born of prejudice and propaganda whipped up by "those with hidden agendas" (p. 255).

Brugge's final chapter also presents some astonishing comments about bias on the part of some outside partisans; analogies between the relocation of the Navajo and "the destruction of Carthage, the rampage of the First Crusade, the Inquisition, and the Holocaust" (p. 256); and a lament for the historically uninformed failure of "a handful of liberal Ph.D.'s in the 30–40-year-old range" to spot elements of Nazism in the dispute. Brugge ends by asking if ethnic bias is not "inherent" in our species. I respond with the hope that ethnic bias is cultural, not biological, and that historical and economic conditions will not be mistaken for some postulated postern of the human psyche through which nebulas of ethnocentrism, racism, and hate will inevitably leak to infect and cloud every human attempt to solve complex social and political problems.

Richard O. Clemmer
University of Denver

Navajo Multi-Household Social Units: Archaeology on Black Mesa, Arizona. By Thomas R. Rocek. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1995. 237 pages. $50.00 cloth.

For many years it has been a common joke on the Navajo Reservation that the basic family unit consists of a man, a woman, their children, and an anthropologist. Now it seems we must include an enthno-archaeologist in that group as well. Whenever two Navajo people squat down under a tree for a chat, it immediately precipitates a quarrel about whether they are a family, a household, a kin group or an "outfit." To this mix, Rocek has added the multi-household unit.

Rocek's book is an anthropological report, a study about social organization among the Navajo people living in a remote section of northeast Arizona known as Black Mesa. The author has focused on what he calls small and medium-size social units, the multi-household. These include people who live in a particular locality and who know and interact with each other in various ways, but who are not necessarily all kin related.

According to the author, there were two goals to this study, one descriptive, the other analytical. His first intent was to describe,

through the use of archaeological, anthropological, and historical information, how these multi-household units formed and changed during the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century when the Black Mesa Navajo were increasingly coming into contact with the impinging white American world.

Rocek's second goal was to analyze the economic and demographic factors that affected the origination and the structure of these middle-level units. He proposes that these groups emerge and disappear in response to broader changes occurring in the larger society. This, then, is a study of historic change in social organization as revealed primarily through the archaeological investigation of settlement patterns.

The book consists of an introduction, nine chapters totaling 151 pages, and two appendices in an additional 43 pages, for a total of 237 pages. Although it is called an introduction, the first section runs to 13 pages and includes not only a lengthy discourse on the types of groups that anthropologists study but a descriptive statement about the goals of this study as well.

Rocek begins by examining the Black Mesa Navajo and the particular environmental and historic factors affecting them within the general context of the recent experience of the Navajo people. It follows with a review of Navajo social organization, emphasizing the constant changes and adjustments the Navajo have made in response to shifting environmental and historic forces. A particularly valuable inclusion in this section is table 3, which summarizes in fourteen pages an exhaustive series of definitions of Navajo social units derived from such major authorities as Kimball, Kluckhohn, Levy, Downs, Adams, Aberle, and Lamphere, among others.

The heart of the book consists of an analysis of the spatial distribution of Navajo multi-household units found on Black Mesa, using the archaeological data resulting from field work conducted in the six study areas. The following thirty-six pages examine the difficulties of measuring sociocultural change using the archaeological data recovered from this survey and leads to a discussion of cultural change on Black Mesa during the century-and-a-half comprising the study period. The final section extends the reach of the book by comparing the results of the Black Mesa survey with findings from similar studies made around the world.

Like most books, this study has good and bad features. The author has taken on a challenging task: to make an esoteric and

narrow topic interesting and productive. It was made even more difficult by the fact that he ventured into a well-plowed field where the general issues have not only been repeatedly addressed but are fairly well defined in the relevant literature. What, then, does Rocek bring to this discussion that is new or insightful?

One of the more important things this book does is to reiterate the value of a closer working relationship between the subfields of anthropology in producing a holistic understanding of a particular problem. Field studies of this type are invaluable in offsetting the overspecialization and artificial divisions that have sprung up within anthropology, with the consequent disregard for the unifying principles that define anthropology. A second important feature is the bringing together in one easily comparable chart of the various definitions of Navajo social units as developed by the many scholars who have taken an interest in this topic. A third value is the emphasis on spatial distribution studies as a complement to the overreliance on artifactual data in the reconstruction of an archaeological history. Fourth is the recognition and emphasis on pragmatic factors as influences on social organizational change. Too often, studies of social structure proceed as if the society were living in an environmental and historical vacuum. The final distinguishing feature of Rocek's book is the ordered presentation of new data containing concrete figures rather than vague guesses and estimates. This enables close and detailed analysis and, equally important, a replication of the analysis.

However, the book also has problems. An immediate jar was the author's disputable statement on page 2 that anthropologists study groups of people. Anthropologists do not study groups of people. They study human behavior, primarily cultural behavior, as performed by individuals operating with systems of shared behavioral instructions expressed through language, artifacts, ruins, biology, social organization, or physical, emotional, and mental activity. It is this type of loose statement that misleads and confuses both anthropologists and others trying to understand what anthropologists do.

The author's focus is on multi-household social units, but the book creates an uneasy feeling that these units are an artificial construct, an artifact of the research need to establish boundaries; Rocek seems to ignore the difference between the study group's internal recognition of its social structure and an externally imposed classification system.

This leads to a third difficulty, the statement of the problem. Rocek phrases the first proposition on page 10 as follows: Increasing population density results in competition and decreased interresident cooperation. But it might have been better to state the proposition in a more precise and answerable form, such as, Does increased population density result in increased competition and decreased cooperation? Or, for the second proposition, Does increased pastoral activity encourage short-term economic cooperation but not the creation of more permanent social units? When the problem is stated this way, it is possible not only to give a precise "yes" or "no" answer rather than some vague, compromising response, but also to see the critical elements of the problem more sharply. However, this exposes a possible weakness in the first problem statement: the confusion of variables. The assertion that increased population leads to increased competition and decreased cooperation (wouldn't it follow automatically that if there is increased competition, there would be less cooperation?) is based on the assumption that these are the critical variables. But, in fact, the causative variable would seem to be the unstated environmental factors of water availability, pasturage, and wood fuel. These are the significant determinates of population density in this region, for changes in these factors directly influence the carrying ability of an area. And if population begins to exceed the carrying ability of the area, the result very likely will be increased competition for resources between members of the affected group.

There are still other problems. The inability of this work to produce reasonably definitive answers is troublesome. For example, on page 12 Rocek summarizes a major premise of this study by stating that social relations may be recognized through an archaeological analysis of spatial patterns. But he immediately follows with the disclaimer that this facet of the study was inconclusive, because the range of conditions and social arrangements represented in the ethnographic sample was limited. Later, referring to chapter 7, the author again notes that the results of the archaeological study were not conclusive because of the lack of ethnohistorical data to support the archaeological interpretations. If the findings are inconclusive, what is left?

Despite these shortcomings, I must be emphasize that any research project as complex and fraught with data limitations as this investigation was, is bound to leave questions and much second-guessing. It is important to set these aside and welcome

the contributions made by the new data, the consolidation of information into a single source, the identification of holes in the historic record, the focus on ethno-archaeological cooperation, and the construction of models for guiding future research. These all help move Southwest anthropological research another step forward.

Charles C. Case

Partial Recall. Edited by Lucy R. Lippard, with essays on photographs of Native North Americans. New York: The New Press, 1992. 199 pages. $19.95 paper.

A compilation of articles by Native American scholars, educators, artists, writers, and photographers, this is a unique book, a must for all those who are interested in photographs of or by Indians. The subject matter tackles the vagaries of interpretation of both historical and contemporary Native American photographs.

The book begins with a preface by Leslie Marmon Silko, who distinguishes among the many types of photographers. She writes, "There is a difference between Joseph Mora's [an artist/photographer who was in Hopi and Navajo country between 1901 and 1906 and whose collection of negatives, notably of dance sequences, is owned by Northern Arizona University, Cline Library, Flagstaff] intricate depictions and photographs by *voyeurs/vampires* like [Edward S.] Curtis, [Heinrich R.] Voth and [Adam C.] Vroman" (emphasis mine). Perhaps this is a bit heavy-handed; there were many different motivations for photographing Native Americans, and while some were clearly exploitative, most were documentary and aesthetic in nature.

The introduction by editor Lucy R. Lippard states the importance of this book as a collaborative effort with Native Americans. She believes that looking at photographs is best considered a process of imagination (p. 18) and that if context is all-important for that imagination, it is out of reach in many cases (p. 20). I do not agree with this; I believe that looking at photos is more a process of interpreting the evidence. Much information can be found by in-depth research on these historical photographs. Details concerning the photographers, subjects, and viewers' responses can be regained, but the process takes considerable sleuthing. Lippard also makes the point that photography by Native Americans has