People with History: An Update on Historical Archaeology in the United States

Barbara J. Little[1]

Historical archaeology has expanded greatly in the past decade. This essay discusses some of the trends and themes that have become important in historical archaeology in the United States since 1982. The first section briefly assesses the field. The second discusses capitalism as one theme that may serve to unify research. Cross-cultural research, integrative analyses, and the concepts of power and ideology are central to this theme. The third section is a brief case study concerning the historic Cherokee. The conclusion comments on the institutional state of historical archaeology.

KEY WORDS: historical archaeology; New World complex societies; capitalism; material culture studies; historical material anthropology.

INTRODUCTION

In the same year in which Kathleen Deagan's (1982) article "Avenues of Inquiry in Historical Archaeology" was published in *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory*, Eric Wolf's (1982) *Europe and the People Without History* appeared. Wolf focused anthropologists' attention on a number of issues simultaneously: the modern world system, capitalism, history, and the variable political uses of "history." Historical archaeology concerns both people "with history," those who commonly have written stories about the past, and people "without history," those who often have been excluded from those stories. A focus on people with history highlights Europeans' history in relation to that of other peoples', creating an archaeology of the Age of Discovery, colonization, and the development of the modern world

[1]National Park Service, National Capital Region, 1100 Ohio Drive, SW, Washington, DC 20242.

system. A focus on people without history considers those issues from another viewpoint and not only is crucial to building a fuller European-American archaeology, but also has the desirable consequence of adding many more voices to our perception of the past. Historical archaeology often has concentrated on people with history but has made serious efforts to restore some of the diversity of the past to our versions of it. This goal is furthered by the discipline's recent grappling with concepts such as capitalism, ideology, inequality, power, and heterogeneity and by paying serious attention to interpreting the meanings and uses of material culture.

This essay discusses some of the trends and themes that have become important or promising in historical archaeology since Deagan's article of over a decade ago. Many of the issues that dominated the field in 1982 remain. The rapid theoretical development that characterized the discipline from 1960 to 1980 continues, in conjunction with developments in archaeology and in anthropology as a whole. One set of issues that remains important is the professional, institutional, and intellectual relations between historical and prehistoric archaeology and between historical archaeology and sociocultural anthropology. Historical archaeology may still be characterized as additive. Early goals such as recovering details of historic architecture continue; newer goals such as the elucidation of power and ideology appear and are engaged. Historical archaeology is beginning to assess more effectively and more critically analytic categories such as gender and race. The following section in this essay takes stock of trends in the discipline over the last decade and considers currently recognized issues and problems. The next section discusses capitalism as one theme with the potential to unify research, and the final section, through an example, offers some threads that are integral to the interpretation of material culture if the broad context of capitalism and related issues are to be addressed successfully.

ASSESSMENT

The contributions of historical archaeology that Deagan (1982) summarized from the literature include historical supplementation, reconstructions of past lifeways, processual studies, cognitive studies, and contributions to archaeological science. These contributions all continue and it is worth summarizing some of the questions that are being addressed. Deagan's second, third, and fourth categories are subsumed here under the heading of historical ethnography.

Historical Supplementation — Historical Challenge

Archaeology still functions as historical supplementation, in the large sense that prehistory might be considered "the best we can do" given the lack of written records and in the more restricted sense of filling in the gaps in documented societies. There is no question that this function continues to be important. But archaeologists need not be content with providing details or "facts" that documentary historians may or may not find useful. Archaeology is not "handmaiden to history," as Ivor Noël Hume (1964) insisted 30 years ago, but is colleague to history.

While much historical archaeology continues to be restricted by the specific needs of cultural resource management (CRM) and by the demands of architectural reconstruction, innovative and important research continues to be done under these conditions. One illustration among many examples comes from work done at the Hermitage, Andrew Jackson's estate in Tennessee (e.g., Smith, 1976). During a routine investigation, archaeologists uncovered architectural details that necessitated a revised understanding of the sequence of building at the site (McKee et al., 1992). It may not seem anthropologically significant that the present kitchen was separated from the main house a few years later than originally thought, or that other remodeling was carried out, until one considers the broader context and the meanings attached to the built environment. In this particular case previously unasked questions were raised about the implications of occupants' physical proximity and tensions within a household made up of white owners living in the main house and black slaves living in the kitchen. The apparent attempts to decrease social and personal tensions through physical separation raise further questions about the efficacy of architectural solutions to social problems.

In addition to suggesting further avenues of inquiry into social relations, the reinterpretation prompted by the archaeology also encourages an examination of by whom and for whom the history of a house and its occupants is structured. As it is told at the Hermitage, the story of Andrew Jackson and even his house implicitly denies contradictions or unsolved conflicts (McKee et al., 1992), a situation that seems extraordinary given Jackson's career, but that is similar to other "great man" exhibits. Decisions about what parts of history are told, embellished, excluded, or glossed over are current choices. Historical archaeologists have some input and responsibility for those choices.

The supplementation function of historical archaeology must be explicitly expanded to address the writing of histories and often may correct history derived from documents. I do not mean to resurrect the idea that archaeology is objective while history is subjective. Instead I mean to em-

phasize that archaeology may provide alternative questions and interpreta-
tions. Part of historical supplementation, then, includes creating ways of
writing about the past that do not rely on historical documents or docu-
mentary historians as final arbiters of meaningful or accurate history. For
example, McDonald *et al.* (1991) describe an archaeological project com-
missioned by the Northern Cheyenne to document escape routes taken dur-
ing the Outbreak from Fort Robinson, Nebraska, in 1879. Archaeological
results successfully challenged official Army-based accounts of the escape
by providing data that bolstered Cheyenne oral tradition. Oral history and
archaeology thus may be mutually supportive in providing data and per-
spectives that contribute to a more accurate history in which biases and
the politics of knowledge are acknowledged.

Supplementing history by filling in gaps calls attention to those gaps
and to an appreciation of their importance. Historical archaeology is in a
position to create analytic links among written, oral, and material forms of
expressions as it continues intertwining history and anthropology. The func-
tion of supplementation, then, is more usefully thought of as historical chal-
lenge. History thus supplemented is history reconceptualized.

Historical Ethnography

Everyday life, cognition, and cultural process all must be considered
in constructing historical ethnography. The trend of pursuing cognitive
studies of the sort exemplified by Deetz (1977) and Glassie (1975) was
taking firm hold by the time Deagan (1982) wrote that this orientation
could be a way to reconcile mentalist and materialist perspectives. This
pursuit is indeed an extension of the "science of material culture" definition
of archaeology and requires that material-culture interpretations be more
adequately theorized. The expressed aim in "cognitive studies" is cultural
rather than behavioral reconstruction or functional interpretation. It is
open to debate whether a focus on structuralist interpretation could be
accurately termed a cognitive approach, since critiques of Levi-Strauss
structuralism point out its inherent emphasis on ahistoricity and meaning-
lessness. Diamond (1974, p. 303), for example, writes, "There is, obviously,
an inconsistency in the presumably highly symbolic categories of structu-
ralism and the reduction inherent in its explanatory principle." Neverthe-
less, investigations of "worldview," however framed, serve both to direct
archaeological attention to culture and to provide some insight into ideol-
ogy, broadly defined. Struggles to understand links between worldview and
material culture have furthered immeasurably the potential for historical
archaeologists to perform historical ethnography. Deetz (1988a) makes this

point by suggesting that the term archaeography more accurately describes the work that archaeologists do that is parallel to ethnography.

The separate categories of lifeway studies and cognitive or cultural studies reflected real trends in the discipline 15 years ago, but it no longer makes sense to attempt one without the other. Nor does it make sense to separate the goals of historical archaeology from those of anthropology as a whole. As historical archaeology was being defined professionally, Schuyler (1970) commented on its potential as a laboratory for anthropology, particularly concerning processes such as colonization and acculturation. Potential for consideration of such processes continues to expand in the discipline. The idea of colonization, for example, may be dissected into dynamically related packages of power, domination, hegemonic negotiation, and resistance on many levels. Acculturation, discussed in the case study below, is more usefully investigated as complicated economic and symbolic mediations between ethnocide and ethnogenesis. The reconstruction of past cultures and lifeways, or historical ethnography, and the description of processes such as acculturation, frontier adaptation, imperialism, and capitalism continue to contribute to the histories of disenfranchised people as well as to those of the privileged.

Historical archaeologists categorize their research in several different, overlapping ways. For example, I may simultaneously describe my work as focused primarily on the eighteenth century, the Eastern United States, urban contexts, capitalism, ideology, and a feminist approach. I could offer an assessment of current work organized chronologically, geographically, thematically, philosophically, or technically. Both the geographic and the analytic scales at which historical archaeologists work vary considerably. Scholars have argued for fruitful scales of analysis from the global world system (e.g., Falk, 1991), to community (e.g., Schuyler, 1988), to household (e.g., Beaudry, 1984). Such variety may be interpreted as hopeless fragmentation or, optimistically, as healthy diversity that may be directed by suggesting some guiding themes.

Since 1982 significant work by many scholars has contributed to topical and regional interests in the United States. The following citations are not exhaustive. For the sake of brevity, I cite mostly monographs and collections rather than articles and individual chapters and include few references to CRM reports. My purpose is to underscore both the enormous amount of work in the past dozen years and the topics that have been investigated as historical archaeology has grown and matured as a discipline. Research within the context of colonization and capitalist expansion includes contact among European, African, Asian, and indigenous peoples; the development of superordinate and subordinate cultures, including the establishment of plantation economy, cities, and industry; interethnic and

interracial conflicts and cooperation; changing gender roles, relations, and ideologies; and myriad related topics.

The unique perspective of historical archaeology provides the organizing theme for several edited volumes of varying geographic, temporal, and thematic coverage (Beaudry, 1988; Cotter, 1984; Falk, 1991; Little, 1992b; Neuman, 1983; Ward, 1983; Yentsch, 1987). Urban archaeology has received specific attention (Dickens, 1982; Schuyler, 1982; Staski, 1987). Both Leone and Potter (1988a) and Yentsch and Beaudry (1992) have edited collections devoted to symbolic analysis and meaning. These themes also are considered by Shackel (1993a) in his analysis of the creation of modern personal discipline.

Inequality is a condition of the ethnographic settings studied by most historical archaeologists and it serves as the topic for McGuire and Paynter's (1991) volume. Related to inequality are race, ethnicity, class, gender, and other social and economic factors important in historical ethnography. Gender, in particular, is a rapidly growing research focus (Seifert, 1991; Walde and Willows, 1991). Several authors have recently discussed the treatment of ethnicity (Leone *et al.*, 1994; McGuire, 1982; Staski, 1990). It is difficult to sort out race and ethnicity because the nature of group boundaries shifts within cultural contexts. Anglo, Spanish, African, and Native Americans have received a great deal of attention. Extensive archaeological and historical research has been performed in the Spanish borderlands from California to Florida (e.g., Farnsworth and Williams, 1992; Thomas, 1989, 1990, 1991). For example, the city of St. Augustine (e.g., Deagan, 1983; Reitz and Scarry, 1985) and California's missions (e.g., Farnsworth, 1989; Hoover and Costello, 1985) are subjects of numerous studies. Racially and ethnically defined Asians are also researched (Costello and Maniery, 1988; Wegars, 1993).

Archaeology of African-Americans often has focused on plantation slavery but has expanded to consider the changing roles and situations of black Americans as slave and free, rural and urban. Plantation studies have undertaken to provide accounts of single plantations (e.g., Kelso, 1984; Otto, 1984), experiment with South's pattern-recognition technique (Singleton, 1985), illuminate material expressions such as colono ware (Ferguson, 1992), and critique the archaeological treatment of slavery (Orser, 1990a). Postbellum tenant plantations and southern farms and the varying situations of free blacks have also been studied (Geismar, 1982; Orser, 1988a, 1990b; Singleton, 1994).

The effects of colonization on native peoples (as well as on settlers) is an important area of overlap for prehistorians and historical archaeologists. Extensive work has been done on Native American depopulation and demography (Dobyns, 1983; Ramenofsky, 1987; Smith, 1987; Verano and

Ubelaker, 1992). European explorations, processes of colonization, and post-contact change form essential frameworks for the interpretation of sites and regions (Dyson, 1985; Ewen, 1991; Fitzhugh, 1985; Fitzhugh and Olin, 1993; McGhee, 1984; Rogers and Wilson, 1993). Some of the research involving contact between Europeans and indigenous people has been carried out in the southeast (Blakely, 1988; Keegan, 1992; Potter, 1993; Wood et al., 1989), in the northeast (Faulkner and Faulkner, 1987), and in the midcontinent (Gums, 1988; Walthall, 1990; Walthall and Emerson, 1992). Rogers (1990) concentrates on culture change among the Arikara. Trigger (1985) reexamines standard accounts and myths of the settlement of Canada by Europeans, crediting native Americans with a creative role in shaping that country.

The variety of other topics explored is quite broad. The frontier (Lewis, 1984) and changing core–periphery relations (Paynter, 1982) are significant issues. Westward movement and extracting wealth from the land are integral to topics such as the California gold rush (Pastron and Hattori, 1990) and silver mining in Nevada (Hardesty, 1988). Focusing on consumer choice in the marketplace, Spencer-Wood (1987) collects research that extends Miller's technique of economic scaling to examine issues of socio-economic status and its archaeological interpretation. Landscape has received increasing attention in many disciplines and has proved fruitful for historical archaeology (Kelso and Most, 1990). The American Civil War, which has always received a good deal of attention from historians, presents a challenge to archaeologists (Geier and Winter, 1994). Other military research includes that on the Battle of Little Bighorn (Scott and Fox, 1987; Scott et al., 1989).

Some other region-specific works include that on the Carolinas (Wilson, 1985), the Chesapeake (Shackel and Little, 1994), Long Island (Stone and Ottusch-Kianka, 1987), and Rockbridge County, Virginia (McDaniel and Russ, 1984). Locally focused work includes that on St. Mary's City in Maryland (Miller, 1986), Martins Hundred in Virginia (Noël Hume, 1983), Philadelphia (Cotter et al., 1992), eighteenth-century New York City (Rothschild, 1990), and nineteenth-century Monterey, California (Felton and Schulz, 1983).

Although admittedly underrepresented in the last few paragraphs, the breadth of the historical ethnography produced in historical archaeology, along with the volume of literature, continues to grow dramatically.

Testing Ground for Prehistoric Principles

The use of historical archaeology as a laboratory for more general archaeological science to be perfected through ethnoarchaeology and a

"science of material culture" has been widely noted (e.g., Deagan, 1982; Schuyler, 1970). A similar contribution is made by modern material culture studies (e.g., Gould and Schiffer, 1981; Rathje, 1979). Such work includes tests of seriation, refuse patterning as a mirror of ethnicity, status indicators, and the observation of formation processes. Many historical archaeologists remain explicit about their hope to develop methods that will further the aims of prehistory and contribute to cross–cultural research, particularly among complex societies (e.g., McGuire and Paynter, 1991; Mrozowski, 1988; Paynter, 1982, 1985; South, 1988a, b; Stevenson, 1982). Paynter (1985), for example, sets up a model of frontier-homeland relations that is meant to be widely applicable to stratified societies. In considering the local environment, primary producers, regional elites, and core elites, Paynter creates a political-economic approach that explicitly rejects a diffusionist model and instead focuses on the production and distribution of surplus. One important insight to studies of phenomena such as frontiers, colonialism, and acculturation is that contact tends to create differences and conflict rather than a melting pot of uniformity. This insight of heterogeneity is broadly applicable to the internal as well as external affairs of states (see Brumfiel, 1992).

Many historical archaeologists use evolutionary and ecological frameworks for explanation. In describing the industrial frontier of nineteenth-century America by analogy to an ecosystem, Hardesty (1985) describes niche structures. He advocates the use of scientific evolutionary theory in historical archaeology but he also writes that "it is clear that we presently lack a set of explanatory principles capable of dealing with the *creative* behavior of organisms [people] toward their environment, such as the 'imported' environment of industrial societies" (Hardesty, 1985, p. 226).

There is both an advantage and a disadvantage to such an approach. Using the same language, models, and research questions that prehistorians employ encourages historical archaeology to fit itself into a temporal continuum and offer itself as a laboratory for prehistoric models and concepts. However, instead of truly acting as a laboratory, historical archaeology often offers itself only as a confirmation of models already created and applied to other data. The function of historical archaeology as "handmaiden to prehistory" is an essential contribution of historical archaeology, yet it is a mistake to dismiss goals that may not necessarily advance more general method. Imagine the poverty of our field if ethnologists were unconcerned with the abstract expressions of cognition, myth, intention, and culture because such information could not be sought through prehistoric data.

New Crisis and Questions of Method

In 1982 archaeology as a whole was beginning a new period of critical
self-examination and, some would say, reactionary entrenchment. In this
year were published Hodder's *Symbolic and Structural Archaeology* (1982a)
and *Symbols in Action* (1982b) and Leone's (1982) "Some Opinions on Re-
covering Mind." Since then numerous debates have taken place about the
pros and cons of processual and "postprocessual" archaeology (e.g., Earle
and Preucel, 1987; Gibbon, 1989; Hodder, 1985, 1986, 1991; Leone *et al.*,
1987; Miller and Tilley, 1984; Patterson, 1990a, b; Preucel, 1991; Schiffer,
1988; Shanks and Tilley, 1987; Watson and Fotiadis, 1990; Watson, 1990).
Historical archaeology has gone through its own periods of growth and
change, and it has been no less affected by the turmoil of the 1980s and
early 1990s than has prehistory. In fact, its practitioners have often been
the most successful proponents of an approach that seeks to uncover in-
tention, social relations, and ideology along with economy, function, and
structure. Watson and Fotiadis (1990, p. 615) note that "it has not escaped
the notice of processualists, and others who are not persuaded by the sym-
bolic-structuralist postprocessualists, that virtually all of their published
work so far has been within or has relied heavily upon ethnographic and
historical data (e.g., Leone and Potter, 1988)." It is obvious that the kinds
of goals espoused by postprocessualism — concerns with meanings, sym-
bols, cognition, power, and historical context — are much more completely
and convincingly achieved within historical archaeology. Hodder (1986, p.
141) writes, "It is partly for this reason [need for great deal of contextual
data] that historical archaeology is an 'easier' approach . . . the richer data
allow more similarities and differences to be sought along more relevant
dimensions of variation."

Of course, historical archaeologists laughingly dismiss such observa-
tions on the "ease" of their work. They are instead all too aware of the
numerous difficulties in maneuvering through both documents and other
material culture and in accommodating cross-cultural concepts and histori-
cally particular situations while recognizing the complexities and dynamism
of their data and their models. The creation of appropriate method is still
under way and is a constant focus of discussion in the discipline.

In 1987 the plenary session at the annual Society for Historical Ar-
chaeology meetings focused on "Questions that Count in Historical Ar-
chaeology." The opinions expressed at that meeting emphasize the need
for conscious attention to method and the need for connecting method
and theory. The critiques that were leveled at the discipline by its practi-
tioners identify long-standing problems. Promises of the vast yet imperfectly

realized potential of historical archaeology were also reiterated. The plenary session papers appeared in the journal the following year (see Historical Archaeology, Vol. 22, No. 1).

In that forum, Honerkamp (1988) characterizes historical-archaeological research as routinized and atheoretical. Some of the plenary participants seek solutions in traditional anthropological concerns. For example, the use of energy theory as an organizing concept to describe and categorize societies is advised by South (1988b). Mrozowski (1988) emphasizes that a cross-cultural perspective may provide the sense of purpose that the discipline lacks.

It is not, however, difficult to find questions that count concerning the modern world after A.D. 1500; what is difficult is finding a unique way of addressing them (Deagan, 1988). Methodology is seen as the primary stumbling block. Two levels of method may be distinguished: the procedural or technical, which often is dwelt upon; and the method informed by theory that structures research, of which there is a dearth and for which there is a desperate need (Cleland, 1988). One major methodological issue is one of using both the archaeological and the documentary records effectively (Beaudry, 1988; Leone, 1988; Little, 1992a; Schuyler, 1988).

There are at least five approaches used in the discipline to combine text and material culture. These strategies consider the two data sources as contradictory, complementary, sources for hypotheses, ripe for debunking, and needed for context (Little, 1992b). In the first case, documents and archaeological data may be played off against one another. Looking for anomalies in databases is inspired by the ethnoarchaeological approach of "middle range theory" (e.g., Binford, 1977, 1981; Schiffer, 1976) adapted for historical contexts (e.g., Leone, 1988; Potter, 1992). The data sources in the second approach may be used to complement each other and fill in where each lacks detail or trustworthiness. In the third case, either data set, commonly the documentary, may give rise to hypotheses, which are then tested against the other data set, usually the archaeological. In the fourth approach, either data set may be used to debunk some version of the past provided by the other. Archaeologists have been more concerned with debunking historical myths than vice versa, a situation that may well change as historians begin to pay more attention to the results of archaeology. Finally, either database, but usually the documentary one, may be used as a source of context that provides the basis for interpretation. In each of these approaches material culture must be accorded full status as a primary database.

There is no question that methods developed specifically for historical archaeology have helped both to describe data and to establish research problems within the discipline. Two particularly widely used methods are pattern recognition of functionally defined artifact categories, created by

South (1977a, b, 1988b), and the economic-scaling index created for English ceramic vessels by Miller (1980, 1991). Each of these approaches provides ways of coherently organizing and comparing data. Critiques of the methods help to refine the questions we ask and better theorize the meaning and relevance of both the categories and the comparisons. Orser (1989) critiques South's pattern-recognition technique, which is widely applied. Yentsch (1991a, b) critiques the widespread focus on measures of economic scaling inspired by Miller's index and the analytical limitations of South's categories. She sees each method as promoting certain questions at the expense of those with more potential to inform on gender and the material correlates of gender relations. The careful documentation of prices for consumer goods and the comparison of relative original costs of assemblages have encouraged the description of consumer choices (Spencer-Wood, 1987) and should continue to spark critical analysis of the meaning and expression of social status, consumption, and developing economic practices.

While it is generally recognized that methodology — in structuring research, in connecting theory to data, and in effectively using both documentary and archaeological information — is in need of attention, there is little agreement over how method is to be improved or applied to broader questions. And the questions themselves are not altogether obvious. Should archaeologists rely on social historians and cultural anthropologists to define the questions that count? Are questions that count those of race, class, and gender? Of current political and sociological import? Of traditional anthropological concern? Of historical detail? The obvious answer, that all of these count, forces us again to emphasize appropriate methods for addressing these questions.

Deagan (1982, p. 171) notes particular potentials of the field owing to the nature of the databases available:

> It is this very quality of relevance to a wide variety of problems and disciplines that is both a unique strength and an inherent danger to historical archaeology. Simultaneous attention to historical, anthropological, archaeological, and ideological questions has caused the field to be somewhat unfocused and erratic. The increased influence of reconstruction-oriented cultural resource management programs in historical archaeology has additionally exacerbated this condition. Different historical archaeologists ask very different kinds of questions, with little exchange of ideas in many cases. In this lies the possibility that historical archaeology could become a set of techniques applicable to a wide variety of concerns, but with no primary focus of its own.

Several archaeologists have suggested that capitalism be considered the proper primary focus of the discipline (Leone, 1977; Leone and Potter, 1988b; Orser, 1988b; Paynter, 1988). Orser (1988b) advises that this focus solves the long-standing problem of an atheoretical and eclectic stance in the discipline. A focus on capitalism, on the development of the current

dominant ideology of the modern Western world, is important. There are weaknesses though, not the least of which is a Western/European-centered viewpoint that may serve to omit from "historical archaeology" cross-culturally relevant work incorporating written documentation such as that on Old World precapitalist states (e.g., Boone *et al.*, 1990; Redman, 1986); political maneuvering between native American groups (e.g., Hantman, 1990); medieval Europe (e.g., Young, 1992); or African cultures documented through oral history (e.g., Schmidt, 1977).

It remains a reality in the field, however, that historical archaeology is defined as "the archaeology of the spread of European culture throughout the world since the fifteenth century and its impact on indigenous peoples" (Deetz, 1977, p. 5). I want to echo the protest that others (Posnansky and Decorse, 1986) have made of the one-sidedness of such a definition. The European emphasis in it comes from the history parentage of historical archaeology. The anthropology parent provides an emphasis on the "other." Historical archaeology need not shortchange either outlook but may examine the dynamic interplay between and within worlds with and without history. In the United States such an historical archaeology is nearly always centered on time periods and people embedded in or buffeted by the complex context of capitalism.

AN ARCHAEOLOGY OF CAPITALISM?

Leone and Potter (1988b, p. 19) write,

> Whether or not historical archaeology is to be an archaeology of the emergence and development of capitalism has been settled in the affirmative. There has never been a choice even for those who were indifferent or hostile to the issue. . . . In other words, we can either know our social context, which is the context of advanced industrial capitalism, or be prisoners of it.

There are two issues: the archaeology of capitalist context as that context has emerged and developed and the social context of archaeology itself within a capitalist culture. Leone and Potter (1988b) identify two concepts that need to be incorporated into our work: ideology — both in historical development and as the current ideology that uses the "pasts" constructed by archaeologists; and consciousness — as awareness of the ideological constructions and constraints within which we as archaeologists work. Several scholars (Blakey, 1983; Handsman, 1983; Schuyler, 1976) have raised the issue of historical archaeology as serving current ideology, a role that might be dubbed "handmaiden to capitalism." Others too have insisted on the necessity of archaeology's social and ideological role (e.g., Gathercole,

1984). The disadvantage of such an insistence, if taken out of a Marxist context, is the risk of overstating relativism. The more convincing advantage is the potential for a real assessment of our own biases and interpretations as well as their social impacts. Consciousness and current ideological context cannot be adequately discussed here, although their importance is assumed in this essay. Instead, investigation of the historical development of the context(s) of capitalism, a compelling research topic due to our current social and cultural situation, is the subject of the rest of this section.

Research on the culture of capitalism seeks to understand the most pervasive changes of the past half-millennium: How did people make sense of capitalism's economic, technical, and social transformations and their cultural effects? Of course, a focus on capitalism in this case begins with mercantile capitalism from the fifteenth century rather than solely forms of industrial capitalism from the eighteenth century. Capitalism as a world system serves as a way to keep myriad issues connected. Within the world system of capitalism there are certainly different spatial and temporal scales of analysis and different foci for research. Within the United States the phenomenon of capitalism is not necessarily specific to region or time period; it is not unique to East Coast industrialism. Although capitalism supports and is supported by a dominant cultural ideology, neither it nor the ideology is transcendent or all-encompassing; they are challenged, changed, and embraced. In seeking to understand the roots and development of capitalism as the roots of much of our modern American society and culture, we must be careful not to treat its history and development as inevitable. To deny the contingencies of historical events would be a disservice to those who resisted and a denial of other possible outcomes or possible futures.

The culture of capitalism as an issue requires consideration in several ways, few of which have received more than preliminary consideration in the literature. There need to be comparative work on different capitalist and noncapitalist cultures; careful linking of production, distribution, and consumption; and innovative analyses of industrialism. There also need to be continued refinement and application of central concepts such as power and ideology.

Cross-Cultural Research

Paynter (1989, p. 372) writes, "A true archaeology of capitalism would be worldwide in scope, and would have to understand the intricate trajectories various parts of the world were following prior to the arrival of Europeans." It is essential that the development of a modern world system be

considered in cross-cultural perspective. In looking to capitalism and the development of contemporary society and the modern world as unifying concepts, historical archaeologists need to turn their attention around the globe to areas colonized or otherwise affected by Europeans. Capitalism will begin to seem less monolithic a concept as regional differences in indigenous culture, historical contingencies, and ecological setting are seen to influence the European adventure. The cross-cultural approach is needed to understand the contemporary "modern world," which is truly diverse.

Several provocative studies highlight the variability of dynamics between colonizers and colonized. For example, Sichone (1989) discusses colonial effects on indigenous populations in the Rhodesian Copperbelt, arguing that colonialism forced new cultural forms instead of allowing indigenous "survivals." His call for a new vocabulary and new ways of looking at colonized peoples' reactions needs to be taken seriously. "Acculturation" and its material-culture clues must be reconceptualized. Howson (1990) also argues for this need to refine our approaches to acculturation in looking at African-American social and cultural adaptation in plantation settings in the American South. Rogers (1990) emphasizes the complexities of cultural survival in his analysis of contact between the Arikara and European settlers. Material conditions, material culture, and the uses to which objects are put vary widely within indigenous stratified societies. They vary as well within a global system such as developing capitalism that consists of interdependent but separate parts.

Intent on identifying similarities and unifying some of the British experience, Deetz (1977, 1983) has turned his attention to South Africa, searching there for parallel developments to those described for Anglo-American society. Winer and Deetz (1990) describe the formulation of a distinctive Eastern Cape culture from the parent British culture from 1820 to 1860. Scott and Deetz (1990, p. 76) write,

> [W]hile each of these "little Englands" had its own distinctive character, the result of different environments and interaction with a rich diversity of indigenous peoples, they all shared a common general form and quality. Language, custom and a distinctive shaping of the physical environment tie together places as outwardly disparate as southern Africa, the United States and Australia, all sharing a common English cultural heritage.

Such homogeneity may well be overstated, yet it is vital to recognize the similarities as well as the differences within world systems. Comparing like and dislike, Schrire and Merwick (1991), for example, contrast the different purposes and outcomes of Dutch activity in New Netherlands in the Americas and on the South African Cape.

Production, Consumption, Industrialism

In promoting a class model for connecting material change and capi-
talism, Paynter (1988) argues that production and consumption, although
often investigated as separate processes, need to be explicitly connected.
It is not altogether clear how these phenomena are to be analytically linked,
especially as we operate within the culture of capitalism, which implicitly
demands such separations (e.g., Barnett and Silverman, 1979, pp. 41–81).
The separate consideration of work and domestic life would be foreign in
many times and places but the separations are enforced within modern
capitalism by both gender ideology, which has attempted to define home
as a place where valued "work" is not done, and class ideology, wherein
it is essential to keep the alienated worker and the consuming worker un-
aware that they are identical. Work affects what there is to be consumed
and the conditions under which it is produced. There is an overarching
cultural change that accompanies the social changes in the organization of
work and connects the conditions of production with the circumstances of
consumption; that is, there is a change in cultural expectations and control.
The study of work is a potential area of contribution for industrial archae-
ology. Merging accounts of workers' tasks with descriptions of workplace
and equipment should provide a "comprehensive picture of daily routines
within a particular trade," an orientation Leary (1979, p. 176) terms "in-
dustrial ecology." An historical archaeology of work need not be limited
to echoing an ecosystem approach, but will make valuable contributions to
political economy of the sort promoted by McGuire and Paynter (1991).

There is a large and growing body of literature on industrial archae-
ology, particularly on that done in Great Britain and the United States
(e.g., Greenwood, 1985; Rapp and Beranek, 1984; Sande, 1976) but also
on that done around the world (e.g., Hudson, 1979; Vance, 1984). Much
of industrial archaeology suffers from antiquarianism and lacks a coherent
theoretical structure. Therefore, the subdiscipline stands to gain an enor-
mous amount of intellectual stimulation from the explicit consideration of
capitalism as a unifying construct. Although the effects of industrial capi-
talism are apparent outside the workplace as well as within it, the locus of
work, the physical conditions, and the organization of the process of labor
and production offer intellectual inroads into the negotiation between peo-
ple who were laborers and people who were managers.

There are a few examples of explicit linking of discipline in the work-
place with personal discipline of the individual. One has been offered by
Shackel (1993a) in describing the standardization of the toothbrush. Stand-
ardized manufacturing of toothbrushes began in Great Britain by the early
nineteenth century. Artisan judgment in placing and drilling holes for the

bristles was replaced in stages by machine precision introduced with reor-
ganization of manufacturing. The change in the workplace is correlated
with the use of toothbrushes as part of an individualizing routine involving
hygiene and the careful presentation of self. Production and consumption
of a particular artifact, then, are linked within overall culture change em-
phasizing discipline. Outside of historical archaeology, but of use to the
field, is the link between standardized routines of workers — authors and
printers — in emerging print culture and both the standardized products
of the press and the standardizing influence of printing on consumers of
printed, standard items (Eisenstein, 1983; Little, 1988).

Linking workers' production and workers' housing is particularly im-
portant in gaining a comprehensive interpretation of early industrial towns.
Beaudry and Mrozowski (1988, 1989; Beaudry, 1989) discuss the role of
corporate paternalism and its effects on workers' lives in Lowell, Massa-
chusetts. The work being done at Harpers Ferry, West Virginia (Shackel,
1993b), explicitly considers relations between technology and culture
change. Domestic material culture, food choice, health-related practices,
and treatment of the landscape are investigated to interpret resistance to
and acceptance of discipline both in the factory itself and within house-
holds.

Ideology and Power

It is clear that one of the important concepts in an archaeology of
capitalism is that of ideology. This concern is no less important in the (pre-)
history of institutionalized states and mechanisms of power and control.
The term ideology has many different and sometimes conflicting meanings.
Eagleton (1991) discusses the ambiguity and changing meanings, offers six
increasingly focused definitions, and identifies six characteristics or strate-
gies of ideology. Historical archaeologists will find that distinguishing
among these levels of specificity and strategies is useful but need to rec-
ognize that the distinctions in any situation often may not be clear and
that ideology may remain ambiguous. Often several kinds of ideologies op-
erate simultaneously. The strategies of various players are not necessarily
mutually exclusive or clearly defined by the players themselves, let alone
the researchers viewing a dynamic situation from another cultural context.

At the risk of oversimplification, only the essence of these definitions
of ideology follows, from broadest to most focused:

(1) ideas, beliefs, and values produced by material processes (stressing
social production of thought);

(2) ideas and beliefs (false or true) of a specific, socially significant group or class;

(3) promotion or legitimation of such a group's concerns;

(4) promotion of a dominant group's interests;

(5) legitimation of the dominant group's interests through distortion and dissimulation; and

(6) deceptive beliefs arising not from the interests of a dominant group, but from the material structure of society, such as fetishism of commodities.

Ideologies, then, are not necessarily false, nor are they characteristic only of the ruling class. Depending on their focus, ideologies may further six kinds of strategies. These are unifying and hegemonic; action-oriented, i.e., practical; rationalizing; legitimizing; universalizing; and naturalizing. The latter two aspects are part of a dehistoricizing thrust that attempts to erase social context and remove any human basis for critique.

Eagleton's carefully argued definitions are helpful in sorting out the different uses of "ideology" in historical archaeology, particularly in distinguishing between ideology as "false consciousness," the definition attributed to "standard" Marxism, and ideology as the totality of social consciousness, a definition that equates ideology with culture (see McGuire, 1988, 1991). The latter definition often is too broad to allow meaningful analyses of ideologies per se. Although the concept of ideology as false consciousness has fallen into disfavor (Abercrombie et al., 1980; Eagleton, 1991, p. 10), it has been used successfully within historical archaeology, particularly to stimulate ongoing discussion about the interplay between social groups and between ideology and material culture. For example, Leone (1984) uses this idea in his analysis of naturalizing ideology through the material culture of gardens in eighteenth-century Annapolis, Maryland. Hodder (1986, pp. 63–70) has critiqued Leone's (1984) use of Althusser's (1971) dominant ideology thesis and the critique has been echoed by others (Beaudry et al., 1991; Hall, 1992; Johnson, 1989). Yet the proffered alternative based on Abercrombie and co-authors' (1980) critique — that subordinates are constantly aware of dominant attempts at ideological obfuscation and that only the elite are misled by their own legitimation strategies — seems an alternative oversimplification. Instead, Eagleton's layered definitions explain that ideologies may be true or false or, more likely, a blend of both, and may be held by groups of varying structural power. Ideologies are not necessarily consciously articulated. Wolf (1990, pp. 592–593) draws on Wallace's (1970) insights that social actors do not need to understand the meaning behind others' actions, but they do need to know how to respond appropriately. "Issues of meaning need not ever

rise into consciousness" (Wolf, 1990, p. 593). Practical knowledge and action must be contrasted against discursive knowledge, which is consciously theorized (Feierman, 1990, p. 27).

Kryder-Reid (1994), for example, is careful to distinguish among the several "readings" that any particular built landscape may prompt. There are messages for different audiences, both the dominant and the dominated: The large house and elaborate garden of Charles Carroll of Carrollton in Annapolis may fail to impress upon the untutored the necessary geometric principles and their relation to the laws of nature but could not fail to impress with the amount of money and coercive power needed to build and maintain such a place. Whether individuals are "duped" by dominant justifications for the claiming of power, they are not likely to be confused as to whether some groups actually *possess* power.

This landscape example also emphasizes a distinction that has been used in archaeology between vulgar and nonvulgar ideology. Vulgar ideology is subjective knowledge and explanation that serves some social class (Meltzer, 1981, p. 114, following Handsman, 1977). Vulgar ideology, encompassing the third, fourth, and fifth of Eagleton's definitions, is potentially obvious and penetrable by members of a culture who can recognize, if not effectively resist, the ideological "arguments" used to promote certain interests. An explicit message of a geometric Georgian garden that material wealth is a legitimation as well as an expression of social power may be questioned but not necessarily effectively resisted. Nonvulgar ideology, akin to Eagleton's most focused definition of deceptive beliefs arising from the material structure of society, is knowledge thought to be objective and beyond question. Nonvulgar ideology is much more difficult to penetrate because it forms the basis for accepted truth, for example, supernatural and natural prescription. The same "wealth equals power" argument holds implicit messages, as wealthy individuals embed their power in natural right and the laws of nature and express it materially through, for example, scientific instruments (e.g., Leone and Shackel, 1987) as well as formal gardens (e.g., Leone, 1984).

Resistance to dominant ideology does not necessitate the complete piercing of dominant ideology but does require understanding what the dominant ideology demands and fulfilling or avoiding those demands. In forming their own ideologies, subordinate groups incorporate, reform, manipulate, and appeal to dominant ideology. The dominant ideology in turn, if operating hegemonically, will incorporate and reform, coopting subordinate concerns into its own constructs. Women's domestic reform movements of the nineteenth century (e.g., Spencer-Wood, 1991) provide an example of this process within gender ideology.

The theme of power is implicit in the manipulation of ideologies and is increasingly offered as a central focus in the examination of capitalism or, indeed, in any context where inequality is an issue (Paynter, 1989; Paynter and McGuire, 1991). Wolf (1990) acknowledges the discomfort that the very term "power" creates and finds it useful to distinguish among four modes to bring more precision to discussion of the concept. The first is power as the capability of a person; the second is power as the ability of a person to impose upon another interpersonally; the third is tactical power, which controls social settings, and the fourth is structural power, which allocates social labor. The first is what Miller and Tilley (1984) and Paynter and McGuire (1991) call "power to," while the latter three are increasing degrees of "power over." The theme of "power" would be trivial in its universality were it not for this explicit consideration of its inherent heterogeneity. The contrast between a universal notion of power and a pluralistic notion of various sorts of power, contextualized, is the contrast that makes the notion useful. Another sense of the heterogeneity of power must also be recognized. Domination may be carried out through coercion, legitimation, or a combination of these. Similarly, resistance may be overt and violent or hidden in everyday defiance (Scott, 1985).

By considering different kinds of power in different contexts, one may also avoid the trap of considering power from a primarily male viewpoint since the usual focus on power may be a peculiarly male focus. As Conkey and Gero (1991) note, the attempt to engender archaeology may require paying closer attention to interpersonal relations and analytically privileging less the centralized state and centralized power. Appraising various scales of power and various forms of resistance and subversion is a key to successfully addressing social relations.

Historical archaeology has a largely untapped but increasingly recognized potential for theorizing, analyzing, and describing strategies of power, expressions of all levels of ideology, and dynamic interactions among those attempting to dominate and those attempting to resist. Within the archaeology of slavery in the United States, for example, Epperson (1990) analyzes covert slave resistance on a Virginia plantation. There are many promising historical contexts for such analyses, including the sixteenth-century European onslaught in the Caribbean, eighteenth-century rise of industrialism, nineteenth-century expansion of Manifest Destiny, and twentieth-century indigenous resurgence. None of these concerns can be addressed, however, without a thorough investigation of material culture: the objects that both express social relationships and reify cultural constructs and metaphors.

MATERIAL CULTURE IN THE NEGOTIATION OF IDEOLOGY:
AN EXAMPLE FROM THE HISTORIC CHEROKEE

In the past several years there have been a number of studies on the
meanings of goods. These are from museum studies (e.g., Craven, 1986;
Lubar and Kingery, 1993), folklore (e.g., St. George, 1988), social history
(e.g., Isaac, 1982; Schama, 1987), American studies (e.g., Lears, 1981;
Schlereth, 1985), and architectural and landscape history (e.g., Herman,
1984; Stilgoe, 1982; Upton, 1986; Upton and Vlach, 1986), in addition to
cultural anthropology (e.g., Appadurai, 1986; Bourdieu, 1984; Douglas and
Isherwood, 1979; Fowler, 1987; Ingersoll and Bronitsky, 1987; McCracken,
1988; McKendrick *et al.*, 1982; Reynolds and Stott, 1987; Scott, 1985).
There also have been a large number of studies in archaeology (e.g., Burley,
1989; Deetz, 1988b; Hodder, 1979, 1989; Little and Shackel, 1992; Neiman,
1978; Schiffer, 1991; Tilley, 1990; Wobst, 1977; Yentsch, 1991b). Serious
material culture studies have escalated in the past decade.

No longer confined to questions of chronology or function, historical
archaeology is now beginning to focus on meaning in context. Contexts are
defined at different spatial scales as mentioned above — global, regional,
local, household — and temporal scales — *longue durée*, social time, event
(e.g., Little and Shackel, 1989; Paynter, 1988; Shackel, 1993a). Many of
these studies draw upon the work of Pierre Bourdieu and Mary Douglas as
well as Anthony Giddens and Michel Foucault (see Shackel and Little,
1992).

A short case study of nineteenth-century Cherokee in Georgia inte-
grates meanings of material culture with a group's resistance to and at-
tempted negotiation of dominant ideology. Part of a dominant nonvulgar
ideology in this case is the avowed progress of civilization; the vulgar ide-
ology that is challenged through both material and nonmaterial culture is
the rigidity of the expression of civilization. All of Wolf's modes of power
come into play, but particularly important is tactical power as dominant
and dominated struggle over acceptable social settings. The heterogeneity
that the resistant group attempts to enforce within the dominant culture's
hegemony fails. Rather than incorporating an effective and compelling
challenge to its own ideology, the dominant group resorts to brute force
to eliminate the threat. This example is offered not as an illustration of
premier historical-archaeological research — the archaeology done decades
ago is poorly documented and difficult to interpret — but as a case of
broadly examining a context in which a culture of capitalism impacted and
was challenged by people "without history." I have simplified the challenge
and response. Neither the dominant nor the dominated group acted uni-
formly; their actions and desires were not monolithic. Rather, there were

factions on each side involved in intragroup power dynamics and ideological struggles.

In considering contact between Native Americans and European Americans during the early nineteenth century, themes of civilization, ideology, and acculturation are useful. The Cherokee found it necessary to present themselves so as to be understood by whites as "civilized" and simultaneously to maintain their identity as Cherokee (e.g., Perdue, 1979; Persico, 1979). They selectively accepted and manipulated the foreign idea of civilization, expressing through material culture both the adoption of "white ways" and the preservation of their own tradition. Their situation was complicated by the coalescence of nationalism in the United States: The quintessential citizen was in the process of being defined, and the Indian was not He.

The Cherokee capital of New Echota established in northwest Georgia is an embodiment of the Cherokee's most explicit demonstration of this white ideology of civilization and a final, desperate effort to preserve their land and nation. New Echota was in many ways the culmination of long intercultural contact. By the first decades of the nineteenth century the Cherokee had undergone extensive change. As in other native societies, all aspects of life were affected. Economy changed as Cherokee hunted to supply the skin trade, began raising stock, and intensified agriculture. Intermarriage brought in outsiders. Gender relations changed as European patriarchy gained influence. Naming and inheritance rules changed. The community of autonomous villages transformed into a "priest-state" and then a nation. Traditional ceremonies were altered and diminished. Missionaries promoted not only Christianity but also behavior and material culture appropriate to their own civilization. Missions established schools and churches and taught the values of individualism and capitalism as well as acceptable styles of dress, hair, speech, and demeanor. Property and wealth became valued and egalitarianism faded. Plantation economy, holding of black slaves, and racism were adopted (Gearing, 1962; Mooney, 1900, 1975; Perdue, 1979; Ronda and Axtell, 1978).

Beginning with a treaty in 1721, Cherokee landholdings steadily diminished. By the end of the eighteenth century there was little left of the original territory, which was further diminished by cessions in 1804, 1805, 1806, 1816, 1817, and 1819. By 1808 governmental pressure increased for the Cherokee to exchange their land for property west of the Mississippi, and by 1817 a few thousand Cherokee had emigrated to Arkansas.

The Cherokee responded to such pressure with political moves. It is hardly coincidental that the first rules of the Cherokee National Council were established in 1808, and the "Articles of 1817" created a Grand Council. In 1820 the Council established a republican government, with eight

districts electing representatives to the Council. In 1825 plans were made for the permanent capital at New Echota, which was surveyed and established a year later. The Presbyterian minister Worcester moved from nearby Brainerd to the new capital and established a mission house.

Cherokee literacy was also made possible in the 1820s. Sequoyah submitted his syllabary to the Council in 1821 and within a few years it was resolved to establish a national newspaper published at the capital in both Cherokee and English. The first issue of the *Cherokee Phoenix* was published on February 28, 1828. Printed in both English and the newly available Cherokee, the newspaper promoted literacy but insisted on equal status of its two languages and cultures. The title itself was taken from Western mythology but refers to the rebirth of the Cherokee people out of an earlier way of life that had become impossible to maintain.

New Echota, then, was created by the Cherokee as the capital of an independent nation with a constitution (in 1827) and a republican government, literacy, printing, a national newspaper, Christianity, and a police force to protect property — in short, all the explicit ingredients for what was understood to be "civilization."

New Echota contained the concrete material-culture evidence of a people presenting themselves as civilized. It also contained evidence of a people who saw themselves as separate from white culture, as distinctly Cherokee [see, for example, writings of Elias Boudinot, editor of the *Phoenix* (cited in Perdue, 1983)]. Preliminary evidence suggests that while some of the most external and visible elements of material culture, especially architecture and planned settlement pattern (Pillsbury, 1983; Wilms, 1974), followed white rules, less visible elements, particularly objects used within households or within activities of limited audience, preserved traditional culture.

Such division itself has implications for adoption of the white dichotomy of public and private and for the role of women and men in separate spheres. Other historical archaeologists' studies of Native-European contact (e.g., Deagan, 1983; Deetz, 1963) have attributed maintenance of traditional culture, kept private within households, to women. As Perdue (1979) mentions, Cherokee women's roles had already changed drastically by the nineteenth century. It is likely that one of women's new roles involved the discreet maintenance of certain traditional practices, including the manufacture and decoration of ceramics.

Archaeological excavations were conducted at the site of New Echota in 1954 (DeBaillou, 1955) and 1969 (Baker, 1970). Descriptions of domestic materials recovered are brief but provocative and imply both coexistence of European- and native-manufactured ceramics and building technology combining native and European attributes. Cherokee ceramics were found

throughout one of the excavations in direct conjunction with European ceramics, at least some of which were presumably high-status teawares (Baker, 1970, p. 22; DeBaillou, 1955, p. 26). Anglo-produced building timbers were used in "old Indian fashion" according to DeBaillou (1955, p. 21).

There are some notes and maps and a brief report on the extensive 1954 excavations. Eighteen "units" were explored, each of which apparently measured at least 100 ft on a side. Several of the units are noted simply as having yielded "nothing important" or as being meager. Features such as wells, cellars, and refuse pits were excavated within six of the large units. Stratigraphic control may have been practiced in the field, but the recorded provenience of artifacts was specific only to the features as a whole. After examining the available material from 11 of 21 features in five units, I found that 9 features exhibited a mix of traditional and European-derived materials. Retouched flakes and retouched sherds of glass probably served similar purposes. Part of an incised slate palette and grit-tempered Lamar-like ceramic sherds, most undecorated but a few with complicated stamping, appeared with handpainted pearlware teacup fragments and an occasional sherd of glazed stoneware from a storage vessel. A stone pipe and pewter table utensils were found together in a refuse pit.[2]

Material culture was used both to adopt and to reject white objects and their uses. The Cherokee invention of an alphabet exemplifies this dual strategic function. An alphabet was adopted but it was not the correct, i.e., civilized English, language. Sequoyah's invention of letters for the Cherokee tongue has been seen as progressive and as an indication of intelligence (e.g., McGinty, 1955; Self, 1955), but it was more than an example of "catching on" to civilization. It was an adoption and adaptation of one part of white civilization in Cherokee terms.

A native people's counteractions and adaptations to the continuing demands of an invading and dominating culture provide insight into the ideological perspective of the nondominant on the issue of acculturation. Ethnocide and ethnogenesis are of central concern to both the dominant culture and the resisters. The Cherokee resisted both the total destruction of their culture and the creation of a new culture that would be defined solely by missionaries, government agents, and other whites. Instead the Cherokee's own ethnogenesis was of an altered Cherokee identity.

---

[2]A fully quantified assessment of the material culture must await a full-scale reconstruction of the archaeology performed at New Echota. I examined artifacts that had been curated at New Echota State Park and moved to the Office of the State Archaeologist at West Georgia College in the summer of 1992. Although there are references to a full report of the excavations supervised by Baker, no copy could be located. I have confined my observations to the earlier work for which I could correlate artifacts with provenience.

The case of New Echota provides an example of alternative uses and meanings of material culture, including but not limited to the use of symbolic artifacts in negotiation for political or social rights. After the American Revolutionary War the Cherokee were compelled to invent peaceful methods for negotiating in a desperate situation and in the face of racism. One method promoted the adoption of the symbols and structures of white civilization. Other types of material culture were used to maintain and create a Cherokee version of civilization.

A great deal of historical and anthropological scholarship has been published on the historic Cherokee (e.g., Gearing, 1962; King, 1979; McLoughlin, 1984, 1986; Mooney, 1900, 1975; Perdue, 1979, 1983, 1989). There is, however, little specific attention to New Echota as a place of importance in the Cherokee strategy for survival. But it is an essential place, especially for understanding the strategies of a culture that traditionally placed great emphasis on places in the landscape.

Because New Echota was occupied by the Cherokee only briefly (1826–1838), it provides a material environment focused on a period of great political and social importance in their history. The material culture of the capital embodies an attempt at the creation of a syncretic, Cherokee and White, civilization.

Summary

Conflicts in relations among Native, African, European, and Asian Americans began with first contacts and continued through the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and beyond. Capitalism's increasingly pervasive promises were being made: In return for market participation, cultural assimilation, and conformity were to be had individual liberty and a place in the new republic. But racism, nationalism, and ethnocentrism were used to deny the promise to Native Americans as well as to blacks and women. The native was a special sort of "other" in the New World but there was no room in the dominant ideology for another version of the promise; there was no place for what could be perceived as a distorted imitation or reflection of "us." Because cultural conformity could not be complete, capitalism's manifest destiny could not tolerate the challenge. In spite of a United States Supreme Court ruling in favor of the Cherokee maintaining title and possession of their lands, President Andrew Jackson ordered their removal. Nearly all of the Cherokee were forcibly removed to reservations in Oklahoma on the "Trail of Tears" from 1838 to 1839. Their land was distributed by lottery to white Georgians. For most Cherokee, ethnogenesis had to continue on foreign soil.

Using acculturation leading to assimilation as an explanatory process to measure cultural influence leads to an interpretation of the Cherokee as Native Americans trying to be "white" and "civilized" but not quite getting it — missing the point by retaining survivals from the prehistoric, Indian past. Instead, an approach that incorporates ideology, hegemony, and negotiation may reveal and create more satisfying interpretations that admit human agency as individuals and groups compete and attempt to "work the system to their minimum disadvantage" (Scott, 1985, p. xv).

Sider (1976) points out that there are two usual views of indigenous peoples' options in the face of colonizing powers. One is stagnation, wherein culture is statically preserved and people impoverished. The other is progress or economic development, with its attendant pressures for complete assimilation. The absence of ethnogenesis from these options, he writes, is a failing of capitalism. I suggest instead that the failure to recognize ethnogenesis as an option and a process is a direct result of failing to consider the dynamics of the contexts of capitalism in our analyses.

PROSPECT

Deagan (1982, p. 170) acknowledges a question about whether or not historical archaeology should concern itself with the "intellectual climate" that existed when sites were created. The question is still heard, but by now there should be little debate that intellectual climate in the form of social and political relationships, ideology, and worldview — in short, the whole of culture rather than decontextualized artifacts — is indeed the proper emphasis of historical archaeology. Increasing attention will be paid to the complex contexts illuminated by historical archaeology as cultural anthropology continues to recognize the need not only for historical context (e.g., Dening, 1988; Sahlins, 1981, 1985; Wolf, 1982), but also for material culture (e.g., Fowler, 1987; Reynolds and Stott, 1987).

Historical archaeology had long been practiced in the United States by the time the new archaeology discovered it and insisted on its incorporation into anthropological archaeology. Since the 1960s, and particularly since 1967, when the Society for Historical Archaeology was formed, historical archaeology has been growing. In spite of its incorporation into anthropological archaeology, its acceptance into the same has been lagging. Often poor cousin and handmaiden to prehistory, itself suffering reduced status under the anthropological parent discipline, historical archaeology repeatedly has been relegated to the role of providing cautionary tales, illustrations, and controlled laboratories for methods to be refined for use with the "real" data of prehistoric sites. Despite Deagan's (1982, p. 154)

optimism that ambivalence toward the legitimacy of historical archaeology has been resolved, the attitude may still be found that historical archaeology is something of a junior varsity where simple confirmation of historical "fact" is the main goal.

In 1982 Deagan (1982, p. 172) could reasonably write that "contemporary advances suggest that a distinct discipline is indeed emerging." There is indeed a discipline of historical archaeology; it has emerged as historical material anthropology. The crisis in the discipline that raged in the 1960s, over whether history or anthropology would be the appropriate parent discipline, is over. "In their approaches to the past there is often little difference today among studies in historical archaeology, cultural anthropology, and social history" (Deagan, 1988, p. 7). There are plenty of questions that count; there are methods being refined and developed to address them, and there is a strong sense of the contemporary context of archaeology and the scholarly responsibility that such a recognition demands. Given the promise and the productivity of the field, why is there still a crisis in historical archaeology? The current crisis is one of professional placement. Historical archaeology is interdisciplinary; it is interloper still. Its own disciplinary genesis as a social and historical endeavor, one useful to but not beholden to method seeking by prehistorians, is painfully under way.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES CITED

Abercrombie, N., Hill, S., and Turner, B. S. (1980). *The Dominant Ideology Thesis,* George Allen & Unwin, London.

Althusser, L. (1971). *Lenin and Philosophy,* Monthly Review Press, New York.

Appadurai, A. (1986). *The Social Life of Things, Commodities in Cultural Perspective.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Baker, S. G. (1970). New Echota Archaeology 1969, a Progress Report. Submitted to Georgia Historical Commission.

Barnett, S., and Silverman, M. G. (1979). *Ideology and Everyday Life, Anthropology, Neomarxist Thought and the Problem of Ideology and the Social Whole.* University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.

Beaudry, M. C. (1984). Archaeology and the historic household. *Man in the Northeast* 28: 27–38.

Beaudry, M. C. (ed.) (1988). *Documentary Archaeology in the New World,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Beaudry, M. C. (1989). The Lowell Boott Mills Complex and its housing: Material expressions of corporate ideology. *Historical Archaeology* 23(1): 19–33.

Beaudry, M. C., and Mrozowski, S. (1988). The archaeology of work and home life in Lowell, Massachusetts: An interdisciplinary study of the Boott Cotton Mills Corporation. *Industrial Archaeology* 19(2): 1–22.

Beaudry, M. C., and Mrozowski, S. (1989). *Interdisciplinary Investigations of the Boott Mills Lowell, Massachusetts. Vol. III. The Boarding House System as a Way of Life.* Cultural Resources Management Series 21, National Park Service, North Atlantic Regional Office, Boston.

Beaudry, M., Cook, L. J., and Mrozowski, S. A. (1991). Artifacts and active voices: Material culture as social discourse. In McGuire, R. H., and Paynter, R. (eds.), *The Archaeology of Inequality,* Basil Blackwell, Oxford, pp, 150–191.

Binford, L. R. (1977). Introduction. In Binford, L. R. (ed.), *For Theory Building in Archaeology,* Academic Press, New York.

Binford, L. R. (1981). *Bones: Ancient Men and Modern Myths,* Academic Press, New York.

Blakely, R. L. (ed.). (1988). *The King Site: Continuity and Contact in Sixteenth-Century Georgia,* University of Georgia Press, Athens.

Blakey, M. L. (1983). Socio-political bias and ideological production in historical archaeology. In Gero, J. M., Lacy, D. M., and Blakey, M. L. (eds.), *The Socio-Politics of Archaeology,* Research Reports No. 23, Department of Anthropology, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, pp. 5–16.

Boone, J. L., Myers, J. E., and Redman, C. L. (1990). Archeological and historical approaches to complex societies. *American Anthropologist* 92: 630–646.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinctions, a Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* (Nice, R., transl.), Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Brumfiel, E. M. (1992). Distinguished lecture in archeology: Breaking and entering the ecosystem — gender, class, and faction steal the show. *American Anthropologist* 94: 551–567.

Burley, D. V. (1989). Function, meaning and context: Ambiguities in ceramic use by the Hivernant Metis of the northwest plains. *Historical Archaeology* 23(1): 97–106.

Cleland, C. E. (1988). Questions of substance, questions that count. *Historical Archaeology* 22(1): 13–17.

Conkey, M. W., and J. M. Gero. (1991). Tensions, pluralities, and engendering archaeology: An introduction to women and prehistory. In Gero, J., and Conkey, M. W. (eds.), *Engendering Archaeology, Women and Prehistory,* Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 3–30.

Costello, J. G., and Maniery, M. L. (1988). Rice Bowls in the Delta: Artifacts Recovered from the 1915 Asian Community of Walnut Grove, California, *Occasional Paper 16,* UCLA Institute of Archaeology, Los Angeles.

Cotter, J. (ed.) (1984). *The Scope of Historical Archaeology,* Temple University Press, Philadelphia.

Cotter, J. L., Roberts, D. G., and Parrington, M. (1992). *The Buried Past, an Archaeological History of Philadelphia,* University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

Craven, W. (1986). *Colonial American Portraiture,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

DeBaillou, C. (1955). Excavations at New Echota in 1954. *Early Georgia* 1: 18–29.

Deagan, K. (1982). Avenues of inquiry in historical archaeology. In Schiffer, M. B. (ed.), *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory, Vol. 5,* Academic Press, New York, pp. 151–177.

Deagan, K. (1983). *Spanish St. Augustine, The Archaeology of a Colonial Creole Community,* Academic Press, New York.

Deagan, K. (1988). Neither history nor prehistory: The questions that count in historical archaeology. *Historical Archaeology* 22(1): 7–12.

Deetz, J. (1963). *Archaeological Investigations at La Purisima Mission,* UCLA Archaeological Survey Annual Report 1962–1963, pp. 163–208.

Deetz, J. (1977). *In Small Things Forgotten: The Archaeology of Early American Life,* Anchor Press/Doubleday, Garden City, NY.

Deetz, J. (1983). Scientific humanism and humanistic science: A plea for paradigmatic pluralism in historical archaeology. *Geoscience and Man* 23: 27–34.

Deetz, J. (1988a). History and archaeological theory: Walter Taylor revisited. *American Antiquity* 53: 13–22.

Deetz, J. (1988b). American historical archaeology: Method and results. *Science* 239: 362–367.

Dening, G. (1988). *History's Anthropology. the Death of William Gooch,* Special Publication of the Association for Social Anthropology in Oceania No. 2, University Press of America, Lanham, MD.

Diamond, S. (1974). *In Search of the Primitive, a Critique of Civilization,* Transaction Books, New Brunswick, NJ.

Dickens, R. (ed.) (1982). *Archaeology of Urban America: The Search for Pattern and Process,* Academic Press, New York.

Dobyns, H. (1983). *Their Number Become Thinned: Native American Population Dynamics in Eastern North America,* University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

Douglas, M., and Isherwood, B. (1979). *The World of Goods,* Basic Books, New York.

Dyson, S. L. (ed.) (1985). *Comparative Studies in the Archaeology of Colonialism,* BAR International Series 233, Oxford.

Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology, an Introduction,* Verso, New York.

Earle, T., and Preucel, R. (1987). Processual Archaeology and the Radical Critique. *Current Anthropology* 28: 501–527.

Eisenstein, E. (1983). *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Epperson, T. W. (1990). Race and discipline of the plantation. In Orser, C. E. (ed.), *Historical Archaeology on Southern Plantations and Farms, Historical Archaeology, Vol. 24,* No. 4, pp. 29–36.

Ewen, C. R. (1991). *From Spaniard to Creole, the Archaeology of Cultural Formation at Puerto Real, Haiti,* University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.

Falk, L. (ed.) (1991). *Historical Archaeology in Global Perspective,* Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Farnsworth, P. (1989). Native American acculturation in the Spanish Colonial Empire: The Franciscan missions of Alta California. In Champion, T. C. (ed.), *Centre and Periphery, Comparative Studies in Archaeology,* Unwin Hyman, London.

Farnsworth, P., and Williams, J. S. (eds.) (1992). The archaeology of the Spanish Colonial and Mexican Republican periods. *Historical Archaeology* 26: No. 1.

Faulkner, A., and Faulkner, G. (1987). *The French at Pentagoet 1625–1674: An Archaeological Portrait of the Acadian Frontier,* Maine Historic Preservation Commission, Augusta; New Brunswick Museum, St. Johns.

Feierman, S. (1990). *Peasant Intellectuals, Anthropology and History in Tanzania.* University of Wisconsin Press, Madison.

Felton, L., and Schulz, P. (1983). *The Diaz Collection: Material Culture and Social Change in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Monterey,* California Archaeological Reports No. 23, State of California Department of Parks and Recreation, Cultural Resource Unit, Sacramento.

Ferguson, L. G. (1992). *Uncommon Ground: Archaeology and Colonial African-America,* Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Fitzhugh, W. W. (ed.). (1985). *Cultures in Contact: The Impact of European Contacts on Native American Cultural Institutions. A.D. 1000–1800,* Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Fitzhugh, W. W., and Olin, J. S. (eds.) (1993). *Archaeology of the Frobisher Voyages,* Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Fowler, L. (1987). *Shared Symbols, Contested Meanings, Gros Ventre Culture and History, 1778–1984,* Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY.

Gathercole, P. (1984). A consideration of ideology. In Spriggs, M. (ed.), *Marxist Perspectives in Archaeology,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 149–154.

Gearing, F. (1962). *Priests and Warriors: Social Structures for Cherokee Politics in the 18th Century,* Memoir No. 93, American Anthropological Association, Menasha, WI.

Geier, C., and Winter, S. (eds.) (1994). *Look to the Earth: The Archaeology of the Civil War,* University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville (in press).

Geismar, J. H. (1982). *The Archaeology of Social Disintegration in Skunk Hollow,* Academic Press, New York.

Gibbon, G. (1989). *Explanation in Archaeology,* Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

Glassie, H. (1975). *Folk Housing in Middle Virginia,* University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

Gould, R. A., and Schiffer, M. B. (eds.) (1981). *Modern Material Culture: The Archaeology of Us,* Academic Press, New York.

Greenwood, J. (1985). *The Industrial Archaeology and Industrial History of Northern England, a Bibliography,* Open University, Cranfield.

Gums, B. L. (1988). *Archaeology at French Colonial Cahokia,* Studies in Illinois Archaeology No. 3, Illinois Historic Preservation Agency, Springfield.

Hall, M. (1992). Small things and the mobile, conflictual fusion of power, fear, and desire. In Yentsch, A. E., and Beaudry, M. C. (eds.), *Art and Mystery of Historical Archaeology: Essays in Honor of James Deetz,* CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, pp. 373–399.

Handsman, R. G. (1977). *The Bushkill Complex as an Anomaly: Unmasking the Ideology of American Archaeology,* Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, American University, Washington, DC, University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, MI.

Handsman, R. G. (1983). Historical archaeology and capitalism, subscriptions and separations: The production of individualism. *North American Archaeologist* 4(1): 63–79.

Hantman, J. (1990). Between Powhatan and Quirank: Reconstructing Monacan culture and history in the context of Jamestown. *American Anthropologist* 92: 676–690.

Hardesty, D. L. (1985). Evolution on the industrial frontier. In Green, S. W., and Perlman, S. M. (eds.), *The Archaeology of Frontiers and Boundaries,* Academic Press, Orlando, FL, pp. 213–230.

Hardesty, D. L. (1988). *The Archaeology of Mining and Miners: A View from the Silver State,* Special Publication No. 6, Society for Historical Archaeology, California, Pennsylvania.

Herman, B. L. (1984). Multiple materials, multiple meanings: The fortunes of Thomas Mendenhall. *Winterthur Portfolio* 19(1): 67–86.

Hodder, I. (1979). Economic and social stress and material culture patterning. *American Antiquity* 44: 446–454.

Hodder, I. (ed.) (1982a). *Symbolic and Structural Archaeology,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Hodder, I. (1982b). *Symbols in Action,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Hodder, I. (1985). Postprocessual archaeology. In Schiffer, M. B. (ed.), *Advances in Archaeological Methods and Theory, Vol. 8,* Academic Press, New York, pp. 1–26.

Hodder, I. (1986). *Reading the Past,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Hodder, I. (ed.) (1989). *The Meaning of Things, Material Culture and Symbolic Expressions,* Unwin Hyman, London.

Hodder, I. (1991). Interpretive archaeology and its role. *American Antiquity* 56: 7–18.

Honerkamp, N. (1988). Preface. Questions that count in historical archaeology. *Historical Archaeology* **22**(1): 5–6.

Hoover, R. L., and Costello, J. G. (eds.). (1985). *Excavations at Mission San Antonio, 1976–1978*, UCLA Institute of Archaeology No. 26, Los Angeles.

Howson, J. E. (1990). Social relations and material culture: A critique of the archaeology of plantation slavery. In Orser, C. E., Jr. (ed.), *Historical Archaeology on Southern Plantations and Farms, Historical Archaeology, Vol. 24*, No. 4, pp. 78–91.

Hudson, K. (1979). *World Industrial Archaeology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Ingersoll, D. W., Jr., and Bronitsky, G. (eds.) (1987). *Mirror and Metaphor: Material and Social Constructions of Reality*, University Press of America, Lanham, MD.

Isaac, R. (1982). *The Transformation of Virginia 1740–1790*. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.

Johnson, M. H. (1989). Conceptions of agency in archaeological interpretation. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* **8**: 189–211.

Keegan, W. F. (1992). *The People Who Discovered Columbus*, University Press of Florida, Gainesville.

Kelso, W. M. (1984). *Kingsmill Plantations 1619–1800: Archaeology of Country Life in Colonial Virginia*, Academic Press, New York.

Kelso, W., and Most, R. (eds.) (1990). *Earth Patterns: Essays in Landscape Archaeology*, University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville.

King, D. (ed.) (1979). *The Cherokee Indian Nation*, University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

Kryder-Reid, E. (1994). "As the Gardener, so is the garden": The archaeology of landscape as myth. In Shackel, P. A., and Little, B. J. (eds.), *The Historical Archaeology of the Chesapeake*, Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Lears, T. J. J. (1981). *No Place of Grace. Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture 1880–1920*. Pantheon Books, New York.

Leary, T. E. (1979). Industrial archaeology and industrial ecology. *Radical History Review* **21**: 171–182.

Leone, M. P. (1977). Foreword. In South, S. (ed.), *Research Strategies in Historical Archaeology*, Academic Press, New York, pp. xvii–xxi.

Leone, M. P. (1982). Some opinions about recovering mind. *American Antiquity* **47**: 742–760.

Leone, M. P. (1984). Interpreting ideology in historical archaeology: Using the rules of perspective in the William Paca Garden in Annapolis, Maryland. In Miller, D., and Tilley, C. (eds.), *Ideology, Power, and Prehistory*, Cambridge University Press, London, pp. 25–36.

Leone, M. P. (1988). The relationship between archaeological data and the documentary record: 18th-century gardens in Annapolis, Maryland. *Historical Archaeology* **22**(1): 29–35.

Leone, M. P., and Potter, P. B., Jr. (eds.) (1988a). *The Recovery of Meaning in Historical Archaeology in the Eastern United States*, Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Leone, M. P., and Potter, P. B., Jr. (1988b). Introduction: Issues in historical archaeology. In Leone, M. P., and Potter, P. B., Jr. (eds.), *The Recovery of Meaning in Historical Archaeology in the Eastern United States*, Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC, pp. 1–22.

Leone, M. P., and Shackel, P. A. (1987). Forks, clocks, and power. In Ingersoll, D. (ed.), *Mirror and Metaphor: Material and Social Constructions of Reality*, University Press of America, Lanham, MD, pp. 45–62.

Leone, M. P., Potter, P. B., Jr., and Shackel, P. A. (1987). Toward a critical archaeology. *Current Anthropology* **28**: 283–302.

Leone, M. P., Little, B. J., Warner, M. S., Potter, P. B., Jr., Shackel, P. A., Logan, G. C., Mullins, P. R., and Ernstein, J. A. (1994). The constituencies for an archaeology of African Americans in Annapolis, Maryland. In Singleton, T. (ed.), *"I Too Am America": Studies in African American Archaeology*, University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville (in press).

Lewis, K. (1984). *The American Frontier: An Archaeological Study of Settlement Pattern and Process*, Academic Press, New York.

Little, B. J. (1988). Craft and culture change in the eighteenth-century Chesapeake. In Leone, M. P., and Potter, P. B., Jr. (eds.), *The Recovery of Meaning*, Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC, pp. 263–292.

Little, B. (1992a). Text-Aided Archaeology. In Little, B. J. (ed.), *Text-Aided Archaeology*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, pp. 1–6.

Little, B. J. (ed.) (1992b). *Text-Aided Archaeology*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.

Little, B. J., and Shackel, P. A. (1989). Scales of historical anthropology: An archaeology of colonial Anglo-America. *Antiquity 63*: 495–509.

Little, B. J., and Shackel, P. A. (eds.) (1992). *Meanings and uses of material culture. Historical Archaeology* 26: No. 3.

Lubar, S., and Kingery, W. D. (eds.) (1993). *History from Things, Essays on Material Culture*, Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

McCracken, G. (1988). *Culture and Consumption, New Approaches to the Symbolic Character of Consumer Goods and Activities*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington.

McDaniel, J. M., and Russ, K. C. (eds.) (1984). *Historical Archaeology West of the Blue Ridge: A Regional Example from Rockbridge County*. The James G. Leyburn Papers in Anthropology, Vol. 1, Liberty Hall Press, Washington and Lee University, Lexington, VA.

McDonald, J. D., Zimmerman, L. J., McDonald, A. L., Tall Bull, W., and Rising Sun, T. (1991). The northern Cheyenne outbreak of 1879: Using oral history and archaeology as tools of resistance. In McGuire, R. H., and Paynter, R. (eds.), *The Archaeology of Inequality*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 64–78.

McGhee, R. (1984). Contact between native North Americans and the medieval Norse: A review of the Evidence. *American Antiquity 49*: 4–26.

McGinty, J. R. (1955). Symbols of a civilization that perished in its infancy. *Early Georgia* 1(4): 14–17.

McGuire, R. H. (1982). The study of ethnicity in historical archaeology. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 1: 159–178.

McGuire, R. H. (1988). Dialogues with the dead: Ideology and the cemetery. In Leone, M. P., and Potter, P. B., Jr. (eds.), *The Recovery of Meaning: Historical Archaeology in the Eastern United States*, Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC, pp. 435–480.

McGuire, R. H. (1991). Building power in the cultural landscape of Broome County, New York, 1880 to 1940. In McGuire, R. H., and Paynter, R. (eds.), *The Archaeology of Inequality*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 102–124.

McGuire, R. H., and Paynter, R. (eds.) (1991). *The Archaeology of Inequality*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

McKee, L., Hood, V. P., and Macpherson, S. (1992). Reinterpreting the construction history of the service area of the Hermitage Mansion. In Little, B. J. (ed.), *Text-Aided Archaeology*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, pp. 163–180.

McKendrick, N., Brewer, J., and Plumb, J. H. (1982). *The Birth of a Consumer Society: The Commercialization of the Eighteenth Century*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington.

McLoughlin, W. G. (1984). *Cherokees and Missionaries 1789–1839*, Yale University Press, New Haven.

McLoughlin, W. G. (1986). *Cherokee Renascence in the New Republic*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

Meltzer, D. J. (1981). Ideology and material culture. In Gould, R. A., and Schiffer, M. B. (eds.), *Modern Material Culture, the Archaeology of Us*, Academic Press, New York, pp. 113–125.

Miller, D., and Tilley, C. (1984). Ideology, power, and prehistory: An introduction. In Miller, D., and Tilley, C. (eds.), *Ideology, Power, and Prehistory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 1–15.

Miller, G. (1980). Classification and economic scaling of 19th-century ceramics. *Historical Archaeology* 14: 1–41.

Miller, G. (1991). A revised set of CC index values for classification and economic scaling of English ceramics from 1787 to 1880. *Historical Archaeology* 25(1): 1–25.

Miller, H. (1986). *Discovering Maryland's First City: A Summary Report on the 1981–1984 Archaeological Investigations in St. Mary's City Maryland*. St. Mary's City Archaeology Series No. 2, St. Mary's City, MD.

Mooney, J. (1900). *Myths of the Cherokee*. Bureau of American Ethnography, 19th Annual Report, 1897–1898, Washington, DC.

Mooney, J. (1975). *Historical Sketch of the Cherokee*, Aldine, Chicago.

Mrozowski, S. L. (1988). Historical archaeology as anthropology. *Historical Archaeology* 22(1): 18–24.

Neiman, F. D. (1978). Domestic architecture at the Clifts Plantation: The social context of early Virginia building. *Northern Neck of Virginia Historical Magazine* 28: 3096–3128. Reprinted in Upton, D., and Vlach, J. M. (eds.) (1986). *Common Places: Readings in American Vernacular Architecture*, University of Georgia Press, Athens, pp. 292–314.

Neuman, R. W. (ed.) (1983). Historical archaeology of the eastern United States: Papers from the R. J. Russell Symposium. *Geoscience and Man* 26.

Noël Hume, I. (1983). *Martin's Hundred,* Alfred A. Knopf, New York.

Noël Hume, I. (1964). Archaeology: Handmaiden to history. *The North Carolina Historical Review* 41(2): 215–225.

Orser, C. (1988a). *The Material Basis of the Postbellum Tenant Plantation: Historical Archaeology in the South Carolina Piedmont,* University of Georgia Press, Athens.

Orser, C. (1988). Toward a theory of power for historical archaeology: Plantation and space. In Leone, M. P., and Potter, P. B., Jr. (eds.), *The Recovery of Meaning: Historical Archaeology in the Eastern United States,* Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC, pp. 313–343.

Orser, C. (1989). On plantations and patterns. *Historical Archaeology* 23(2): 28–40.

Orser, C. (1990a). Archaeological approaches to New World plantation slavery. In Schiffer, M. B. (ed.), *Archaeological Method and Theory, Vol. 2,* University of Arizona Press, Tucson, pp. 111–154.

Orser, C. (ed.) (1990b). Historical archaeology on southern plantations and farms. *Historical Archaeology* 24: No. 4.

Otto, J. S. (1984). *Cannon's Point plantation 1794–1860: Living conditions and status patterns in the Old South,* Academic Press, Orlando, FL.

Pastron, A. G., and Hattori, E. M. (eds.) (1990). *The Hoff Store Site and Gold Rush Merchandise from San Francisco, California.* Special Publication No. 7, Society for Historical Archaeology, California, Pennsylvania.

Patterson, T. C. (1999a). History and the post-processual archaeologies. *Man* 24: 555–566.

Patterson, T. C. (1990b). Some theoretical tensions within and between the processual and postprocessual archaeologies. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 9: 189–200.

Paynter, R. (1982). *Models of Spatial Inequality: Settlement Patterns in Historical Archaeology,* Academic Press, New York.

Paynter, R. (1985). Surplus Flow between Frontiers and Homelands. In Green, S. W. and Perlman, S. M. (eds.), *The Archaeology of Frontiers and Boundaries,* Academic Press, Orlando, FL. pp. 163–211.

Paynter, R. (1988). Steps to an archaeology of capitalism. In Leone, M. P., and Potter, P. B., Jr. (eds.), *The Recovery of Meaning: Historical Archaeology in the Eastern United States,* Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC, pp. 407–433.

Paynter, R. (1989). The archaeology of equality and inequality. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 18: 369–399.

Paynter, R., and McGuire, R. H. (1991). The archaeology of inequality: Material culture, domination and resistance. In McGuire, R. H., and Paynter, R. (eds.), *The Archaeology of Inequality,* Basil Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 1–27.

Perdue, T. (1979). *Slavery and the Evolution of Cherokee Society 1540–1866.* University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

Perdue, T. (ed.) (1983). *Cherokee Editor, the Writings of Elias Boudinot,* University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

Perdue, T. (1989). *The Cherokee,* Chelsea House, New York.

Persico, V. R., Jr. (1979). Early nineteenth-century Cherokee political organization. In King, D. H. (ed.), *The Cherokee Indian Nation,* University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville., pp. 92–109.

Pillsbury, R. (1983). The Europeanization of the Cherokee settlement landscape prior to removal: A Georgia case study. *Geoscience and Man* 23: 59–69.

Posnansky, M., and Decorse, C. R. (1986). Historical archaeology in sub-Saharan Africa — A review. *Historical Archaeology* 20(1): 1–14.

Potter, P. B., Jr. (1992). Middle-range theory, ceramics, and capitalism in 19th-century Rockbridge County, Virginia. In Little, B. J. (ed.), *Text-Aided Archaeology*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, pp. 9–24.

Potter, S. R. (1993). *Commoners, Tribute, and Chiefs; the Development of Algonquian Culture in the Potomac Valley*, University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville.

Preucel, R. W. (ed.) (1991). *Processual and Postprocessual Archaeologies; Multiple Ways of Knowing the Past*, Occasional Paper No. 10, Center for Archaeological Investigations, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.

Ramenofsky, A. (1987). *Vectors of Death: The Archaeology of European Contact*, University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

Rapp, W. F., and Beranek, S. K. (1984). *The Industrial Archaeology of Nebraska*, J-B, Crete, NE.

Rathje, W. L. (1979). Modern material culture studies. In Schiffer, M. B. (ed.), *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory, Vol. 2*, Academic Press, New York, pp. 1–29.

Redman, C. L. (1986). *Qsar es-Seghir, An Archaeological View of Medieval Life*, Academic Press, New York.

Reitz, E. J., and Scarry, M. (1985). *Reconstructing Historic Subsistence with an Example from Sixteenth-Century Spanish Florida*, Special Publication, No. 3, Society for Historical Archaeology, California, PA.

Reynolds, B., and Stott, M. A. (eds.) (1987). *Material Anthropology, Contemporary Approaches to Material Culture*, University Press of America, Lanham, MD.

Rogers, J.. D. (1990). *Objects of Change: The Archaeology and History of Arikara Contact with Europeans*, Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Rogers, J. D., and Wilson, S. M. (1993). *Ethnohistory and Archaeology, Approaches to Postcontact Change in the Americas*, Plenum, New York.

Ronda, J. P., and Axtell, J. (1978). *Indian Missions, a Critical Bibliography*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington.

Rothschild, N. A. (1990). *New York City Neighborhoods, the 18th Century*, Academic Press, New York.

Sahlins, M. (1981). *Historical Metaphors and Mythical Realities*, Special Publication of the Association for Social Anthropology in Oceania No. 1, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.

Sahlins, M. (1985). *Islands of History*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Sande, T. A. (1976). *Industrial Archaeology: A New Look at the American Heritage*, S. Greene Press, Brattleboro, VT.

Schama, S. (1987). *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age*, Alfred Knopf, New York.

Schiffer, M. B. (1976). *Behavioral Archaeology*, Academic Press, New York

Schiffer, M. B. (1988). The structure of archaeological theory. *American Antiquity* 53: 461–485.

Schiffer, M. B. (1991). *The Portable Radio in American life*, University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Schlereth, T. J. (ed.) (1985). *Material Culture, a Research Guide*, University Press of Kansas, Lawrence.

Schmidt, P. (1977). *Historical Archaeology: A Structural Approach in African Culture*, Greenwood Press, Westport, CT.

Schrire, C., and Merwick, D. (1991). Dutch-indigenous relations in New Netherland and the Cape in the seventeenth century. In Falk, L. (ed.), *Historical Archaeology in Global Perspective*, Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC, pp. 11–20.

Schuyler, R. L. (1970). Historical and historic sites archaeology as anthropology: Basic definitions and relationships. *Historical Archaeology* 4: 83–89.

Schuyler, R. L. (1976). Images of America: The contribution of historical archaeology to national identity. *Southwestern Lore* 42(4): 27–39.

Schuyler, R. L. (ed.) (1982). Urban Archaeology in America. *North American Archaeologist* 3(3), Baywood, Farmingdale, NY.

Schuyler, R. L. (1988). Archaeological remains, documents, and anthropology: A call for a new culture history. *Historical Archaeology* 22(1): 36–42.

Scott, D. D., and Fox, R. A., Jr. (1987). *Archaeological Insights into the Custer Battle, an Assessment of the 1984 Field Season*, University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.

Scott, D. D., Fox, R. A., Jr., Conner, M. A., and Harmon, D. (1989). *Archaeological Perspectives on the Battle of the Little Bighorn*, University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.

Scott, J. C. (1985). *Weapons of the Weak, the Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.

Scott, P. E., and Deetz, J. (1990). Building, furnishings and social change in early Victorian Grahamstown. *Social Dynamics* 16(1): 76–89.

Seifert, D. J. (ed.) (1991). Gender in historical archaeology. *Historical Archaeology* 25: No. 4.

Self, R. D. (1955). Chronology of New Echota. *Early Georgia* 1(4): 3–5.

Shackel, P. A. (1993a). *A Historical Archaeology of Personal Discipline and Material Culture in the Chesapeake*, University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

Shackel, P. A. (ed.) (1993b). *Interdisciplinary Investigations of Domestic Life in Government Block B: Perspectives on Harpers Ferry's Armory and Commercial District*, National Park Service, National Capital Region, Occasional Report No. 6.

Shackel, P. A., and Little, B. J. (1992). Post-processual approaches to meanings and uses of material culture in historical archaeology. In Little, B. J., and Shackel, P. A. (eds.), *Meanings and Uses of Material Culture, Historical Archaeology, Vol. 26*, No. 3, pp. 5–11.

Shackel, P. A., and Little, B. J. (eds.) (1994). *The Historical Archaeology of the Chesapeake*, Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Shanks, M., and Tilley, C. (1987). *Re-Constructing Archaeology Theory and Practice*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Sichone, O. B. (1989). The development of an urban working-class culture on the Rhodesian Copperbelt. In Miller, D., Rowlands, M., and Tilley, C. (eds.), *Domination and Resistance*, Unwin Hyman, London, pp. 290–298.

Sider, G. M. (1976). Lumbee Indian cultural nationalism and ethnogenesis. *Dialectical Anthropology* 1: 161–172.

Singleton, T. (ed.) (1985). *The Archaeology of Slavery and Plantation Life*, Academic Press, New York.

Singleton, T. (1994). *"I Too Am America": Studies in African American Archaeology*, University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville (in press).

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

Smith, S. D. (1976). *An Archaeological and Historical Assessment of the First Hermitage*, Research Series No. 2, Tennessee Department of Conservation, Division of Archaeology.

South, S. (1977a). *Method and Theory in Historical Archaeology*, Academic Press, New York.

South, S. (ed.) (1977b). *Research Strategies in Historical Archeology*, Academic Press, New York.

South, S. (1988a). Santa Elena: Threshold of Conquest. In Leone, M. P., and Potter, P. B., Jr. (eds.), *The Recovery of Meaning: Historical Archaeology in the Eastern United States*, Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC, pp. 27–72.

South, S. (1988b). Whither pattern? *Historical Archaeology* 22(1): 25–28.

Spencer-Wood, S. (ed.) (1987). *Consumer Choice in Historical Archaeology*, Plenum Press, New York.

Spencer-Wood, S. (1991). Toward an historical archaeology of materialist domestic reform. In McGuire, R. H., and Paynter, R. (eds.), *The Archaeology of Inequality*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 231–286.

Staski, E. (ed.) (1987). *Living in Cities: Current Research in Urban Archaeology*, Special Publication No. 5, Society for Historical Archaeology, California, Pennsylvania.

Staski, E. (1990). Studies of ethnicity in North American historical archaeology. *North American Archaeologist* 11(2): 121–145.

Stevenson, M. G. (1982). Toward and understanding of site abandonment behavior: Evidence from historic mining camps in the southwest Yukon. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 1: 236–265.

St. George, R. B. (ed.) (1988). *Material Life in America, 1600–1860,* Northeastern University Press, Boston.

Stilgoe, J. R. (1982). *Common Landscapes of America, 1580 to 1845,* Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.

Stone, G., and Ottusch-Kianka, D. (eds.) (1987). *The Historical Archaeology of Long Island, Vol. VII, Part I. The Sites,* Suffolk County Archaeological Association and Nassau County Archaeological Committee, Stony Brook, NY.

Thomas, D. H. (ed.) (1989). *Columbian Consequences, Vol. 1. Archaeological and Historical Perspectives on the Spanish Borderlands West,* Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Thomas, D. H. (ed.) (1990). *Columbian Consequences, Vol. 2. Archaeological and Historical Perspectives on the Spanish Borderlands East,* Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Thomas, D. H. (ed.) (1991). *Columbian Consequences, Vol. 3. The Spanish Borderlands in Pan-American Perspective,* Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Tilley, C. (ed.) (1990). *Reading Material Culture,* Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

Trigger, B. G. (1985). *Natives and Newcomers, Canada's "Heroic Age" Reconsidered,* McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal.

Upton, D. (1986). *Holy Things and Profane: Anglican Parish Churches in Colonial Virginia,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Upton, D., and Vlach, J. M. (eds.) (1986). *Common Places, Readings in American Vernacular Architecture,* University of Georgia Press, Athens.

Vance, M. (1984). *Monographs on Industrial Archaeology,* Bibliography A1286, Vance Bibliographies, Architecture Series, Monticello, IL.

Verano, J. W., and Ubelaker, D. H. (eds.) (1992). *Disease and Demography in the Americas,* Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Walde, D., and Willows, N. D. (eds.) (1991). *The Archaeology of Gender,* Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Chacmool Conference, Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary, Calgary.

Wallace, A. F. C. (1970). *Culture and Personality,* Random House, New York.

Walthall, J. A. (ed.) (1990). *French Colonial Archaeology of the Illinois Country,* University of Illinois Press, Urbana.

Walthall, J. A., and Emerson, T. E. (eds.) (1992). *Calumet and Fleur-de-Lys; Archaeology of the Indian and French Contact in the Midcontinent,* Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Ward, A. E. (ed.) (1983). *Forgotten Places and Things, Archaeological Perspectives on American History,* Center for Anthropological Studies, Albuquerque, NM.

Watson, P. J., and Fotiadis, M. (1990). The razor's edge: Symbolic-structuralist archeology and the expansion of archeological inference. *American Anthropologist* 92: 613–629.

Watson, R. A. (1990). Ozymandias, King of Kings: Postprocessual radical archaeology as critique. *American Antiquity* 55: 673–689.

Wegars, P. (ed.) (1993). *Hidden Heritage, Historical Archaeology of the Overseas Chinese,* Baywood, Amityville, NY.

Wilms, D. (1974). *Cherokee Indian Land Use in Georgia 1800–1888.* Ph.D. dissertation. University of Georgia, Athens.

Wilson, J. H., Jr. (ed.) (1985). *Current Research in the Historical Archaeology of the Carolinas,* Chicora Foundation Research Series No. 4, Columbia, SC.

Winer, M., and Deetz, J. (1990). The transformation of British culture in the eastern Cape, 1820–1860. *Social Dynamics* 16(1): 55–75.

Wobst, H. M. (1977). Stylistic behavior and information exchange. In Cleland, C. E. (ed.), *For the Director: Research Essays in Honor of James B. Griffin,* Museum of Anthropology Publication 61, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Wolf, E. (1982). *Europe and the People Without History,* University of California Press, Berkeley.

Wolf, E. (1990). Distinguished Lecture: Facing power — Old insights, new questions. *American Anthropologist* 92: 586–596.

Wood, P., Waselkov, G. A., and Hantley, T. (eds.) (1989). *Powhatan's Mantle: Indians in the Colonial Southeast,* University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.

Yentsch, A. (ed.) (1987). Humanism and revisionism in historical archaeology. *American Archaeology* **6**: No. 1.

Yentsch, A. (1991a). Engendering visible and invisible ceramic artifacts, especially dairy vessels. *Historical Archaeology* 25(4): 132–155.

Yentsch, A. (1991b). The symbolic divisions of pottery: Sex-related attributes of English and Anglo-American household pots. In McGuire, R. H., and Paynter, R. (eds.), *The Archaeology of Inequality,* Basil Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 192–230.

Yentsch, A. E., and Beaudry, M. C. (eds.) (1992). *Art and Mystery of Historical Archaeology: Essays in Honor of James Deetz,* CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.

Young, B. K. (1992). Text aided or text misled? Reflections on the uses of archaeology in medieval history. In Little, B. J. (ed.), *Text-Aided Archaeology,* CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, pp. 135–150.