, scale and time change the perspective. If one were thoroughly familiar with the archaeological remains from five relatively contemporary sites of 2,000 B.C. in Egypt, Mesopotamia, the Indus Valley, China, and Mexico and were then offered an unidentified collection from a site from one of the above regions, an archaeologist would have little difficulty placing the assemblage in the correct geographical and cultural/ethnic context. At this scale of analysis the archaeologist is quite good at distinguishing distinctive cultures/ethnic groups. Reduce the scale and the problem becomes more acute but, I would argue, still manage-

able. Several excellent essays in the edited work of Kohl and Fawcett suggest that the archaeological identification of ethnicity is manageable, controversial, and volatile.

*Nationalism, Politics, and the Practice of Archaeology* is organized by geographical regions and opens with Western Europe. Bernard Wailes and Amy Zoll take on the theme of "Civilization, barbarism and nationalism in European archaeology". The authors point out that the transformation from barbarism to civilization is typically played out within an ethnic frame of reference, a confrontation between the "retarded" and the "primitive", between the "emotionally event more satisfying, bad guys versus good guys". The example taken is that of Insular art, a style of the seventh century A.D. developed in Ireland, western Scotland (the Irish Kingdom of Dalriada), north England (Anglo-Saxon Northumbria), and eastern Scotland (Pictland), lands generally regarded as more barbarian than civilized. Insular art combines features taken from the "barbarian" Celtic and Germanic worlds with those derived from the "civilized" contemporaneous Mediterranean and provincial Roman world. The diversity of the art has prompted much debate as to its origins and to the historical implications of the interaction between the "barbarian" and "civilized" regions. Wailes and Zoll argue convincingly that the appearance of Insular art should be seen as a new cosmopolitan civilization that cannot be couched in terms of specific ethnicity nor understood within the framework of a barbarism-civilization polarity. Nevertheless, the authors point out that "European concepts of ethnicity, of barbarism, and of civilization were born in antiquity, or at least first recorded in antiquity" (p.33). Later medieval attitudes held by the English toward their Celtic neighbors, the Welsh, Scots and the Irish, offer ample evidence of ethnic intolerance. If the Irish conformed to English ways they were seen as "civil"; if not they were "wild". In Europe the juxtaposition of barbarian versus civilized was inherited from antiquity and molded later methods of classification, constructions of identity and ethnic history, and schemes of human evolution. The authors conclude their excellent essay with the dubious notion that "these concepts may often distort archaeological analysis, but they probably do no great harm used in purely scholarly context". Such a context, as pointed out by several other authors in this volume, does not exist!

Margarita Diaz-Andreu addresses "Archaeology and nationalism in Spain" and discusses how Spanish nationalism was challenged by the "peripheral nationalisms" of Catalonia, the Basque, and Galicia. Thus, distinct ethno-nationalisms, with antagonistic versions of the national past, confronted each other within a single nation-state. On the one hand the archaeological excavations of a Celtiberian town, Numantia, attempted to build a commemorative monument as a means of awakening a uniform national consciousness, while on the other hand, the archaeological excavations at Emporion offered the Catalans a symbol for their own nation building. The author suggests that the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939) can be seen as "a fight over two ways of understanding Spain as a nation. Some saw Spain as a multi-cultural unit....Others such as General Francisco Franco, viewed the country as a single cultural unit". (p.45) From her discussion of Spanish, Catalan, Basque, and Galician nationalism and archaeology it is clear that the "two ways of understanding Spain as a nation" were also fought out in the archaeological trenches.

Perhaps the most distinguished archaeologist in Spain, prior to the Civil War, was the Catalan nationalist Pere Bosch Gimpera. In his publications he attempted to relate ancient "etnie" to modern cultures thereby demonstrating that the cultural diversity of Spain had prehistoric roots. These findings allowed him to support a federal structure for the Spanish state in which Catalonia would have an autonomous status. The end of the Civil War and the victory of General Franco's vision of a Spain with a single cultural entity meant the exile of Professor Bosch Gimpera. What Bosch Gimpera was to the archaeology of Catalan nationalism so Father José Miguel de Barandian was to Basque archaeology and nationalism and Florentino López Cuevillas to Galician. Following the Civil War the fascist Julio Martínez-Santa Ollala was placed in charge of archaeology in Spain. Predictably under Franco, the Roman and Visigothic periods were emphasized. During these periods Spain was seen as first united, Christianity arrived, and the country learned to behave like an empire. Diaz-Andreu offers powerful evidence for her conclusion, namely, "the development of archaeology as a scientific discipline in the nineteenth century can only be understood in the context of a creation of a national history; that is to say a history directed at legitimizing the exist-

tence of a nation and, therefore, its right to constitute an independent state". (p.54) In other words, archaeology became scientific to fulfill a political agenda. Not a particularly uplifting genealogy. On the other hand, the author points out that after the Second World War, as archaeologists attempted to pursue a scientific method, archaeology became "depoliticized".

Katina Lillios writes about "Nationalism and Copper Age research in Portugal during the Salazar regime (1932-1974)". She contends that followers of Salazar's authoritarian regime glorified the importance of the Copper Age which resembled the glories of Portugal's Age of Discoveries; both in turn recalling the Salazar present. Under Salazar the Copper Age was seen as a "golden age" emphasizing the positive images of Portugal's past: discovery, exploration, a nation of colonizers, missionaries, and traders. Thus archaeology, we are told, was in the interest of forming a national ideology. The author suggests that today this has changed. The post-Salazarian view of the Copper Age is said to be Marxist wherein class conflicts, territorial control, and agricultural surpluses rule the day; the rich tombs of the of the Copper Age are barely mentioned. This hardly seems what Lillios believes to be a "disarticulation of archaeology as an instrument of the Portuguese government". It seems rather to be a matter of first subscribing to a political ideology and then matching it to an agreeable archaeological interpretation.

Constructing a political ideology and then making up a past to affirm its superiority is precisely what the National Socialists did under Hitler. Bettina Arnold and Henning Hassmann, in "Archaeology in Nazi Germany: the legacy of the Faustian bargain", make it clear that "Prehistoric archaeology was to become the handmaiden of the National Socialist platform of territorial expansion and racialist dogma" (p.76). The authors discuss in considerable detail the role played by archaeology and archaeologists in the events of 1933-1945. Following the war there was a characteristic silence—the denial of individual responsibility and an absence of seeking out the culpable. The authors do not make it clear what "evidence" is to be used in distinguishing those involved in actual complicity, the confirmed and activist party liner, from the expedient, cynical opportunist. Are both as guilty? The authors point out that "There is no question that using the appropriate language was essential to obtaining funding" (p.80). How does one



distinguish lip-service to party dogma from the cynic? It would appear to me that the drawing of such lines is fundamental in confronting the legacy of the Faustian bargain. Arnold and Haussmann suggest that today there is a "continuing atmosphere of threat, retribution, and oppression" which will pass when the Faustian bargain can be examined without fear of reprisal. Recent events resulting from the destruction of the Berlin Wall suggest that it is easier to clean the house of another than one's own. With reunification came the summary dismissal of a number of archaeologists in East Germany for allegedly collaborating with the communists. To many, in both West and East, the dismissals, in the absence of formal criteria and even formal charges, were seen as arbitrary and retributive. Their replacements, invariably from West Germany, did little to effect a rapprochement.

The author's judgment of German archaeology as practiced today is harsh. "In all likelihood the next generation of German prehistorians will bring the profession into the twentieth century, at least with regard to developments in archaeological theory" (p.81). The implication is that Germany has been held back in the development of archaeological theory due to its lack of catharsis over its "Faustian bargain". In my opinion this seriously misreads and underrates the achievements of a generation of post-war archaeologists in Germany, referred to as a "vacuum of innovative archaeological scholarship" (p.73). There is something of an apologia, with overtones of political correctness, by suggesting that the "promising and potentially original young archaeologists were killed" in the war and that the emigration of "innovative scholars who were either Jewish or openly critical of the regime" led to a scarcity of professionals. This in turn allowed for "active party members and operatives" to be "reinstated in their old or related departments".

In Nazi Germany, as well as in the USSR and China, archaeological theory was constrained and atrocities were carried out in the name of party ideology. Fortunately, as we shall see, the authors of the chapters on the USSR and China do not make the mistake of diminishing the contributions of archaeology and/or archaeologists because of the political ideology under which they willingly, or unwillingly, worked. Nazi and Soviet political ideology perpetuated, in equal measure, the greatest atrocities of this century. In nations ruled by these

ideologies archaeologists found abundant opportunities for collaboration or resistance. The Soviet experience, contra that of the Nazi, suggests that a considerable accomplishment can occur in a discipline, i.e. archaeology, in spite of a nightmarish political context. The Faustian bargain and its political legacy have different impacts; a successful examination of this "bargain" and its political legacy, whether in Nazi Germany, the Soviet Union, or Mao's China, remains to be written.

Concluding the section on Western Europe is David W. Anthony's splendid essay, "Nazi and eco-feminist prehistories: ideology and empiricism in Indo-European archaeology". Anthony's essay begins with a critical analysis of post-processual archaeology that has led the discipline into a "current paralysis": "Having lost its former objective guideposts, prehistoric archaeology has opened itself to innumerable popular reinterpretations of the past, ranging from nationalist bigotry to fantasies of spiritual root-seeking". (p.85) Anthony rightly ridicules the absurdities perpetuated in the search for an Aryan homeland, recalling Max Müller's observation that an Aryan skull makes about as much sense as a dolichocephalic language. Following a brief review of the views of Kossina, Childe, Gimbutas, and Renfrew, each sharing a vision of migrating hordes of Aryans imposing their will, language, and technology (agriculture) upon indigenous populations, Anthony focuses upon the transforming interpretations of Marija Gimbutas. Gimbutas believed that the invading Indo-Europeans destroyed the Copper Age cultures of "Old Europe" predominately situated in southeastern Europe. The cultures of "Old Europe" were gynocentric, peaceful, artistic, and egalitarian; weapons, particularly thrusting weapons, were largely absent, and women were ritually and spiritually dominant although not in a hierarchical way. This utopia was presided over by female goddesses who extolled the female creations in clay and textiles and nurtured the creativity of agriculture, animal breeding, architecture, and a civilized way of life. Sadly, this paradise was destroyed by the invading Indo-Europeans who introduced such abominations as social hierarchy, warfare, violence, weaponry, and the patriarchal domination of women. The triumph of the Indo-Europeans laid the foundations for the male-dominated Western world that threatens to destroy all of us. Eco-feminism would have us learn the lessons of the Copper Age and remake our

social and political world accordingly. Anthony synthesizes the views of archaeologists and spiritual gurus that believe this claptrap while also summarizing the views and data of others who refute it. While Chakrabarti is fighting the arrested myths of an Aryan past as they relate(d) to India, Anthony is contesting the invention of new Aryan myths pertaining to Europe. In India the Aryan myths served to legitimize colonial rule, in Nazi Germany to legitimize racial superiority, and in its new eco-feminist guise the newly constructed Aryan myth fosters an image of inspired spiritual unity of female superiority. The pernicious evil inspired by Indo-European 'studies' and Aryan mythology lead Chakrabarti to dismiss the entire field of historical linguistics. Anthony, fully cognizant of the nonsense perpetuated under the banner of the Aryans, is more to the point: "Indo-European comparative mythology and linguistics really do hold out the possibility of reconstructing ideologies and symbolic systems of an entirely prehistoric European society, a possibility of unparalleled potential because there is no prehistoric linguistic and mythological tradition anywhere that has been so intensively studied by linguists over the course of the last two centuries" (p.96). In an environment of increasing political correctness it is not untoward to state that attempting to discover from linguistic palaeontology the historical background of the Indo-Europeans does not mean endorsing colonialism, racism, sexism, or for that matter any other 'ism'!

In a timely and informed essay Timothy Kaiser addresses "Archaeology and ideology in southeast Europe". Today, ethnicity and nationalism are etched into the thoughts of virtually all who inhabit the Balkans; its imprint is transformed into violence and bloodshed. Changes in the archaeological record are explained as resulting from migrations and invasions. Thus, agriculture, metal-working, and urbanism were brought into the Balkans through diffusion. One's immediate reaction is to counter the reflex of diffusionism; however, the author points out that following Roman colonization the "Balkans witnessed a millennium of destruction at the hands of successive waves of invading tribes" (p.102): the Goths, Avars, Slavs, Bulgars, Magyars, Pechenegs, Cumans, and Mongols. In spite of these invasions that characterized the years between 800-1400, the local Kingdoms in Serbia, Croatia, Bosnia, Bulgaria, Wallachia, and Moldavia attempted to survive within their fluctuat-

ing territories. Ultimately the region was to be divided and subjugated by the Habsburg and the Ottoman Empires. Kaiser's essay should be required reading for those who diminish the significance of ethnicity, think of it as of recent origin and of transient importance, and negate the significance of migration and invasion. Ethnicity as an organizing principle is one of the most significant attributes of Balkan history, "Balkan history is largely ethnic history, a history of ethnic movements and ethnic conflicts. This being the case, it should hardly come as a surprise that archaeologists in southeast Europe who deal with the prehistoric past think of the past in terms of ethnic groups, their movements, their territories and their customs..." (p.104). In discussing nineteenth century national movements, Kaiser makes an important point: language was the determinant of which people should form a nation state while history (which includes different religious differences) was the prime determinant of the territory they should occupy. Needless to say, archaeology formed an important role in outlining that history and, in doing so, was intimately associated with the rise of nationalism. The creation of new political identities required both legitimacy and a newly created citizenry. Smaller groups, even individuals (Wilhelm II who linked Prussia with the rest of Germany to create a new nation), could create a nation and fill it with a people by rewriting history. As the nation-builder d'Azeglio remarked, "We have made Italy; now we must make the Italians".

It was almost seventy years ago that Childe wrote *The Danube in Prehistory*. His was the first effort to integrate the disparate and duplicating evidence of the archaeological cultures that are spread over southeastern Europe. It is disheartening to learn that identical archaeological cultures can still be given different names in different countries. Thus, in Hungary the Füzesabony, in Romania the Otomania, and in Slovakia the Nitra masquerade as three different entities because archaeologists in each nation believe there are socio-cultural distinctions that are relevant to their own nation. On the Balkan landscape today archaeologists are busy inventing multiple pasts and traditions to fit emerging ethnic identities as well as destroying archaeological monuments that do not fit their construction. Bosnians, Croations, and Serbs are not alone in attempting to "concretize a connection to remote antiquity which is claimed as an important part of



their national identity" (p.117).

There can hardly be a more apt example in which the past, presented in the form of invented traditions, is used to contour national identity or legitimate present policy. Today, perhaps more than in any other region of the world, nationalism, ethnicity, and the practice of archaeology come together in the Balkans; each offers fuel for the celebration of nation-building—a fuel in the form of an unrelenting river of blood.

Two splendid essays cover the complexities of our theme as practiced in the former USSR. Victor Shnirelman addresses "From internationalism to nationalism: forgotten pages of Soviet archaeology in the 1930s and 1940s" and Chernykh adds "Postscript: Russian archaeology after the collapse of the USSR - infrastructural crises and the resurgence of old and new nationalism". Evzen Chernykh joins Tim Kaiser in pointing an accusatory finger at archaeologists fueling the flames of nationalism; he makes the astonishing statement that, "Suffice it to say that nearly all the 'hot' conflicts currently burning throughout this area [the former USSR] are directly supported, if not headed, by archaeologists and historians of antiquity who...are not only interpreting the world through their chauvinist readings of the remote past but attempting to change it through violent political action" (p.143).

Somewhere Marx wrote something to the effect that ethnicity was false consciousness. If so, the Soviets failed to eradicate the ethnic consciousness of the Uzbeks, Armenians, Buryats, Turkoman, Azeris (and remaining one hundred ethnicities that inhabited the USSR), and transform them into Soviet citizens. Shnirelman reviews how, in the early years, the policy of the Soviet Union attempted to eliminate ethnicity and fashion the Soviet man and woman. In 1930 Stalin declared that in a multi-ethnic state, under the dictatorship of the proletariat, all cultures would become "national in form and socialist in content". An internationalist socialist culture with a single language would emerge; what Chernykh points out was referred to as "the formation of a single Soviet people". Before the victory of the internationalists Stalin realized that there were two enemies to fight: Great Russian chauvinism and local nationalism. To effect this "[t]he discipline (archaeology) was violently transformed through purges and reorganization demanded by the party bureaucracy" (p.124). The construction of the 'interna-

tionists' model by Nikolai Ya Marr, Mikhail Pokrovski, and S.N. Bykovski is well detailed by Schnirelman as is the destruction of this paradigm, and many who constructed it. Internationalism was replaced by nationalism as the Russians played the role of "big brother" among the different nationalities. The transition from one paradigm to the other resulted in Bykovski, a pioneering advocate of internationalism, being shot and Pokrovski, who portrayed the Russians as imperialist and colonizers of indigenous regions, being accused of "contempt for the Motherland". He and the 'Pokrovski School' were destroyed "so that historians would realize the ideological changes better and begin to fulfill more expeditiously their new political tasks" (p.130). The new nationalist paradigm, discussed by Schnirelman under the heading 'The Slavs are coming', is self explanatory. The archaeology of the Slavs became the paramount concern while a Germanic presence was cleansed from the soil. The "Great Russian people" were identified in the archaeology of the Scythians, the Halstatt, the Tripolye, Sarmatian-Alanian; Slavic roots stretched in an unbroken chain from the Palaeolithic to the Medieval period. Just as German scholars in the 1930s and 40s advocated a German superiority and "ethnogenetic expansion", so Russian scholars advocated the same for the Slavs in the 40s and 50s. Stalin offered his imprimatur on the 'internationalist' policy in his speech before the 16th Communist Party Congress in 1930. Later, when he decided to ditch this failed program he endorsed the nationalist agenda and pointed out the special merits of the Russian people. Russians now were mentioned with the epithet "Great" and salutary influences upon their neighbors, both real and imagined, were pointed out.

E.N. Chernykh offers a catalog of the unbelievable being peddled as true in the post-USSR, i.e. the Sumerians and Scythians were Turkic speakers. The concluding paragraph of Chernykh's paper, which the footnotes inform us was written by Phil Kohl, is direct and to the point:

...the nationalist crazies out there are not uniquely restricted to eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. Rather, little fascists eager to distort their pasts to further their own, often violent, political ends are capable of sprouting up like weeds everywhere, and one must recognize them for what they are and not excuse them away on the basis of some slippery

relativist standard (p.148).

One is reminded here that Siân Jones, specifically in reference to the book edited by Kohl and Fawcett, prefers a relativist standard in approaching ethnicity. Without it, that is a relativist, post-processual approach, she argues, we are left with only "empiricist positions" and "claims to scientific objectivity". She objects to archaeologists acting as arbitrators of nationalist conflicts and distinguishing between 'objective' and 'balanced' interpretations from 'distorted' or 'implausible' ones (p.11). Behind a screen of academes Jones addresses the nature of "empiricism", "scientific objectivity", "positivism", "archaeological epistemology", etc. In the final analysis I would rather trust a Kohl, Chernykh, Schnirelman, or Anthony to spot and counteract an "empiricist" injustice in the name of nationalism than Jones to identify and respond to the same within the shifting relativisms of post-processual thought.

In "Nationalism, politics, and the practice of archaeology in the Caucasus" Philip Kohl and Gocha Tsetskheladze offer contradictory "readings of archaeology as practiced in Azerbaijan, Armenia, and Georgia, and the northern Caucasus". The authors point out that within these regions "essentialist interpretations", what I have termed a primordial perspective, and questions of ethnogenesis and claims to specific territories, are the dominant motifs of nationalism. Georgian, Armenian, and Azeri archaeologists all share in tracing their territorial roots back to the Palaeolithic period and offer an ethnic identity to a constellation of archaeological cultures. That the Caucasus consists of a mosaic of ethnicities and languages has long been noted, far less appreciated is the extraordinary interlacing of modern ethnicity with archaeological cultures and historical linguistics. This chapter is perhaps the most explicit in the book showing how nationalism is intimately linked with archaeology. Specific authors, archaeological cultures, irredentist claims, ethnic hostilities, nationalist propaganda, the distortions of linguistic palaeontology, territorial rights, the fabrication of 'evidence', and more, are all part of the wedding of archaeology and nationalism; the purpose of the "reading" is to distance one from the "other" while forging a singularity of the primordial "we".

The authors discuss the influence of the Greeks upon the lands east of the Black Sea and south of the Caucasus range, known to the Greeks as 'Colchis'. On the

one hand, the Greeks influenced this region from Archaic to Hellenistic times; on the other hand, in the fifth century the region of Colchis may have been a satrapy of the Persian Empire. The regions east and south (Iberia) of Colchis almost certainly were. That purely Greek and Persian imports exist in Colchis is an undeniable fact. Still, some Georgian archaeologists of distinction deny this evidence. Colchis, they argue, was highly developed, it did not need any outside influence to originate and sustain its grandeur—this argument precisely mirroring that of Chakrabarti in dealing with the Indus civilization. Rather than celebrating contacts with distant worlds and showing how they refashioned the achievements of others, their highly developed civilization must remain a pristine entity, unpolluted by an outside world.

Cultural patriotism and the dogma of indigenous origins is a theme of the two essays on China. Enzheng Tong and Lothar von Falkenhausen address "Thirty Years of Chinese archaeology (1949-1979)" and "The regionalist paradigm in Chinese archaeology". Enzheng Tong points out that for thirty years, "even acknowledging the persistence of Marxist/Maoist guidance", China "completely ignored theory". If it lacked theory the author does an excellent job of showing that it did not lack an agenda. Its agenda was, (1) to document the existence of a unilinear evolution, i.e. from matriarchal to patriarchal clans, (2) "to prove that ancient Chinese history followed Marxist social development theory", (3) to follow the instructions of Mao and "Let archaeology better serve the politics of the proletariat", (4) to sever connections with foreigners as instructed by Xia Nai, China's foremost archaeologist, in order "to wipe out all the abominable influences of the distortion of history by bourgeois and other exploiting classes", and (5) to prove the independent development of Chinese civilization and to "inordinately emphasize the importance of the cultures of the middle and Yellow River valley, the so-called 'Central-Plain Region' of Chinese history". It was this region, so stated the official view, in which Chinese civilization was established.

The insular view and isolationist posture of archaeology is evident with Xia Nai's denial of a collaborative archaeological project which Harvard University and Sichuan University wished to undertake in 1981. In contrast, in the same year, Academician Boris Rybakov, Director of the Institute of Archaeology in Moscow, allowed for



the first collaborative undertaking between archaeologists of the USA and USSR. As in China so also in the USSR—both demanded obedience from peripheral regions to the political center, Beijing and Moscow. But unlike Beijing [thus China], Moscow [thus the USSR] *did not* stress the cultural superiority of any single ethnic group. In China a specific ethnicity, the Han, were presented as superior and their homeland was said to be in the Yellow River. Both within China and the USSR, as the respective authors in this volume point out, archaeologists were commanded to follow the official dogma. The absence of such conformity led to isolation, persecution, and death.

Lothar von Falkenhausen discussed the new "regionalist Paradigm" in Chinese archaeology. His discussion expands upon the point enumerated as (5) above. He writes,

all of Chinese civilization had been perceived as originating from a narrowly circumscribed area along the middle reaches of the Yellow River, from where it gradually spread outward. This mononuclear model has now given way to a geographically much more broadly based interpretation of Chinese cultural origins, in which early developments in virtually all of China proper (excluding border areas still inhabited by minority populations) are seen as interlinked and are collectively taken as ancestral to the dynastic civilization of China. (p.198)

The author suggests that the exaggerated centralization of control, which characterized the Maoist era, was reflected in the centralized unity required for the origins of Chinese civilization. Today, however, "The idea of an 'interaction sphere' symbolically embodies the decreased degree of political control by the center in the wake of Deng Xiaoping's economic reforms". In empowering the periphery with respect to the center of the new view can be seen as more pluralistic, allowing a greater number of ethnicities to bloom, and thus, be more democratic. Ironically, but perhaps predictably, as the importance of new regions arise a form of centralist priorities emerge within the regions. Mononuclear models within regions replace the single one that integrated all of China. The author emphasizes the political and ideological nature that motivated these changes. It must be pointed out, however, that in this regard changing political ideologies are not occurring within an archaeological vacu-

um. That is to say, dramatic and significant new discoveries in peripheral areas challenge the old "mononuclear model" and call forth the need for a new paradigm. While one can agree with von Falkenhausen that the interpretive strategies of the "regionalist paradigm have arisen chiefly in response to current political realities and needs" (p.215), one cannot lose sight of the fact that new and extremely important archaeological discoveries challenge the mononuclear model and support the greater complexity of interaction spheres (Bagley 1992). Important discoveries in Xinjiang extend our understanding of the westernmost regions of China and offer an initial glimpse at the Bronze and Iron Age interaction that brought this region into contact with the territories of Central Asia in the former Soviet Union (Binhua 1995).

Sarah Nelson points out in "The politics of ethnicity in prehistoric Korea" that questions of ethnic origins have been paramount in addressing the prehistory of that peninsula. She points out that while Korea is unusual in having a homogeneous population it looks to discover its ethnic origins outside of Korea. Archaeology is in search of a Korean homeland in order to affirm an "emphasis on eternal Koreanness" extending from the Palaeolithic to the present. An emphasis on "ethnic purity" prohibits the development of a perspective which, in fact, the archaeological record suggests, namely, that Korean homogeneity was forged from a diversity of elements. In spite of the unlikely thesis of "eternal Koreanness" the author, in a fit of political correctness, supports "the right of Koreans to define their own archaeology in accordance with their own national goals" (p.220). This is, I believe, the only author to explicitly support the notion that archaeology should serve the goals of the state, in this instance "ethnic homogeneity", and be in the exclusive hands of its citizens. Nelson reviews the Siberian, Chinese, and Japanese connections vis-a-vis Korea pointing out the different influences, migrations, and asymmetrical relations that characterized their interaction. Given the author's criticisms of the paradigm of "eternal Koreanness" and the extreme complexity of the interaction between the above regions it is astonishing to read her conclusion: "The origins of specific ethnicities, however, should be reachable with archaeological data" (p.231). While Nelson notes that Korean archaeologists point to the formation of the early Japanese state, resulting from a migra-

tion of Koreans to Japan, Clare Fawcett, who writes on "Nationalism and postwar Japanese archaeology", points out that the Japanese believe their homeland to be in the Asuka area of Nara Prefecture. The Asuka region is "the homeland of the Japanese people" which today forms both a major historic park and serves as "a symbol designed to create a new Japanese national identity". Nelson's richly textured essay addresses a number of relevant topics: the prewar archaeological emphasis on sacralizing the emperor's divine being; an emergent revisionism, led by a new school of Marxists who were almost alone in criticizing imperial ideology and the earlier ultranationalist history, during the period of Occupation; the beginnings of rescue archaeology and the subsequent growth of an administrative archaeology responsible for the management and excavation of the country's archaeological resources. In this regard Japan mirrors the States in having more administrative archaeologists dealing with the nation's cultural resource management (CRM) than academic archaeologists. In 1987 archaeologists in Japan excavated a staggering 21,755 sites, of which only 409 were academic excavations. The importance of CRM in Japan has led to a situation in which "the state and business elites have shaped the kinds of research archaeologists do, the way they structure and organize their work, and the use of archaeological results in the public realm — particularly the use of archaeology to define Japanese national identity" (p.244). As in Korea, so also in Japan, archaeology serves in support of the "myth of homogeneity" which, in its larger form, argues for the uniqueness of the Japanese, stresses the importance of group consensus, national self-determination, and the need for cooperation with authority.

Two essays of 'Commentary' conclude the volume: Neil Silberman's "Promised lands and chosen peoples: the politics and poetics of archaeological narrative", and Bruce Trigger's "Romanticism, nationalism and archaeology". Silberman, after reviewing the uses and abuses of archaeology in different parts of the world concludes that the discipline in inevitably, a political undertaking. To Trigger's (1984) three alternative archaeologies: nationalist, colonialist, and imperialist, Silberman adds "touristic archaeology" and an "archaeology of protest". The former are well represented in this country by Colonial Williamsburg, Ellis Island, Chaco Canyon, and even the absurdities of the so-called Celtic site of

Mystery Hill in New Hampshire. The "archaeology of protest" springs from forces that oppose the state. The archaeology of plantation life and American slavery, the recently formed archaeological service of the Palestine Authority, and the right to excavate, preserve, and interpret Hawaiian and Native American sites are varying forms of protest archaeology. They represent views that differ fundamentally from traditional and state sponsored perspectives. A strikingly new example of "protest archaeology" is evident in the newly constructed scholarly tradition of Palestinian archaeology. A nationalist and political expression of this tradition suggests that the Arab peoples in the Levant were Canaanites; thus they precede the coming of the Israelites into the Levant and have a more legitimate claim to this territory than the Jews who, with the creation of the state of Israel, dispossessed them of their homeland. In the concluding essay Bruce Trigger seems unable to make up his mind about 'nationalism'. On the one hand it is likened to Islamic fundamentalism and regarded as a "backward looking philosophy" (p.278) and, on the other hand, "[a]rchaeology in the service of nationalism has undoubtedly sometimes contributed to our understanding of the past and promoted worthy causes" (p.279). Trigger also advances the doubtful thesis that culture-history was formed under the impetus of nationalist concerns and that V. Gordon Childe "described culture history as the archaeological equivalent of political history". It is unlikely that the cultural historical writings of Henry Austen Layard on the Assyrians or Sir John Lubbock's speculation on the culture history of European megaliths were motivated by nationalist concerns.

The books under review accuse the discipline of archaeology, and in rare instances specific practitioners, of supporting a variety of 'isms', specifically nationalism, racism, imperialism, and ethnic intolerance. In each of the above books, with the exception of Dilip Chakrabarti's, the authors find it easier to hold the discipline culpable rather than individual practitioners. Gustav Kossina stands virtually alone, at center stage, a poster boy of "the other" archaeologist, one who served the malevolent interests of Nazism. The fact is that archaeologists have simply ignored the social context in which archaeology is practiced. The widely read and highly regarded history of American archaeology written by Gordon Willey and Jeremy Sabloff (1993) is a case in point. The book