

Institution Press, 1993). Like its predecessor, *Learning from Things* comes out of conference proceedings, but this one has more ambitious goals than its useful predecessor. This latest set purports to be “an introduction to the methods and theories common to material cultural studies in a variety of specialist fields” (ix). The fields primarily represented are the history of technology, materials science, and anthropology. A short section that could have helped clarify the common ground of material culture studies among these and other specialties contains only one essay, and it is not up to the task. Probably the best aspects of this volume are to present fresh views of “formation processes”—ways that artifacts become evidence—and to provide perspectives on the contributions of materials science to the analysis of material culture. Reference to American Studies is tangential at best, but some resources for followers of the field can be mined from Michael Brian Schiffer’s essay on American hobbyist magazine and Catherine S. Fowler and Don D. Fowler’s chapter on ethnographic collections in the American West. Harvard University Simon J. Bronner

INDIANS AND ANTHROPOLOGISTS: Vine Deloria, Jr., and the Critique of Anthropology. Edited by Thomas Biolsi and Larry J. Zimmerman. Tucson, Arizona: University of Arizona Press. 1997.

Vine Deloria, Jr., has been a prominent Indian activist and spokesperson for more than thirty years, though his many contributions to academic discourse have received very little critical response. If this collection of essays is any indication, a few scholars may finally be giving Deloria’s work the attention it deserves. Most of the essays included here originated at the 1989 annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association, in a session titled “Custer Died for Your Sins: A Twenty-Year Retrospective on Relations between Anthropologists and American Indians.” Editors Thomas Biolsi and Larry J. Zimmerman also invited contributions from two scholars sympathetic to their own Marxist theoretical perspective. The result of this collaboration is a volume with a subtle but unmistakable tension running through it, between an analytical approach that leads to an emphasis on professional ethics and Deloria’s own moral/relational (and ultimately religious) position on intercultural engagement.

The editors’ introduction, “What’s Changed What Hasn’t,” offers a very helpful overview of anthropologists’ interactions with American Indians since the publication of *Custer Died for Your Sins*, Deloria’s first book, in 1969. Biolsi and Zimmerman point out that “Long before anyone in anthropology had heard of Michel Foucault or Pierre Bourdieu, Deloria had put his finger directly on what would later be called discursive formations, symbolic capital, and the micropolitics of the academy” (4). Whether “the most well known thesis of the book” is Deloria’s chapter on anthropologists, as they also argue, is a point that would be disputed by church leaders and government bureaucrats, who were the targets of his scathing critique in subsequent chapters. If nothing else, this myopic observation is one indication of the personal sensitivity and professional chauvinism that persist in even a chastened anthropology.

The ten contributed essays are arranged in three sections: “Deloria Writes Back,” “Archaeology and American Indians,” and “Ethnography and Colonialism.” Most of the authors here are anthropologists, though the disciplines of history and education are also represented, and several report that they first encountered Deloria’s writings while in graduate school. Little attention is paid to the predicament of Indian anthropologists, an unfortunate oversight, and only two of the ten contributors have tribal affiliations. Essays by Herbert T. Hoover and Murray L. Wax in the first section are the only ones that focus

directly on Deloria's writings and attempt a critical engagement with his proposals. The rest use Deloria's historic challenge as a jumping-off point in their varied considerations of the theory and practice of anthropology. Randall H. McGuire and Larry J. Zimmerman write about archaeology and the reburial conflict. Cecil King, Marilyn Bentz, and Elizabeth S. Grobsmith reflect on the ethics of ethnographic field work. Essays by Thomas Biolsi, Gail Landsman, and Peter Whiteley are the most interesting contributions in the volume, examining the professional and personal predicaments facing scholars who work with Lakota, Iroquois, and Hopi materials, respectively.

Deloria's concluding response to this medley of recognition, "Anthros, Indians, and Planetary Reality," is an incisive and urgent statement on the past, present, and future of cultural critique. In a characteristic fashion, he is less interested in reviewing anthropological accomplishments and shortcomings than in pushing the next generation of scholars and leaders into new territory, though he is still skeptical (to the editors' chagrin) about the ability of anthropology to transcend its colonialist legacy. "We live in an era of melt-down, breakdown, and disintegration," Deloria writes, and it is time for the social sciences ("the hobbies of the affluent class") to articulate a forceful critique of industrial society, a critique fundamentally informed by insights gained from tribal communities (213). Anthropologists must "develop a personal identity as concerned human beings and move away from the comfortable image and identity as 'scholar.' If anthros did begin to offer intellectual and moral leadership in American society and became problem solvers, they would achieve the necessary objectivity they do not have at the present time" (221). A challenging but pragmatic proposal from one who has refused to rest on his own numerous laurels.

University of New Mexico

James Treat

**THE LONG ARGUMENT: English Puritanism and the Shaping of New England, 1570-1700.** By Stephen Foster. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture. 1991.

In this book Professor Foster extends his valuable contribution to the understanding of New World Puritanism as not only a religious movement—driven with internal dissents and controversies—but as a significant cultural and political movement as well. Foster addresses his work not only to specialists in this field of ecclesiastical history but to the community of Americanists in general who work with a context heavily inflected by the European assumptions or ideologies that accompanied migrants to the colonies, often referred to as the Puritan "inheritance" (the ideals of the New England Way that were, as Foster emphasizes, articulated by Elizabethan radicals decades before the New England Migration).

The narrative moves, with impeccable scholarship, lively prose and an engaging attention to the individual people involved in these grand historical movements, through the period 1570 to 1700 in phases. Professor Foster begins with an account of the contribution made by Elizabethan radicals in the period 1570 to 1610. He then moves to the second stage in the development of English Puritanism, 1590-1630; the failure to find a political solution to religious and constitutional conflicts in the period immediately preceding the Great Migration; the move toward Sectarianism in England and America during 1630 and 1650; and he goes on to discuss the half-Way Covenant and declension controversies, 1650 to 1680. The book concludes with a consideration of the Great Awakening within the trans-Atlantic Puritan context.