ophy of science is often used in processual polemics "as a tool for legitimation rather than verification." I applaud Leone's feeling that reconstruction of past ways of life cannot be achieved by scientific techniques. For that matter, the descriptions of present ways of life in ethnography are frequently lacking in any sense of a lived human experience. Works that have been most successful in conveying emotional reality, for example Carlos Castaneda's phenomenological presentations of his experiences under Don Juan's tutelage, are beyond the realm of science, and depend on something other than scientific technique—Castaneda has been chastised for just this reason.

Another goal of archeology, that of providing an outline of world prehistory, has been largely achieved. Reconstruction and chronological outline, then, no longer offer fresh challenges, Leone suggests. This contributes to the paradigm crisis. In addition, there is in the new archeology a vision of archeology as an active participant in that enterprise which is science, aiming at "a generalized, cross-temporal set of observations drawn from plural cultures." This is joined with a realization that for the first time in the history of archeology there is no single major paradigm in general anthropology that can be borrowed. Instead, there are contending alternative and incomplete paradigms such as structuralism, materialism, and cognitive anthropology, some of which seem irrelevant or at least are beyond the capacity of archeology to cope with at present. The new or "cultural process" paradigm, based on the synthesis of evolutionary theory, cultural ecology, and general systems theory, provides both a means of resolution of the crisis and a scientific revolution in archeology.

What alternatives, then, are available, given the new paradigm? The description and analysis of processes of sociocultural change demand that archeology "choose a course which involves it directly with data from the present," Leone seems to imply. This will require radically different interpretations of what archeology is all about. Three "marginally affiliated types of archaeology" are extant which may enable progress in new directions: historical archeology, ethnoarcheology, and an incipient one based on a new conception of archeology as a science of technology or material culture. Work illustrative of the first and third types is presented in the reader.

The third especially will enable the systematic exploration of relations between technology and other cultural subsystems. This will put archeologists in a position to respond to "relevant" questions in a different (and more informed, I'd suggest) way from those of such pundits as Marshall McLuhan, Alvin Toffler, Jacques Ellul, *et al.* The point is, as Leone puts it, that archeology need not concern itself solely with "the exotic and long dead."

Leone's programmatic article is a blueprint for a role for archeology as anthropology in the modern world. His colleagues will, I suspect, have to think through its implications carefully in years to come.

Walter W. Taylor offers "a contemporary parable" in which he quite rightly calls attention to his *A Study of Archaeology*, first published in 1948, as one of the significant forerunners of the new paradigm. He accuses some individual scholars, and by implication many more, of not fully appreciating what he said over 20 years ago. This collection of articles will allow his peers and juniors to test Taylor's claim that much of the current research is no more than "a practical application of a basic conceptual scheme" which he introduced. A measure of Leone's evenhanded editing is that a portion of Taylor's article is devoted to what I view as an unwarranted attack on Leone's (and others') remarks about the various difficulties of cultural reconstruction. In addition, Taylor suggests that a conception of culture focusing on its adaptive quality is not sufficient for all descriptive and explanatory purposes.

In a statesmanlike fashion Raymond H. Thompson tries to find a means of making peace between the new and the old by utilizing the notion of a linear model or continuum, proposing that the new paradigm can be profitably viewed as an instance of cumulative change. It is the result, he suggests, not of a revolution but rather of an incremental series of developmental changes. In this way the ends of the continuum may be seen not as opposed but as complementary.

The articles in this reader are highly recommended, both those previously published and the original or completely revised. The latter are uniformly excellent and nicely illustrate the various differences between processual and other modes of archeology. For example, Frederick Gorman's analysis of the Clovis hunters presents an alternative view of their environment and ecology and in so doing tests new hypotheses in new ways. John M. Fritz's original contribution on archeological systems is an elegant demonstration of what can be done given the view of the field expounded by Leone. William L. Rathje's effort may indeed be viewed, as Leone suggests, as "the first substantive breath of fresh air in Maya studies" in years. Rathje offers a new hypothesis ingeniously linking noncultural and cultural variables in the context of a cultural ecological position in order to explain the evolution of the Olmec and Maya civilizations.

A careful reading of this book should finally put to an end mistaken claims by archeologists that they have been doing the new archeology all along. It should also put to rest the assertion that the new archeology is merely "computer archeology." And criticisms noting environmental determinism and the use of adaptation as an explanatory catchall have obviously had their effect. Finally, it is quite apparent that processual archeology has evolved from its beginnings in the early 1960's to a new level of maturity and moderation.

Other anthropologists, tempted to put this book down thinking that all is calm and sweet reasonableness outside of archeology, might ask themselves what is going on in their own bailiwicks. It could well be that the new synthesis of evolutionism, cultural ecology, and general systems theory should be making more of an impact on the rest of us. Surely the same basic issues addressed in this book cry out for resolution in cultural anthropology, physical anthropology, and linguistics.

GILBERT KUSHNER
Department of Anthropology, University of South Florida, Tampa

Autobiography

Blackberry Winter. My Earliest Years. MARGARET MEAD. Morrow, New York, 1972. xiv, 306 pp., illus. $8.95.

Every life provides clues from which others can learn. The appearance, in 1935, of Dollard's *Criteria for the Life History* (*1*) was an indication that interest in the scholarly analysis of autobiography was developing. A decade later the use of personal documents in history, anthropology, and sociology became a concern of the Social Science Research Council (*2*). Anthropologists interested in the interplay between personality and culture had begun collect-

ing autobiographical materials from their informants even earlier, and interest in the collection of life histories has continued since then (*3*). Through these collaborative autobiographies readers came to appreciate the qualities of each life, while learning of the many ways in which sociocultural changes led to the development of tensions within the societies of which the central characters were a part and how these changes and tension affected the life-styles of the subjects.

Although a number of biographies of deceased anthropologists have appeared (*4*) and Columbia University Press is currently issuing a series of biographies of past greats of American anthropology, there has been relatively little material dealing with living anthropologists, for few have chosen to subject to the scrutiny of others that part of human society they knew best, namely their own. There have, however, been a few books and brief papers on the researcher's inside view of fieldwork which provide small bits of autobiographical insight (*5*). Taken together these give one view of the society which produced the anthropologists of the 1920's through World War II. Clearly the society from which these anthropologists came was more unified than that which might be depicted by those attracted to the discipline in the decades since World War II. Mead's *Blackberry Winter* provides another welcome view of the particular strengths of the society which encouraged the scholarly exploration of people and cultures in distant places.

Margaret Mead, the present dean of American anthropology and always one of its most effective spokesmen, was the first-born child of Edward Sherwood Mead and Emily Fogg Mead. Her father was professor in the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce at the University of Pennsylvania. Her mother was active in the support of worthy causes and was also engaged in what today would be called "ethnic research" in contemporary urban settings. Her widowed paternal grandmother, who was a member of the household in which Margaret and her brother and sisters grew up, had earlier supported herself and her son by teaching school. Thus Margaret Mead had many within her family to serve as partial models as she determined the direction of her own career.

A speech she gave on graduating from high school dealing with the anticipated results of World War I foretold the most important areas of research interest of her later life. She advocated "internationalism, a new status for womanhood, a greater value for childhood, a more real religion, and a greater vision." These, indeed, are the directions her research has taken through the years: a cross-cultural perspective and a focus on the roles of both women and children in their societies, always with a strong underpinning of religion in the broad, nondogmatic sense, and always with attention to the implications of her findings both for the present and for the future. After a year at DePauw University, which provided her with less than she had expected from a college experience, she went to Barnard. There she focused on psychology before discovering anthropology in her senior year. In the following year she completed an M.A. in psychology, taught in the psychology department at Barnard, and began her graduate studies in anthropology at Columbia University. A multidisciplinary approach, consequently, was built into her training and has continued to manifest itself throughout her long and productive career.

Margaret Mead has always been willing to share herself with all who would listen. She has been devoted both to her discipline and to American society and has worked hard to make laymen understand what anthropology has to offer toward the understanding of the society of which they are a part. At a time when communication with "the masses" was not seen as a fit endeavor for the scholar or the scientist, Mead scorned the conventions and taught America the meaning of anthropology. She has always been a persuasive transmitter of ideas, both her own and those of others.

In *Blackberry Winter* she has again come to share herself with her far-flung admiring readership. It is not necessary to read this book as other than a delightful contribution to documentary literature. But Mead has also shown, perhaps more intensely and intimately than she herself knows, the role of early and subsequent socialization in the formation of character, the need for both brain and guts for a woman to assure herself of an education, and how both qualities, once developed, were manifested. Through her life-style Mead adumbrated many of the twists and turns of the present generation. She was then, as they are now, conscious of the societal significance of varying life-styles in vogue. Her participation in some of these alternative patterns, particularly many happy years spent with Lawrence K. Frank and his family as part of a joint household, which she shares with the reader, have helped put her in an extraordinary position to communicate across generational lines. Her life experiences have also added to her insights into the strengths and potential weaknesses (and she sees more of the former than of the latter) of behavior widely divergent from that considered proper by both the Victorian society of her youth and the classic values of contemporary Middle America.

Popular, insightful, and well worth reading, the book again demonstrates that one need not be obscurely stuffy to contribute to the understanding of man. If you would know something of the social sources of American scholarship read Mead. Would that there were as revealing autobiographies from other great figures in various disciplines. Such accounts of the making of the scientist would yield great understanding of the society which made them as well as of the role science plays in making society.

BERNICE A. KAPLAN
Department of Anthropology,
Wayne State University,
Detroit, Michigan

References

1. J. Dollard, *Criteria for the Life History* (Peter Smith, New York, 1949; copyright 1935).
2. L. Gottschalk, C. Kluckhohn, A. Angell, "The Use of Personal Documents in History, Anthropology and Sociology," *Soc. Sci. Res. Counc. Bull. 53* (1945).
3. W. Dyk, *Son of Old Man Hat* (Harcourt, Brace, New York, 1938); C. S. Ford, *Smoke from Their Fires* (Yale Univ. Press, New Haven, Conn., 1941); P. Radin, *Crashing Thunder: The Autobiography of an American Indian* (Appleton, New York, 1926); L. W. Simmons, Ed., *Sun Chief (Don C. Talayesva)*, (Yale Univ. Institute of Human Relations, New Haven, Conn., 1942); W. Sachs, *Black Hamlet* (Bles, London, 1937); N. O. Lurie, *Mountain Wolf Woman* (Univ. of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1961); R. Pozas, "Juan Perez Jolote," *Acta Anthropol.* **3** (3) (1948).
4. A. L. Kroeber, R. Benedict, M. B. Emeneau, M. J. Herskovits, G. A. Reichard, J. A. Mason, "Franz Boas, 1858–1942," *Amer. Anthropol. Ass. Mem. 61* (1943); R. P. Rohner, *The Ethnography of Franz Boas: Letters and Diaries . . . Written on the Northwest Coast from 1886 to 1931* (Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1969); R. Benedict, *An Anthropologist at Work*, M. Mead, Ed. (Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1959).
5. B. Malinowski, *A Diary in the Strict Sense of the Term* (Harcourt, Brace and World, New York, 1967); M. Mead, "Diaries of Events in Alitoa," in *The Mountain Arapesh, Amer. Mus. Natur. Hist. Anthropol. Pap.* **36**, pt 3; **37**, pt. 3; **40**, pt. 3; **41**, pt. 3 (1938–1949); H. Powdermaker, *Stranger and Friend: The Way of an Anthropologist* (Norton, New York, 1966); E. S. Bowen, *Return to Laughter* (Doubleday, Garden City, 1964).