

Donner's style is personal. In the "Preface," he describes his circuitous route to his interest in Pennsylvania Germans, mentions the influence of his mother and grandfather, and uses the first-person pronoun frequently. His numerous illustrations lighten the text. Nevertheless, he employs scholarly paraphernalia. Passages in Deitsch are paralleled by English translations. In eleven pages of endnotes, he carefully documents his sources, which include lodge records, newspaper accounts of Versammlinge, and material in archives of academic institutions. (He implies that he might have learned more by attending meetings and talking with knowledgeable participants.) His extensive bibliography contains numerous books and articles that indicate not only where he obtained some of his information but also where those who are interested in Pennsylvania Germans can find additional material. For readers who are not familiar with the Pennsylvania Germans, he includes a brief glossary, in Deitsch and English, of terms that appear frequently in the text.

Donner has developed a topic that few outside of the Pennsylvania German community know about. Indeed, not even all Pennsylvania Germans are aware of where and why so many men spend their evenings enjoying what Rahn called "sensible nonsense" (3, 95) at the Versammlinge and lodge meetings. Donner has expanded our knowledge of Pennsylvania German culture. His book is a valuable contribution to the increasing volume of enlightening literature about Pennsylvania Germans.

JOHN B. FRANTZ

The Pennsylvania State University

Gary F. Coppock. *Valentines and Thomas: Ironmasters of Central Pennsylvania. Phase III Archaeological Data Recovery. The Valentine Iron Ore Washing Plant (36Ce526), Proposed Benner Commerce Business Park 82-Acre Parcel Benner Township, Centre County, Pennsylvania*. Prepared for The Centre County Industrial Development Corporation by Heberling Associates, Inc., 2012. Pp. 544. Free, available for download courtesy of the Centre County Historical Society at www.centrehistory.org/exhibits/building-on-the-past/.

It's not what you find, it's what you find out.

—David Hurst Thomas

Gary Coppock's technical monograph on the history and archaeology of the Valentines and Thomas Foundry, and specifically of the ore washing plant, is a great example of the back-and-forth interplay between history and archaeology, and the ways each discipline informs the other. The volume, and the archaeological and historical research on which it rests, were produced as part of the Centre County Industrial Development Corporation's (CCIDC) efforts to comply with federal and state historic preservation laws and regulations. In professional parlance, it's what is known as heritage or cultural resource management (CRM). Since the 1980s the overwhelming bulk of American archaeological and historical research has come from CRM. This effort to help publically funded and permitted projects lie more gently on the historic landscape has produced some of the best and most exhaustive historical and archaeological research. As I noted in a 2016 *Pennsylvania Heritage* article on the fiftieth anniversary of the National Historic Preservation Act, many millions of public dollars have been poured into archaeological and historical research ahead of infrastructure projects across the United States. The result has been more and better archaeology and public history by orders of magnitude than the work accomplished in the preceding eight decades of the twentieth century. There's no doubt about that. The problem is (as noted in this book review) nobody knows it! Coppock's volume and the project that produced it are excellent examples of some of the very best of that work, and also illustrate two of its persistent problems.

This monograph is substantial (544 pages with the appendices). It contains an extensive historical context ranging from the general (a clear and very readable description of nineteenth-century iron-making) to the particular (a company history and the documentation of ore washing technology). The focus of the context is the ironworks operated by the Thomas and Valentine families in Centre and Clinton counties. These charcoal- and later coke-fired works operated for over a century (1815 to 1922), and the company played an important role in the technological evolution of iron-making in Pennsylvania. The context sets the stage for the description and interpretation of the archaeological investigation of the remains of an ore washing plant located near the company's Lindsay Coates Tract ore beds. The plant, operated by Henry Valentine from ca. 1887 to 1898, utilized the machine called the log washer, which had been invented by his father, Abraham S. Valentine, in 1842. Water for the ore washing process was obtained from deep wells that were drilled using technology adopted from the nascent oil

industry, also developed in part in Pennsylvania in the mid-nineteenth century. By freeing the ore washers from the need for close proximity to a stream, the invention made it possible to site the facilities close to the ore sources wherever they might be found. Thus, the report documents and interprets the specifics of one of the most transformative technologies in the history of the American iron industry.

The archaeological excavation encompassed a roughly half-acre area that exposed the masonry foundations and related features of the plant. These included the outlines of the plant's four interconnected sections, external features such as platforms and narrow-gauge rail lines, and the likely locations of the boilers and engines. More than two hundred artifacts were collected, including tools, hardware, and machinery parts. This last category included complete and fragmentary washer blades. These discoveries are significant because they document the specifics of plant organization and technology that exist only as generalities in the written and photographic record.

If this project and report highlight some excellent and important scholarship, they also illuminate two of CRM's biggest problems.

The first is the issue of access to the data. Despite at least a couple of decades of efforts to change things, the tens of thousands of CRM-generated reports are mostly inaccessible to scholars and to the interested public. Technical volumes like this one are often the principal or only product of thousands of hours and hundreds of thousands of dollars of research, laboratory analysis, and fieldwork. Typically, a few hard copies or DVDs are produced and shelved at a federal or state agency office and at the state historic preservation office. Unless scholars or the public can make a pilgrimage to these offices (usually by appointment), they will never see these monographs. Electronic distribution is slowly beginning to ease this problem, but the backlog is decades long. Thanks to the collaborative efforts of the CCIDC, the Centre County Historical Society, and Heberling Associates, this free report is the rare exception to the problem.

The second, and perhaps more difficult issue the report highlights is the difference between management (the M in CRM) and preservation of the archaeological record. Most archaeological sites owe their eligibility for, or actual listing on, the National Register of Historic Places to the fourth of the four criteria: Criterion D. This refers to heritage resources "That

have yielded or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.” There are obvious problems in the definition of what “important” means and how that might change over time, but the bigger issue is the implication that the resource in question is valuable for its information only. What that means is the resource’s significance (information) can be recovered via excavation. The result is a lack of any real incentive for agencies and project sponsors to actually preserve archaeological sites. Only when sites are eligible or listed under other criteria—which is a rarity—is there any real impetus for their long-term preservation. That’s unfortunate. Archaeology, while certainly a fascinating and indispensable way to view the past, is destructive. Once a site is excavated, the information may be preserved, but the site most certainly is not. Even the question of information loss is not entirely answered. Technology improves with time. Thanks to methodological and analytical marvels ranging from ground-penetrating radar to global positioning systems, modern archaeologists can extract data and meaning from sites that their predecessors could only dream about.

While this report may draw attention to some issues that plague CRM, it’s not diminished by them. *Valentines and Thomas: Ironmasters of Central Pennsylvania* stands as an excellent example of the high-quality scholarship that can come of meaningful collaboration between historical and archaeological inquiry. As the historical record forms the contextual foundation and framework, the details come into focus through the patient work of the archaeologist. The result is a more complete and clearer understanding of the past than would be possible with any single line of inquiry.

The value of projects and reports like this extends well beyond how we see history. Local industries and developments like those documented in Coppock’s report inform our understanding of everything that has since happened in the region. The story of Valentines and Thomas is the story of resource extraction and industry and economic growth in the Centre County region of Pennsylvania. The commerce park that is now replacing the site of the old iron industry is simply the most recent manifestation of trends that began in part on the floor of the ore washing plant.

In a way, for all of us, the archaeologist’s excavation into the site of the old ore plant isn’t just a window into the past. It’s also a mirror.

JOE BAKER

PennDOT Highway Archaeological Survey Team