



NEW ZEALAND
ARCHAEOLOGICAL
ASSOCIATION

ARCHAEOLOGY IN NEW ZEALAND



This document is made available by The New Zealand
Archaeological Association under the Creative Commons
Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

To view a copy of this license, visit
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>.

REVIEWS

Rhoda H. Halperin. *Cultural Economies : Past and Present*. University of Texas Press, Austin, 1994.

In this book, Professor Halperin sets out to look at *cultural* economies. Consequently, she emphasises the cultural and institutional construction of economic patterns. Her aim is to take Economic Anthropology beyond models based upon utilitarian, individual behaviour.

Much of the book builds upon the work of Karl Polanyi as one of the instigators of modern economic anthropology. Polanyi was a major figure in the debate that occurred in the 1960's between the formalists (e.g., Epstein), who believed that concepts of economic rationality could be applied to non-capitalist economic systems, and the substantivists (e.g., Polanyi, Dalton), who argued that non-capitalist economies required a different conceptual framework for their analysis. Most students of anthropology have vaguely heard of the debate but would be unable to comment on its contemporary relevance.

Halperin suggests that Polanyi bridged this apparent divide through the formal analysis of cultural economies using a political-economic approach. This is based upon the study of institutions and processes in situations where a conventional economist would use microeconomic theory. Halperin advocates that we jettison theories based upon the rationality of individual choice under conditions of resource scarcity (i.e., methodological individualism). She includes optimal foraging models within her attack. Her position does not revert to that of structuralists such as Sahlins, however, and she quotes Giddens's premise that both structure and culture inform individual agency. Individual actions can be repetitive and patterned and hence can be seen as situated or deeply layered practices (c.f., Bourdieu).

Maintaining the balance between structure and agency is hard to achieve and Halperin reverts to seeing a causal relationship between the two. On one occasion she states that a central question is 'What kinds of structures are defining and driving what kinds of agents?' (p.26). The slip is understandable in a book that seeks to reassert the importance of history and cultural institutions in the definition of cultural economies.

Chapters 2 and 3 deal with Polanyi's generic model of the economy - a model of livelihood in material systems. Halperin argues that Polanyi differentiated between 'appropriational movements' i.e., changes of hands, and, 'locational movements', changes of place. These correspond with Marx's relations of production and forces of production.¹

It is important to note that these concepts cannot be identified with

REVIEWS

economy and ecology respectively nor can they be collapsed together. Halperin suggests that economic anthropology has tended to focus on appropriational movements while ecological anthropology has concentrated on locational ones. While the two can be treated separately to assist in the analysis of particular economies, Halperin stresses that appropriational and locational movements are in actuality inseparable and that all human activity involves both to varying degrees. She uses as an example the sexual division of labour as a cultural construction based upon biological and ecological necessities.

Chapter 4 deals with the problem of equivalencies - the setting of value in exchanges. Halperin claims that the relationships between the parties rather than any concept of equal exchange is the key to equivalency-formation processes. Allied with this are Polanyi's models of economic integration i.e., reciprocity or symmetry, redistribution or centrality, market or random exchange, and householding or circularity. All of these systems of integration might be present within a single cultural economy though one form or another might be dominant. Halperin notes that prices in a market (or capitalist) exchange system are set by impersonal and non-localised factors of supply and demand. This should not be confused with equivalency-formation processes that might occur at a localised market place where personal relationships or even the time of day can have a significant impact. In addition, many economies create rules as to who can engage in exchanges and there might also be a ranked hierarchy of spheres of exchange or categories of exchangeable commodities. Subsistence, kinship and prestige spheres commonly occur. Exchanges within a sphere will differ from those between spheres which often involve substitutive equivalencies. Inequalities of relationships could also be internal (within a community) or external (between communities).

I found the chapter on householding (5) less interesting because discussion of this form of economic integration was restricted to the context of peasant resistance to capitalism through a strategy of self sufficiency and family autonomy. More interesting was the claim that all economies might have both formal and in-formal sectors (Chapter 7) with the latter also representing a potential sphere of resistance or rebellion. One form that such an anti-economy might take is where gifts, food, prestige or even wives might be given in secret to shamans for sorcery, healing or mediation with the gods.

The discussion of storage as an economic process (Chapter 6) is useful if incomplete. Ingold's point that storage involves both locational and appropriational movements is well taken, as is the notion that storage does not necessarily imply the existence of a physical cache. The statement that archaeologists, in their analysis of storage structures, can often find evidence of the movement of goods on the landscape but not the institutional arrangements driving those movements is an important one. It identifies one of the major difficulties archaeologists have in the economic analysis of New Zealand

REVIEWS

prehistory where storage structures are a common site type. For the most part storage structures (and subsistence economies in general) have been analysed in terms of the ecological requirements of efficient production with little attention being given to the appropriational aspects of economic life involving food exchanges, feasting and the support of chiefs.

Chapter 8 entitled 'Time and the Economy' serves as an introduction to the topic. Different concepts of time are discussed, eg., life course, seasonal time, culturally constructed notions of time, evolutionary time and the rootedness of time in historical circumstances. Halperin usefully discusses Evans-Pritchard's argument that seasonality is socially constructed using ecological referents. This is an antidote to anthropologists who consistently interpret seasonal movements and activities in purely ecological terms without reference to systems of kinship and land tenure. The longevity of cultural forms beyond the life of individuals is also discussed but the concept of social reproduction is not mentioned in this context.

To conclude. This is an interesting if somewhat disorganised book. As it straddles the divide between economic and ecological anthropology it is unlikely that either side will find the arguments and analyses presented here to be convincing. On the other hand, archaeologists who are untutored in either of these disciplines will not find it an easy introductory text. The questions raised, however, are important and I would recommend that they make the effort.

Notes.

1. Halperin suggests that Polanyi, writing during the McCarthyite 1950s, used a code to disguise concepts that were similar to those of Marx.

Harry Allen
Anthropology Department
University of Auckland

E. Hodder, I., M. Shanks, A. Alexandri, V. Buchli, J. Carman, J. Last and G. Lucas (eds). 1995. *Interpreting Archaeology: Finding meaning in the past*. London: Routledge. 275 pp. A\$122.95

This book stems from a Theoretical Archaeology Conference held at Peterhouse of the University of Cambridge in 1991. The Introduction states that: "The college has long been associated with radical and reflective thought on the nature of the discipline archaeology, and this was the purpose: to explore the latest thinking on the issues associated with interpreting the material remains of the past- and, indeed, understanding material culture generally, past and present." (p.1).

REVIEWS

The book consists of 28 chapters organised in 5 sections, an appendix and a glossary. I read it all. Those of you familiar with previous "post-processualist" writings from Peterhouse might feel I deserve a medal or medical care. But wait, this text seems to be a serious attempt at communication. The glossary and the comparative brevity of most chapters are signs of this desire (requirement) to communicate and one does not need a degree in French philosophy to understand most of it. In fact readers may find an understanding of pre-80's archaeology and anthropology of more use. Contributors include a mixture of familiar (M. Shanks, I. Hodder, E. Gellner, R. Foley, C. Gamble, M. Leone, J. Gero, M. Bloch) and unfamiliar (mostly Cambridge students) players and together they form an interesting mix of the old and new, old fashioned scepticism and post modern angst.

The goal of most of the papers in this volume appears to be to search for ways out of the relativist swamp of post-modern archaeology while retaining the water lilies and discarding the weeds and leaches. For this the authors need to be truly congratulated, however, although they shine some light, the way forward is not as clearly indicated as we might like.

My favourite stroll through this volume includes the introductory two papers by Shanks and Hodder, the paper in Part I (Philosophical issues of interpretation) by Gellner, Gamble's paper in Part II (The origins of meaning), Leone *et al.*'s paper in Part III (Interpretation, writing and presenting the past), Last's paper in Part IV (Archaeology and history) and finally Bloch's paper in Part V (Material culture). I will briefly discuss each of these in turn.

In a chapter entitled "Processual, post-processual and interpretive archaeologies" Shanks and Hodder present their understanding of processual and post-processual archaeology and describe what they call interpretive archaeology. This chapter is a very useful summary of the distinguishing characteristics of processual and post-processual archaeology and it would make good reading for interested students. Although the authors range widely the key points of interest by my reading are attempts to escape the relativist trap which follows from post-positivism taken to its logical extremes. In short if we reject positivism and consequently the possibility of objectivity how can we chose between alternate creations of the past? More simply for most of us, How do we proceed to do archaeology? Are all stories about the past equally valid? If so why should we bother to excavate?

What role is left for our traditional methodologies? I think Shanks' and Hodder's answers will seem very familiar to most archaeologists. Most of the key concepts developed in post-processual archaeology have a long history in archaeology. The notion that data is theory dependent and therefore created can be seen in the Ford-Spaulling debate over the meaning of types. Different types could be constructed from the same 'archaeological things' depending on the

REVIEWS

purpose of the observer. The importance of defining and setting out purpose or theory was central to the 'New Archaeology'. The past did not speak for itself nor could it be read directly from the record. Similarly the philosophy of Thomas Kuhn (1970) which popularized the notion of scientific revolutions, theory dependence of data and the importance of the social context in the doing of science was, I believe, central to much of the archaeology of the 70's. The big parting of the ways comes with the shift of archaeological purpose from the primarily materialist based theories of 'processual' archaeology to the search for meaning and the celebration of the ideal. Shanks and Hodder suggest that we should interpret or seek understanding of the past by study of contexts and associations.

"The task of the archaeologist is to go round and round the data in a hermeneutic spiral, looking for relationships, fitting pieces of the jigsaw together. Does the patterning of faunal remains correlate with the two axe types or with male and female burials? Is there any difference in axe-type deposition in different parts of the settlement system? And so on. The more of the evidence that can be brought together in this way, the more likely is one able to make statements about meaning -for example, that chalk axes were of high value and were associated with women in ritual contexts" (p. 15).

This detective-like process would I think be familiar to most archaeologists no matter what their professed theoretical stripe. The authors must of course go on to note that interpretation can not proceed in the absence of theory. "It is impossible to approach the data without prejudice and without some general theory. But the interpretive challenge is to evaluate such generality in relation to the contextual data" (p. 15). But where does this general theory come from and how do we evaluate data and theory? On the source of general theory the authors are disappointingly quiet, although Gellner takes up this point in his contribution, however they do provide some liberating discussion of evaluation and the related issues of objectivity, realism and reality.

The authors state that: "Reality is what resists, and trials test its resistance. Kick a megalith and it hurts - it is very real." This is comforting. Shanks and Hodder then go on to make the old point that reality is plural and different types of analysis or different "trials" will reveal different aspects of this reality and therefore they reject the concept of "abstract objectivity". They seem to admit the possibility that "trials of resistance" can be made commensurable (p. 20) thereby allowing, I assume, different individuals to agree on the extent to which "reality" resists the trial. It seems to me this is the type of objectivity which the scientific method strives to create. We have escaped the relativist dilemma by re-naming objectivity and the scientific method. But have we learnt anything in this journey?

One of the sections of this paper which I found most interesting was the

REVIEWS

discussion of "Projects and Networks" (P. 13). Here the authors remind us once again how complex a process our fundamental data creation enterprise - excavation - really is. From the negotiations with landowners, through the mobilisation of labour with varying skills and interests, the chasing of cows, and the blooming of back-dirt romance, a vast "heterogeneous network" leaves its mark all over our 'data'. The history of the crafting of our received archaeological 'data' by fossickers, field schools, and CRM excavators deserves considerable thought. We can in theory analyze our pot-herd in an infinite number of ways, we can only excavate a patch of ground once.

Ernst Gellner is a very well respected social anthropologist at the University of Cambridge and he has apparently taken a critical interest in his archaeological colleagues theoretical development. I recommend his article "What is *Structuralisme?*" (1982) which appeared in the proceedings of an earlier conference on theoretical archaeology. Much of the structure and argument of the present book can be seen as a response to Gellner's (or similar) criticism presented in Chapter 5 "Interpretive Anthropology". Gellner characterises interpretive anthropology and describes its roots before presenting a critique. "What is wrong with it? At least three things: its subjectivism, its exaggerated sense of cultural symmetry, and its style." (P. 50) Gellner argues that the hermeneutic desire to establish cultural symmetry and re-dress old imbalances leads to "...an anguished recognition of subjectivity, a proudly recognised inner turbulence reflected in a correspondingly murky style of expression" (P. 49). Gellner reminds us that social order is perpetuated by social, physical and semantic coercion. He suggests the hermeneuticists with their focus on meaning tend to ignore the non-semantic constraints and that their method makes it hard to look at them. He states that "The central fact about the current transformations of the world is that one cognitive style engenders a technology which, economically and militarily, easily dominates all others." (P. 50). For Gellner the basic flaw with interpretive anthropology is its inability to adequately deal with the fundamental asymmetrical nature of our condition. Further he fails to see how it can even provide insight into meaning given: "The awesome difficulty of gaining access to the meanings of others, or even one's own.... all this is used more to soften us up than to illuminate us." In conclusion Gellner states that: " (But) things do have their reality and exercise constraints over us, and some ways of knowing them are more effective than others. An exaggerated meaning-centredness, which obscures all this, cannot be salutary."(P. 50).

Clive Gamble's paper, "Interpretation in the Palaeolithic", is found at the end of Part 2 which contains 5 papers under the heading "The origins of meaning". This section is interesting because it applies post-processual considerations or approaches to a problem which has been popular with palaeolithic archaeologists for some time. This problem is usually framed either as examination of the Upper/Middle Palaeolithic transition or more explicitly as the origin of symboling. So how does the hermeneutic twist fare in the palaeolithic?

REVIEWS

Gamble begins with an interesting comment on how the founding fathers of palaeolithic archaeology often (e.g. Boucher de Perthes and his search for flint sculptures) flirted with meaning and aesthetics in the palaeolithic but he notes we routinely dismiss their efforts as mere assertion which can not be proved with palaeolithic data. Using Australian ethnographic data he discusses the significance of aesthetic properties of stone tools and suggests that we might look at those properties along with more traditional attributes, although he divorces himself from any attempt to understand the European palaeolithic using Aboriginal analogies. Finally he notes that stone tools have been available for co-option in projects of meaning for 2.5 million years but at no point are they necessarily required to interpret existence as well as provide assistance. Gamble suggests that searches for origins of meaning, especially those recently proposed by Hodder (1990:283) are flawed and differ little from the assertions of Boucher de Perthes essentially because, as I read him, they have no historical theory (P. 91).

Leone *et al.*'s article entitled "Can an Afro-American historical archaeology be an alternative voice?" in Part 3 is a real jewel which demonstrates in a practical manner the useful application of a 'post-processual', hermeneutic approach. Most archaeologists should find something of interest here. Leone and his students walk the reader through the dialogue they developed with Black communities while creating displays to present the results of their excavations of 19th century houses occupied by Afro-Americans in Annapolis. This is one of the few papers in the book to actually deal with archaeological material/projects in any detail. Interestingly they confront the problem of what you do when your artefactual/oral tradition data conflicts with the apparently preferred view of the past held by one of your audiences.

The fourth section, "Archaeology and History", contains 6 papers. Authors throughout the book express concern at the lack of any theory of history or a way of theorizing the past which allows us to look at both material and ideal constraints while encompassing the significance of history and agency. Unfortunately the papers in this section provide no magic bullet. The paper by Last "The nature of history" discusses in some depth the issues raised in the other papers. He begins with a discussion of the Annales School of history which he usefully describes from its inception until the present with emphasis on the variety encompassed within the approach. Despite having interesting notions of different temporal scales and historical rhythms which seem to embrace individual agency, structure and material constraint Last notes that Annales approaches have not seen much development in archaeology and he discusses its use by Hodder, Bintliff and others. Pacific archaeologists would I think be better off reading Sahlins (1985; Kirch and Sahlins 1992).

A post-modern theoretical approach to history is a narrative approach which Hodder experiments with in this volume and in his book "The

REVIEWS

Domestication of Europe" (1990). Again Last covers this topic in a useful manner. My only comment would be that although it might be true that history is best presented as a narrative and that people may in fact live their lives as a narrative I fail to see why long-term history should have a narrative structure. This latter point takes us to Last's discussion of structure and agency (individual or collective action). Last criticises Hodder for coming too close to a structural theory where individual action is too constrained. He then goes on to discuss the work of Bourdieu and Giddens, two social theorists wrestling with ways of integrating structure and agency. Again this discussion brings us up to date with significant debate and points up interesting directions but papers in this book do not employ any useful theory of structure and agency. As Last mentions this may well be because we have yet to conduct the specifically archaeological project of theorising the relationship between structure, agency and material culture. It is this last project which is taken up in the final section of the book.

Material culture studies have in the post-processual world been dominated by discussions of material culture as text, and this history is documented in the paper by Buchli "Interpreting material culture: The trouble with text". Clearly reading of this section reveals much naval gazing and little agreement by archaeologists on how to proceed. I found Bloch's paper "Questions not to ask of Malagasy carvings" presented the fundamental problem and returned us once again to the paper by Gellner. Bloch describes his attempts to determine from living informants the "meaning" of carvings incised on house posts in Madagascar. After much effort and false starts he discovered they had no meaning although they did have a use. They signified nothing but they were used in the process of celebration of the growth of a house and the society it contained. Clearly material culture is, or can be more than, or at least different from literary text, unfortunately as noted by Gellner it would seem rather difficult to interpret it in a meaning-centred way if we can't even know if it had meaning.

This book will not teach you how to do 'Interpretive Archaeology'. It will show you what has become of post-processual archaeology in Britain and to some extent in the USA and in the process it may provide a few ideas or uncommon perspectives. Unfortunately it is very expensive and poorly printed in places so if interested I recommend you borrow a copy.

Peter Sheppard
Anthropology Department
University of Auckland

References:

- Gellner, E. 1982. What is *Structuralism*? In C. Renfrew, M. Rowlands and B. Seagraves (eds) *Theory and Explanation in Archaeology*. London: Academic Press.

REVIEWS

- Hodder, I. 1990. *The Domestication of Europe*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kirch, P. and M. Sahlins. 1992. *Anahulu: the anthropologies of history in the kingdom of Hawai'i*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Khun, T. 1970. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sahlins, M. 1985. *Islands of History*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Champion, T.C. (Ed) *Centre And Periphery: Comparative Studies In Archaeology*. Routledge, London, 1995. 240 pp. A\$49.95.

This is a paperback edition of a book first published in 1989. It is one of the more than twenty volumes which arose from the World Archaeological Congress held in Southampton in 1986 and which have been published in the *One World Archaeology* series. The volumes in the series have all demonstrated a concern with discarding traditional Eurocentric assumptions and biases. *Centre And Periphery* is no exception.

Centre And Periphery is concerned with the interaction between powerful polities and their near or remote neighbours. The introduction is a review of the concept by the editor. This helps readers locate some of the important themes in the various contributions that follow. The great diversity of the subject matter makes commenting on the individual essays themselves difficult. All make interesting reading but eight of the thirteen essays are about European topics and three are about North American subjects. That leaves just two essays dealing with other parts of the world.

European topics are the place of Etruria in the Mediterranean World (1200-500 BC) (Stoddart), relations between Greek colonists and natives in southeastern Italy in the 8th century (Whitehouse and Wilkins), Greek and Etruscan trade in the Rhône basin in the early iron age (Dietler), the impact of the Roman amphora trade on pre-Roman Britain (Williams), Iron Age Serbia (Winter and Bankoff), acculturation and ethnicity in Roman Moesia Superior (Bartel), Denmark and Europe in first millennium BC (Randsborg), and external relations of Great Moravia in the 9th century (Halvík). American subjects are the Southwest as a periphery of Mesoamerica (McGuire), Iroquoia as a periphery of Cahokia (Dincauze and Hasenstab), and acculturation in the Franciscan Missions of Alta California in the late 18th and early 19th centuries (Farnsworth). The remaining two essays deal with the interaction of nomads with China in the middle ages (Szykiewicz) and the political economy of the Solomon Islands 1880-1980 (Boutilier). Two of the above, Boutilier and Halvík, are based largely on historical sources.

Champion notes that the concept of centre and periphery has a long

REVIEWS

history in one form or another. The older concepts often employed a dichotomy between the dynamic and innovative centre and the static and backward periphery. (Just fifty years ago New Zealand prehistory was being written on the basis of such concepts and the assumption about the backwardness of peripheral areas was an essential element in the analysis.) Champion argues that any given historical situation requires its own analysis and it is partly this emphasis on the concept as framework or as heuristic device which allows him to differentiate it from older anthropological uses. He is, however, clearly opposed to the idea that centres and peripheries might have no validity apart from the purpose for which they are identified in the first place. The question of domination and inequality, he suggests, must be faced otherwise the concept is 'totally vacuous'; the two sets of notions, centre and periphery, domination and subjugation, are inextricably linked. Vacuous or not, the diverse essays in this volume suggest that centre and periphery have no content apart from that provided by the context in which they are invoked. Champion's formula may, therefore, be a bit too prescriptive.

Champion's emphasis on inequality may explain the significance attached to Wallerstein's model of the modern world system by various contributors. Champion's comments, along with those of other contributors, indicate that this particular model actually has very limited usefulness for archaeologists. Wallerstein was explicitly concerned with how the centre subjugated the periphery and how the pattern of 'unequal exchanges' was established and maintained by Western capitalist development. The usefulness of this model has been explored by Eric Wolf (*Europe And The People Without History*, 1982) and others and from Wolf's work and the volume under review it would seem that Wallerstein's influence derives partly from his emphasis on domination and inequality and partly from his lesson that 'wider linkages ... must be investigated if the processes at work in the periphery are to be understood' (Wolf 1982:23). The quote demonstrates the traditional anthropological interest in seeing things from the periphery but, of course, the centre itself was radically changed by capitalist development and the patterns of inequality which arose there were as striking in their own way as those which occurred between centre and periphery.

The lesson about wider linkages, as Wolf notes, runs counter to the tendency for academics (and, with rather more ominous overtones, nationalists) to turn phenomena into static, disconnected things. An emphasis on national identity ignores the reality of change: the world is not divided into discrete groups each with its own culture and each doing its own thing in its own way. Contact and connections, linkages and interrelationships, domination and subjugation, across all sorts of lines, are the commonplaces of history. That is why developing better models of interaction, such as centre and periphery, are so important.

Tony Walton

REVIEWS

W. David Lewis, *Sloss Furnaces and the Rise of the Birmingham District; an Industrial Epic*, The University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa and London, 1994 : xxvi, 646 pp. Price \$US39.95.

Geological aeons ago the shifting tectonic plates and inland seas which were to become the continent of North America laid down the deposits of coal, iron ore and limestones which provided the raw materials of the industrialisation of the United States in the 18th and 20th centuries. The deposits of ores which were present in Jones valley in the state of Alabama became the basis of a significant iron and steel industry, the principal focus of which became the city of Birmingham. It is the history of the development and eventual collapse of this industry, and of Birmingham, which is the subject of this book.

Substantial in length and content, this is a superb history written by an academic historian of industrial technology, and will be of greater interest to historians than it will be to archaeologists. But it will be of general interest to anyone concerned with industrial history, and the conservation and preservation of its surviving artefacts and field monuments. However, Chapter 16 (Preserving the Heritage, pp 450-473) is a compelling study of heritage conservation in action. Dealing as it does with the problems of preserving for posterity a complex of mighty but, by 1970, redundant blast furnaces, it suddenly becomes an absorbing study which will hold any conservation archaeologist spellbound.

Proposals for the abandoned site, control of which had been surprisingly vested in such an unlikely organisation as the Alabama State Fair Authority, ranged the whole gamut of suggestions from total demolition and the selling of the site for modern factory development to its preservation as a multi-million dollar museum covering the complete history of American industrial technology. Public attitudes ranged from complete apathy, to total opposition, through to unquenchable determination to save the complex for posterity. A core of enthusiasts committed to the saving of the site for the presentation of a history of the Alabama and Birmingham iron industry persisted and eventually prevailed. The site is now a National Historic Landmark, with the restored furnaces being the centre of an outdoor museum that attracts some 100,000 visitors annually. A refurbished former casting shed is now the venue for summer presentations by the Alabama Symphony Orchestra through to rock band concerts.

In New Zealand the Brunner industrial site, the Rotowaro carbonization plant, the Kawau Island copper industry ruins, the ruins of the gold industry of Otago, the West Coast or the Coromandel, and the kauri driving dams of northern New Zealand are some of the industrial or historical ruins which have attracted the attention and the resources of archaeologists and historians. Their experiences, frustrations, and successes are well-known to members of the Association, but I do not believe that any publication or conference report has covered such projects with the feeling, tempered by professional skill and

REVIEWS

detachment, that is found in Chapter 10. However, be warned that to get the greatest value from this book it is necessary to closely read the whole volume. So tightly is it written that scarcely a page can be lightly skimmed. Perhaps the most important message to get from Chapter 10 is that in heritage conservation the darkest moment frequently comes just before the dawn!

As noted above this book is a history of iron and steel in Alabama, from its tentative beginnings before the Civil War, through the establishment in 1881 by Col. James Withers Sloss of the first blast furnace in the small settlement that was to become the industrial metropolis of Birmingham, to the collapse of the industry in 1970. But the book is much more than this. Within its pages are absorbing discussions, among others, of antebellum industrialisation of the South and its carry-over into the post-war Reconstruction period; of the role of negroes in the Southern economy, both agricultural and industrial; of the use of prison labour in industry, both to achieve low production costs and as strike breakers; of racial attitudes in labour and in civic leadership in the south; of the civil rights movements and overall racial attitudes in the south; and of the suspicions of Southerners, even well into the 20th century; of the financial and technical resources of Northerners, and their fears of Northern control of Southern enterprises.

But the book is not entirely without flaw or frustration. It is a history of an industry, and of the industrialists and financiers who made it possible. It is not really a history of the technology of the industry, although technology is a significant part of the story. Illustrations, apart from photos of the major people involved, are sparse and not well-chosen. Maps are frustratingly inadequate, consisting mainly of copies of mid-19th century railway networks, which are, however, an important and integral part of the story as a whole. The author is clearly much more conversant with the social issues of the period being covered than the scope of the book allows him to deal with. Overall, however, this is an absorbing story, which will be greatly enjoyed by its readers.

Jim McKinlay, formerly NZ Historic Places Trust.