

ter of the United States itself. The Declaration of Independence contains a statement of the "rights of man" from which it excludes the "merciless Indian savages" among whom might be the Sicangu Lakota. Another of the origins is the further exclusion of "the natives, who were heathens" as aliens from American humanity by Chief Justice John Marshall (p. 12).

Then, the U.S. Congress excluded "Indians not taxed" from citizenship, when it gave citizenship to former slaves, and then, the Supreme Court of the United States kept individual Indians from citizenship, even if they had dropped their tribal affiliation (Ibid.). This was the case notwithstanding having ruled, Indian Nations were not real nations, but "denominated domestic dependent nations" (p. 13). To Canadians this may sound familiar. It is similar to the views expressed by Premier Gordon Campbell, of British Columbia, regarding First Nations of the Province and their Treaties.

These exclusions are crucial. Not because of the obvious bigotry of the law, but the making of "Indians" into "others" then giving the "others" the choice between extinction or assimilation; no choice at all. In the real world of the Lakota excluding them as people or trying to obliterate them makes the indeterminate legal outcomes of Indian law into zero-sum games or outcomes: somebody, Indian or White, has to lose (p. 198). These outcomes or potential ones make neighbors into the deadliest enemies of the title. That is an origin of the violence in the race relations between Whitemen and the Sioux. There are several more origins.

In the chapters, about Indian-White relations, and the conclusion, Biolsi points out that the historic legal battle for rights, respect, and even sovereignty has defined a very "narrow range of rights-claims that are actionable" (p. 181). This means that the centuries of abuse and humiliation borne by the Lakota (or other First Nations, elsewhere) are heaped on to each legal action taken to define or determine jurisdictions, responsibilities, and liabilities under or within Indian law (p. 203). This intensifies the importance of these actions and their zero-sum outcomes.

A major point made by the book is that the historic processes of colonization and domination of the many North American Indian Peoples has at the same time privileged anthropologists and others as "Whitemen." Furthermore, the innocence or objectivity which the anthropologists and judges claim in their ethnological and legal discourse, "...is both a produced cultural fiction and a valuable political and legal status" (p. 206). Anthropology has a history, too, and in this history lie questions about our collective and individual relations with the First Nations whose recent history of Aboriginal rights claims have been influenced, in part, by the same history. The privilege which the Whiteman has is starkly exemplified by how and where the Lakota must claim their own independent humanity. They must do so in the Whiteman's court rooms or legislatures, in the Whiteman's language (s) and protocols.

The differences between Canadian and American law and practice are significant, but the basic Crown (human) versus Indian (who is other-than-human or not-quite-human) is the Canadian version of the U.S. Declaration of Independence mythology. Canadian anthropologists, jurists, and others must read this book. It ties historic myth, theory, and legal precedent to the day to day lives, discourse and battles of the contemporary First Nations of the New World.

Thomas C. Patterson, *A Social History of Anthropology in the United States*, Oxford: Berg, 2001, x + 212 pages.

Reviewer: *Robert L.A. Hancock*
University of Victoria

Since 2000, a number of significant books dealing with the history of anthropology in North America have been published. Among the most notable are Susan Trencher's *Mirrored Images: American Anthropology and American Culture, 1960-1980*, a major survey of the development of what she terms "fieldworker ethnographies" in the latter half of the twentieth century, and Regna Darnell's *Invisible Genealogies: A History of Americanist Anthropology*, a comprehensive examination of the development and refinement of the Boasian theoretical paradigm. With his new book, *A Social History of Anthropology in the United States*, Thomas Patterson has added yet another perspective to this literature.

Patterson's book arose out of a dissatisfaction with available histories of anthropology. In his opinion, the existing literature "did not refer to the social and political contexts in which anthropology was born and nurtured in the United States, and they certainly did not address how anthropologists as active agents fit into and helped to shape these contexts" (ix). He has three objectives: to examine the ways in which the civil-rights and anti-colonial movements, as well as European social theorists and critics, influenced American anthropology; to bring to the fore anthropologists on the left of the political spectrum whose contributions to the discipline had been downplayed by repression in the inter-war and Cold War eras; and to highlight the dialectical nature of anthropological knowledge production, that is, to show that the discipline "is shaped by what the world is and who the anthropologists and the diverse peoples they study are" (x). He explicitly characterises his book as a corrective to previous internalist approaches which did not examine the history of American anthropology in the context of American society.

Treating the topic chronologically, Patterson divides his book into five chapters. The first, "Anthropology in the New Republic, 1776-1879," examines the preprofessional period of American anthropology, from the founding of the Republic to the work of Lewis Henry Morgan. He draws connections between debates in Britain and the United States, focussing

on anti-slavery movements. Relying largely on secondary sources, Patterson emphasises the role of territorial expansion in the development of anthropological thought in the United States, and in the parallel rise of scientific racism.

In his second chapter, "Anthropology in the Liberal Age, 1879-1929," Patterson examines the founding of the Bureau of Ethnology (later the Bureau of American Ethnology) and the professionalisation of the discipline. The expansion of the discipline, reflected in the growth of academic departments, the re-organisation of *American Anthropologist*, and the founding of the American Anthropological Association, occurred during a period of widespread racial intolerance of American Indians, Jews, and African-Americans. Patterson discusses Franz Boas in this context, focussing on his anti-racist work, his arguments against evolutionism, and his work with African-American intellectuals. Only brief mention is made of Boas's political work in a public setting—an aside on Boas's defence of the Kwakwaka'wakw potlatch neglects to mention that it was the *Canadian* government he petitioned. Interestingly, in his discussion of Boas's censure by the AAA in 1919, Patterson does not mention the anti-Semitism of the Washington group which opposed Boas. Instead, he discusses the anti-Semitism of marginal characters, such as Madison Grant.

Patterson's third chapter, "Anthropology and the Search for Social Order, 1929-1945," covers an era of increasing politicisation of American anthropology. Here he focuses on prominent anthropologists, including Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict, who undertook major government research projects; ironically, many of the anthropologists chosen for these projects were students of Boas, the man who had been censured for his "disloyalty" during the First World War. As well, the growth of philanthropic funding for anthropological research during the Depression led to an emphasis on inter-disciplinarity which carried through the war years.

The period shaped by the Cold War and decolonisation movements is the subject of Patterson's fourth chapter, "Anthropology in the Postwar Era, 1945-1973." He highlights the massive influx of students, a result of the GI Bill, and the resultant shift in the locus of development back to universities from the government, though the government still dictated the areas of research. The growth of the discipline caused a certain amount of consternation in the academe, and a committee under the leadership of Julian Steward sought to reshape the AAA, advocating closer ties with government and other professional groups. One outcome of this new development was the growth of area studies, with the Ford Foundation initiating a training program for area specialists suitable for government service. This politicization was one-sided, however; Patterson notes that the AAA offered little or no support to those Fellows or Members called before the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Patterson's fifth and final chapter, "Anthropology in the Neoliberal Era, 1974-2000," characterises this period as having been marked by a fracturing of the discipline. Leading to

this rupture was a number of factors: the contraction of employment opportunities in universities, which led to an increase in the number of anthropologists working outside the academe; the attempts to reorganize the AAA to make it more inclusive, but which actually created divisions amongst the various interest groups; and the rise of postmodernist approaches, which privileged ethnography at the expense of the other subfields. However, this section also shows the limitation of his approach: by emphasising the influence of outside approaches on anthropology, Patterson underplays the links between generations of anthropologists, such as that between the interpretivist approach of Geertz and the post-modernism of Rabinow, Clifford, and Marcus.

There are numerous weaknesses in this work. Given his explicitly political orientation, Patterson's discussion of the highly charged eras is strangely anodyne. Failing to analyze them in any depth, he instead focusses on the development of area specialisations, the anthropological critique of modernisation theory, and the role of anthropology in introducing and valorizing other world views in an American context. An explicit examination of the political views of the main figures, and of the impact of these views on theoretical developments, would have been a more fruitful approach. While Patterson does this for the Marxist scholars, he does not expose the politics of the conservatives. After all, the Marxists were reacting to forces within the discipline as well as to changes in the "real world," and conservative politics were part of the social context of the time. Additionally, as a historian of anthropology I am dismayed by the fact that Patterson does not take into account other approaches to the history of the discipline. His desire to improve upon previous internalist studies of the discipline has led him to neglect much of the previous work on the history of anthropology, weakening his analysis. He has moved too far from the internalist approach he disparages to offer an effective analysis of the development of American anthropology.

While this work, as a general survey, makes an important contribution to the historiography of American anthropology, it needs to be supplemented by more detailed works such as those by Trencher and Darnell. Patterson has done an admirable job of linking innovations in anthropological theory to developments outside the discipline, but his description of the growth of anthropology as a discipline over time is somewhat thin. Overall, however, his new book offers an interesting perspective on the history of anthropology in North America.