

EDITOR'S CORNER

THIS ISSUE is the first number to appear under my editorship. I hope to continue the general editorial policies initiated by my predecessors, although there will be certain changes initiated during my 3-year term as editor. Some of the technical changes in type face and page make-up can be seen in this issue. Other changes will emerge in coming issues. In particular, it is the Society's hope that the hiring of a professional as Assistant Editor will improve the stylistic and grammatical quality of articles (Lynne Sweeney is currently filling this position). I also will aggressively attempt to solicit articles on what I perceive are major trends in the discipline.

Basically, my goal is to keep *American Antiquity* in the mainstream of archaeological thinking and make its articles relevant to a broad spectrum of archaeologists. I very much hope to avoid the fragmentation that has plagued other general anthropological journals. Although the discipline of archaeology is becoming increasingly specialized, I believe that *American Antiquity* should not fall prey to this specialization. Each issue of the journal should contain a sufficient number of articles, reports, and reviews so that all American archaeologists, no matter what their geographic interests, technical specialties, or theoretical inclinations, will be able to spend many hours poring over the issue instead of merely glancing at one report or review and tossing the journal into their bookshelves. Readers should be able to clearly judge my success or failure in reaching this goal after several issues have appeared.

I also plan to continue the *Editor's Corner* in coming numbers and will use the space to comment on the contents of each issue as well as on trends represented by the published articles. In addition, there will be a *Current Affairs* column in future issues featuring the personal opinions of the Associate Editor for Current Affairs or guest commentators on major issues in conservation archaeology and related concerns.

Whatever success the journal has under my editorship will in no small part be due to the excellent condition of *American Antiquity* at the time of its transfer to me from its previous editor, Frank Hole. I am deeply grateful to Frank for making the transition so smooth. I only hope that I can further improve the quality of the writing published in *American Antiquity* and maintain the interest of the readership at large. *American Antiquity* should be the first place to which archaeologists turn when submitting for publication what they consider an important contribution to New World archaeology or general theory or method. Moreover, it should be a journal whose quarterly publication is eagerly anticipated by its audience.

There are many exciting ideas floating around the archaeological scene today, but their originators are often unwilling to put them down on paper or put them to the test of critical evaluation. It is my belief that it is better to write up one's ideas and submit them for review than to fail to do so out of fear of facing the criticism of one's colleagues. The rejection of a manuscript by *American Antiquity*, or any other journal with peer review, certainly is not the end of the world, and fear of such rejection should not keep authors from submitting what they think are important contributions. As noted historian Lewis Hanke has cogently stated (in *Attitudes of colonial powers toward the American Indian*, edited by Peckham and Gibson, 1969), publication is "the way to express one's personality, to engage in discussion and argument . . . and thus to learn from your peers." He continues,

The most regrettable result of the present 'publish or perish' syndrome is not that the world has to suffer some articles and books that are too green for human consumption, but that our younger colleagues, and some older ones too, have not come to realize that unless they do let the world know that they are thinking, they will not only have no evidence to be weighed on the scales outside the dean's office, but they will cease to grow intellectually.

The important point to emphasize is that if the submitted paper is logically argued and well-written, I will try my hardest to see that it gets a fair evaluation. The quality of the journal is clearly dependent on the active participation of the discipline. The excellent response I have received from

reviewers of manuscripts submitted for publication and the high quality of their reviews is just one reflection of the importance of the participation of a large number of archaeologists in the production of each issue of *American Antiquity*. I am open to any suggestions that the readership of *American Antiquity* might have for improving the nature of the journal. Please feel free to write or call me or to button-hole me at the annual meetings of the AAA or SAA. Specific comments for the Associate Editors also would be welcomed.

With this issue, Ezra Zubrow succeeds Chris Peebles as Associate Editor for Reviews. He intends to maintain the high standards of Peebles' editorship, while making certain innovations which he feels will further improve this section. Thomas P. Myers remains as Associate Editor for Current Research and will continue his fine effort to upgrade this useful section. Finally, Charles R. McGimsey remains as Associate Editor for Current Affairs and will initiate the Current Affairs column noted above.

* * *

Although it is commonplace for many archaeologists to state that American archaeology has undergone a "revolution" in the past two decades and that we have entered a postrevolutionary era, many other archaeologists have come to realize that rather than being over, the revolution has just begun. Old assumptions, perspectives, models, and goals have been discarded in favor of new ones that promise new understandings of the process of culture change. However, in order for such accomplishments to be made, archaeologists must build a new conceptual base and a new theoretical structure. Fortunately, the initial construction efforts are now under way.

Professor Lewis Binford's article on "Dimensional Analysis of Behavior and Site Structure: Learning from an Eskimo Hunting Stand" is just such an effort. As Binford has discussed in *For theory building in archaeology* (1977), archaeology must begin to build new theory from the ground up. His article indicates how such theory building, with particular reference to the archaeology of hunters and gatherers, can be achieved. Whether one agrees or disagrees with the specifics, the article indicates a potentially productive path for archaeologists to follow.

It is a pleasure to welcome Lew back to the pages of *American Antiquity* with his first article for this journal in more than a decade. I hope that his next contribution to these pages will not take as long to appear. I also hope that I will be able to publish more articles that will attempt to build a new theoretical structure for archaeology by case examples rather than by programmatic or polemic statements about what needs to be done or has been done.

* * *

The other main articles in this issue also should interest a wide range of readers. The paper by Gordon McEwan and D. Bruce Dickson makes a contribution to the ongoing Jomon-Valdivia debate, while the article by Roy Dickens, Jr. and James Chapman uses statistical tests of pottery assemblages to demonstrate differential behavioral patterning at two archaeological sites in Alabama. The paper by William Isbell and Katherina Schreiber applies the criteria for state formation developed by Henry Wright and Gregory Johnson, in their studies of the rise of complex societies in Iran, to Precolumbian Peru in order to provide concrete archaeological evidence that Huari was a state. In addition, Waldo Wedel provides an obituary of Neil Judd. Finally, the *Reports* run a gamut of subjects from new archaeological discoveries and interpretations to geomorphology, ethnohistory, neutron activation analysis and lithic replication experiments. The five reports on the latter two topics clearly reveal the current popularity of these subjects. The *Comments* section offers some lively debate on recent articles in the journal.

* * *

I have received several manuscripts on the nature of contract archaeology and its impact on the conduct of archaeology in the United States and expect to receive more. I hope to be able to publish papers in this area which contribute to professional understanding of the role that cultural resource management can and should play in the advancement of archaeological knowledge.

* * *

I am reviewing the procedures involving papers that comment on articles previously published in *American Antiquity* or elsewhere and replies to these comments. Guidelines for the reviewing of these comments, the timing of publication for replies, and further comments will be discussed in a future *Editor's Corner*.

* * *

J. L. Bischoff, W. M. Childers, and R. J. Shlemon have prepared a reply to the report by Louis Payen et al. This reply will appear in the October issue of the journal.

* * *

A final note: Members who are interested in presenting papers at the 1979 Annual Meeting are urged to consult the announcement of the 44th Annual Meeting, which appears on the inside back cover of this issue.

* * *

To conclude, I should remark that while the job of editor of *American Antiquity* is not an easy one, it can be quite intellectually rewarding. I have found the job very interesting so far and am quite excited about the future of the journal. With the active help of the readership, through the submission of sound, scholarly, and imaginative manuscripts, through the prompt and fair review of papers, and through the communication of ideas and suggestions to the editorial staff, *American Antiquity* can and will remain one of the major archaeological journals in the world.

Jeremy A. Sabloff

The cover drawing, from Lewis Binford's article, is by Dana Anderson and Tim Seaman.