Words from the Chair

My subject is an old, enduring and often hidden tension. It hovers between those who wish to identify and explain human universals, and those who would keep our analytical gaze steadily on the great diversity of human cultures. Is there one human nature, accessible to us whatever particular population we choose to study? Or are there many incommensurable varieties of human experience, thus the need for broadly comparative analysis?

I recently encountered this tension in a double dose, an HBES conference in Ann Arbor and, by happenstance, a book review I read on the return flight from Michigan. HBES is the Human Behavior and Evolution Society. This group of about one hundred scholars met at the University of Michigan in June. Although they represent diverse disciplines, HBES members share strong commitments to neo-Darwinian concepts and methodologies. However, their individual approaches are labeled—behavioral or evolutionary ecology, Darwinian psychology, Darwinian medicine, or sociobiology—all the participants had about them a palpable sense that novel and interesting things are happening here.

An invitation to deliver a paper on the economics of primitive exchange gave me the chance to appreciate this enthusiasm, and to assay interactions within this community of (Continued on page 2)

Editor’s Note

Can AnArchaey Notes substitute for the Tavern House? Almost in the shadow of the Alumni Building, archaeological excavations (see News from the RLA) recently uncovered the foundations of the Tavern House/Eagle Hotel (1796-1892). I fantasize that the Tavern House, like the Eagle Pub in Cambridge, provided a grand atmosphere for conversations, academic and otherwise. I wish it were still close by.

The last issue of AnArchaey Notes reminded me of being at a busy crossroads. This one makes me think of dialogues—too much Bakhtin perhaps. I notice several invitations to conversation, so far unrequited in person. Bruce Winterhalder invites discussion about the mutuality of pursuits across the biological/sociocultural divide in anthropology (see Words from the Chair); Kevin Brennan (Continued on page 2)

Jim welcomes Bill to UNC-CH’s 200th Birthday Party, October 12, 1993.
(Cont. from *Words from the Chair*)

apparently like-minded scholars. I found that on one issue HBES members are not so like-minded. Verbal sparring between the psychologists and anthropologists was rife during formal presentations (which is rare) and in the informal talk in hallways (which is common). The psychologists in the group are seeking universals, which they locate in the invariant aspects of the human condition, be those genetic or environmental. Empirically, many of the psychologists present statistical studies of midwestern undergraduates who are given multi-choice questionnaires asking about their preferences ("Would you prefer a mate X number of years younger, or X numbers of years older, than yourself?"). When the psychologists attend to differences, it is sex and age that have their attention.

By contrast, HBES anthropologists are seeking to explain features of human diversity. They are wary of universal and dubious about questionnaires featuring multiple-choice options. They prefer careful, ethnographic eliciting of belief and direct observations of actual behavior. The anthropologists include sex and age in their analyses, but they also pay close attention to the role of localized cultural and environmental differences. For every chi-square test featuring the responses of middle-class, Euro-American students, the anthropologists are reminded of exceptions to be found in non-western cultures.

We switched in our seats when sweeping inferences were based — to our minds — on a very limited and unrepresentative sample. We were tempted to interrupt, and sometimes did, "But the Kipsigi!" "The Inujuamut!" "The Ye'kwani!"

Cultural Studies is another area experiencing a florescence of scholarly activity. HBES and cultural studies are worlds apart, separated in part by a gulf of mutual suspicion (but that is another story). On the issue before us, however, they share a tendency: like many in HBES, cultural studies is dominated by a focus on the Euro-American scene. Ethnicity and class are added to sex (read gender) and age as important dimensions of experience, but attention is confined to populations living in the industrial, market economies of Europe and North America. From this sample also come broad conclusions about human beings.

Here I draw on the review that I encountered while returning from the HBES gathering. By Richard Handler, the review concerns the book, *Cultural Studies* [see *American Anthropologist* 95: 991-995. 1993]. *Cultural Studies* is an anthology of papers derived from a major conference ("Cultural Studies Now and in the Future," 900 attending); it is described as a handbook, the "bible," of this new field. Handler finds much in the book that is worth our attention, and on diversity much that merits consternation. In his words, "it is precisely cultural studies' apparently blissful ignorance of the wide range of human alternatives...that anthropologists will find most troubling...there are almost no references—in 730 pages of cultural studies—to anthropological ethnography. Thus, despite its claim to cultural inclusiveness, cultural studies focuses almost exclusively on modern societies..." Reading his review I could almost sense Handler twitching, "But the Banyoro!" "The Trobrianders!" "The Ju'hoansi!"

Set a biological and sociocultural anthropologist down for serious talk and they can find something to dispute. On certain principles, though, we set aside our differences. One of those principles is our tenacious engagement with diversity. Whether we trace our intellectual roots to Darwin or to Durkheim, anthropologists have stood face-to-face with multiple, non-western "others," and we refuse to exclude them from our accounts of the human condition. As a consequence, we are compelled to protest when our colleagues in other disciplines speak broadly about human nature but show, in Handler's words, "disinterest in a comprehensive view of cultural differences."

As anthropologists we routinely attempt to make our students aware of this diversity and its importance. We've much to do if we are to convince our colleagues in other disciplines that some of their projects would benefit from more inclusive attention to the full range of human experience.

Bruce Winterhalder

(Cont. from *Editor's Notes*)

raises issues about class and other backgrounds (not visible and (not) valued in anthropology training programs (see *Opinions*); a letter from Anne Larme invites dialogue about mentoring practices in anthropology graduate programs (see *Anthropologists at Work*); Kaja Finkler's description of a central concept from her book makes me wonder if we know about each others' "life's lesions" (see *New Faculty Books*). No doubt a Tavern House would make such discussions easier, but I'm inspired that they have, at least, been broached here in *AnArchaey Notes*.

---
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In the last issue of AnArchaey Notes, we asked for opinions on Anthropology’s current or possible contribution to issues of cultural diversity in the classroom and the workplace. The pieces below are additional responses. For the next "Opinions" topic, see the box in this section.

Kevin Brennan is a second year graduate student in the Social Systems Program.

In the first issue of AnArchaey Notes, Mary Ann Medlin forcefully addressed several points, including the relative abilities of African-American and White students in her anthropology courses to discern differences between society and culture, the clear preference, in introductory anthropology texts, for White, middle-class culture, and the homogenized depiction both of "the other" of a presumably typical anthropological study, and of American culture. My interest in these issues of diversity is an extension of the lessons I learned while growing up in a working class family in which learning was encouraged, but not seen as synonymous with schooling. In my experience, schools have more often been places in which conformity and acquiescence to existing societal power relations are the norm rather than places in which learning takes place. They were places in which the middle-class life was treated either as normal, or desirable, even for those of us who were not middle-class.

My interest in these issues also arises out of my past educational work. The School for International Training (SIT), for which I worked at various times from 1989-93, utilizes an experiential approach to learning that stresses learning and teaching as an endeavor undertaken by both student and teacher, where learners’ experiences and knowledge are recognized as fundamental to the learning process. Facilitation replaces lecture, reflective writing replaces exam-taking, and diversity is sought. Though reference to pertinent secondary resources is encouraged, and often required, it is not entirely necessary for students to place themselves within a “discipline” when reflecting upon their experiences. This experiential model allowed me, as a teacher, to learn something through the students’ work that might not have been produced in a more standard classroom environment.

To return from this brief sojourn into experiential education, I would like to bring Medlin’s concerns as to how students of diverse backgrounds approach anthropology to our own training. I would like to discuss how cultural diversity is addressed in the graduate program in anthropology here at UNC-CH. What does it mean to be a graduate student of anthropology here at UNC-CH? Does UNC-CH’s anthropology department provide an environment of sufficient diversity to allow each of us to bring our past experiences into consideration in our present endeavors? Is it necessary for us to be an ethnically and economically diverse group, to have an equitable gender mix before we can discuss difference and diversity? Do we sufficiently incorporate, and respect, diverse experiences and opinions in our class discussions, papers, seminars, etc.? Have any of us felt it necessary to hide or downplay our differences as we make our way through the graduate program? If so, are we merely being realistic or pragmatic, or is the result less positive than this? How different can we afford to be (as individuals) when we are pursuing graduate study in a “discipline,” especially when we may occasionally wish to ask (during those times when we may feel alienated) whose “discipline” it is that we are studying? Is it, in any sense, our own? Does the constitution of anthropology as a “discipline” necessarily privilege the ideas and work of some social groups over the ideas and work of others? And, if so, what responsibilities do we have as students of anthropology to change this? Does diversity become an issue at this point?

Have any of us felt it necessary to hide or downplay our differences as we make our way through the graduate program?

How well does the “core course” structure, which does much (in a positive way, I feel) to create a cohort from the individuals who arrive here as new students, serve our interests when it comes time to reinstate those interests as belonging to diverse individuals, each of whom brings prior knowledge and experience to her studies? To whom do we owe the greatest responsibility as we question what we are trying to accomplish here? Ourselves, as (theoretically) temporary students? The program, which was here long before we arrived, and will remain after we have gone? The faculty members? The larger community of anthropologists? The students in Medlin’s Barber Scotia College for whom we may write future textbooks? The people with whom we will eventually live and work as we further order our ideas, or, possibly those people among whom we have already lived and worked?

These questions (and others which this space is too limited to allow me to present) are posed in the hopes that discussion is generated from them. Alternatively, because such discussions are (more likely than not) already underway, perhaps they can be made more public. Anthropology cannot hope to honestly address issues of cultural diversity without, unless anthropology programs are willing to publicly examine how they deal with issues of cultural and social diversity within.

* * *

Dr. James Peacock is Kenan Professor of Anthropology, UNC-CH. Excerpts are from his talk, "Multi-culturalism in the U.S.A.,” given at the American Embassy in Tokyo, Japan to the Japan-American Society, May 12, 1993.

My talk is subtitled "Anthropology’s Challenge." That can be taken in two ways: a challenge for anthropology to...
contribute a solution to the problem of multi-culturalism, and a challenge by anthropology to offer something beyond the conventional approach to multi-culturalism.

Anthropology and multi-culturalism have a lot in common, but they also differ. Anthropology is concerned with describing and analyzing particular cultures, and also with understanding culture in general. Political multi-culturalism is perhaps less concerned with that kind of study, and more concerned with power, and empowering groups who consider themselves victims of injustice. Therefore, much that anthropology considers intrinsic to an understanding of culture is thought to be irrelevant by multi-culturalists, by those who are involved in a battle, in a struggle for political, economic validation, and for power.

This brings me to holism. Holism is one of the key themes in anthropology. For example, anthropology has insisted that culture includes many things: religion, kinship, beliefs, symbols, language, economics, politics, social structure, private life, and public life. All of these have to be understood together as part of a whole. Multi-culturalism is often concerned with one part of that whole. It often is concerned with the arts of a culture that you are proud of, and that are beautiful and expressive, for example, the art, the music, the dance, the theater of a culture. It does this to argue for the validity of the culture. Multi-culturalism is also particularly concerned with another part of culture, with politics, when trying to show that a particular group is victimized by oppression, by racism, by sexism. Anthropology certainly studies the arts, and it may celebrate them, but it may also criticize them, it may analyze them, and critique them showing how they do or do not work to the advantage of the culture. And anthropology might describe, and expose, injustice, but it would do it as part of analyzing the culture as a whole, and not so much in terms of the evil intent on the part of individuals. So in a word, anthropology tries not to be reductionist, it tries not to reduce culture to any one part, it tries to see the whole.

Secondly, in addition to its holistic perspective, anthropology proceeds by fieldwork. Fieldwork means participant observation: months or years of intensive involvement in the lives of others. Fieldwork is noted for the loneliness, the confusion, the inconveniences that attend it. It’s confounding, it may be life threatening, it is anything but romantic. However, it is an excellent technique for learning about other cultures, for learning to live in a culturally diverse world. It is much more enabling of understanding than is casual engagement, much more than say a short exercise of appreciating someone else’s literature, or arts, or taking a workshop, or a trip that is not too long or too uncomfortable. This latter method tends to lead to romanticism, to seeing the other cultures, foreign cultures, as cute, or quaint, or helpless, or maybe heroic, but seeing them as rather romantic. While these other approaches unite romance and convenience, anthropology seems sort of perverse. It tries to link realism and inconvenience. Fieldwork is very disruptive and inconvenient, but it does lead to understanding. It’s not likely that a cultural center or multi-culturalism as a movement would inspire someone to do anthropological field work, because the fieldwork takes too long for the observations, or causes too much detachment. Multi-culturalism wants to celebrate and to prescribe, and to change, and it really doesn’t have the patience to go through all this long, descriptive, analytical fieldwork. Knowledge may be a way to power, but multi-culturalism often wants the power right away; as for knowledge, you can take it or leave it. (Sometimes anthropologists seem to want knowledge and perversely to press away from power.)

Multi-culturalism wants to celebrate and to prescribe, and to change, and it really doesn’t have the patience to go through all this long, descriptive, analytical fieldwork.

Now a word about this emphasis on fieldwork and on the idea of diversity. The key contribution, the genius of anthropological field work is to immerse oneself profoundly in the logic of a particular culture. To use an analogy, if you want to be multi-lingual, you don’t learn all the languages of the world at once, at least most of us don’t, we can’t. We learn one language at a time. And we try to learn a language in some depth, because learning a language is entering another world. You learn not just some words and some grammar, but you learn a whole other perspective. So the perspective of anthropology is to get inside and comprehend the other culture in-depth—you don’t want just to learn a few foreign songs and enjoy a few spicy exotic foods. That’s technique number one for anthropology.

The other technique deals with comparison. You try to grasp the other culture in relation to yourself, and many cultures in relation to each other. Like fieldwork, the comparative method is also hard and specialized. With multi-culturalism we may have food fairs or international festivals where we put together diversity, and that’s fun, but it’s kind of a hodgepodge, a mixture. Comparative method is much harder, more analytical. It takes the mixture, and tries to reduce it to variables and correlations, patterns, and principles. If you are comparing America and Japan, for example, you try to figure out what ways we are alike and what ways we are different, and how one difference relates to another difference, and what are the principles behind that. That’s comparison.

Anthropology, then, is concerned with a) describing and analyzing specific cultures in-depth through fieldwork, and b) illuminating the nature of culture in general through comparison. These two concerns are not antithetical to multi-culturalism, they are not antithetical to the idea of empowering groups who are victims of oppression and injustice. But the goal of anthropological study is not just and not mainly that kind of empowerment. Instead, it is what Max Weber called *verstehen*, or understanding.

Finally, anthropology is not the same as another kind of multi-culturalism, and that is what we might call academic multi-culturalism. In academic multi-culturalism, you may create a new program to study a particular cultural group, and insist that the only members of that program are members of that group. This is antithetical to anthropology. Anthropology
be the republican and biblical traditions of early America (civic virtues that linked individualism to a social commitment) or some other constellation emerging today—non-values such as the marketplace or simply anarchy will carry the day. Anthropology is called to join the quest to define our national culture as a diverse and dynamic, nonetheless somewhat cohesive, somewhat directed entity.

Get in on the next Opinions. The topic will be training for what? Whispers have it that many anthropology departments (our own included) marginalize non-academic careers and interests sometimes to the point of derogating non-academic anthropology and silencing the students who have such concerns. What is your opinion? Do the graduate programs you’re familiar with fit this profile? If so, what difference does it make? What are the costs and benefits, for the discipline and for graduate students, of ignoring non-academic and/or activist anthropology? Should the center of gravity in training programs be moved any closer than it is to future work outside of academia? How much retooling would it take to encourage, alongside high quality academic anthropology, excellent non-academic anthropology? Given the shortage of academic jobs, should departments continue to concentrate on turning out academics? (See, for example, “Graduate Education is Losing its Moral Base,” The Chronicle of Higher Education March 23, 1994, by Cary Nelson and Michael Burbee, and the series of articles in the April 27, 1994 issue of the same journal.) Send your Opinion to the editor (see bottom of page 2 for address).

Gove Griffith Elder (PhD, ’82) is Intercultural Trainer/Case Manager at Lutheran Family Services Refugee Assistance Program, headquartered in Raleigh, North Carolina.

Because people frequently cross cultural boundaries as tourists or electronically by telephone and television with limited emotional and intellectual hassle, they don’t realize or consider the crossing-of-culture experience as a major human problem within today’s world. It is true that the world is shrinking due to air travel and global electronic communication. Instantly we’re placed in the midst of the world’s cultural diversity even while we are in our living rooms. Yet this constant intrusion of the world’s cultures into our lives has not made us more aware of the world’s diversity or more able to handle this diversity. In fact this “pseudo” intimacy with the world’s cultures and peoples has the effect of desensitizing us and disabling us from using the power of cultural pluralism in our personal and professional lives.

Due to this general pseudo-intimacy, those who do experience culture shock or personal culture identity confusion are left without support. The general public’s understanding is that entry or reentry into a culture should be handled quickly and privately. One certainly should not have to go for psychotherapy and cross-cultural counseling or take a course on the subject in order to get a handle on the experience. No one
needs to join a "global nomad" support group in order to be able to adjust to the crossing of cultural boundaries. The general folk belief that this crossing of cultures is "no problem, man," to quote a Jamaican phrase, translates into a dearth of culturally sensitive counselors, classes in the University, and support groups to which one can go for solace.

During the last twenty-five years, I have returned numerous times for professional and personal reasons to this culturally insensitive environment and its lack of recognition of the importance of cultural diversity. During these transitions from Southeast Asia to North Carolina, I had become aware of some dysphoria related to my entry and reentry experiences, but I kept these feelings suppressed and denied them legitimacy in my cultural adjustment experience. Such emotional denial continued until I attended the first International Conference for Global Nomads in Washington, DC (Dec. 1988). At this conference I became aware of who I am, which is a "Third Culture Adult." I found myself among people who had similar experiences and they eagerly concurred with me about the dysphoric feelings they had had. I became aware that I was not alone.

Upon returning to Chapel Hill, I began to explore the possibilities of starting a global normad support group as well as developing a network of psychotherapeutic support personnel and a course. This experimentally designed anthropology course is called "Crossing Culture: An Educational Awareness in Global Awareness" and was first taught at the UNC-CH summer school through the Department of Anthropology. The students' responses at the end of the course reflected the effectiveness of the teaching style which mixed lecture/discussion and experiential learning events in a ratio of 1:1.

The fifty/fifty mix of lecture and interactive learning allowed me to provide the students with an experiential and intellectual entree into the power of culture, the emotional intrusiveness of the crossing-of-culture experience, as well as the potential benefits of this experience for personal and professional growth. In addition, this mixed teaching style was required because the "culture shock" experience, due to its strong emotional content, is often suppressed. Since that first class in the summer of 1991, this course has been taught a number of times and has continued to be important in students' personal life development as well as being a stimulating academic course.

An important mentor of mine, Dr. Edward T. Hall, in his book Beyond Culture, stated "There are two related crises in today's world. The first and most visible is the population/environment crisis. The second, more subtle but equally lethal, is humankind's relationships to its extensions, institutions, ideas, as well as the relationships among the many individuals and groups that inhabit the globe." I believe that the reason we are facing the cultural diversity question so powerfully today is because we are being challenged to "take up our cultural beds and walk into a new world of cultural diversity" and to "walk and not faint." The challenge is before us to act now and build peace or wait and face our destruction.

**Brian Riedel (BA, '94)**

As students of people and peoples, anthropologists are in a peculiar position when it comes to issues of cultural diversity. The broad range of research called "Anthropology" provides, by default, the raw material for understanding cultural diversity. Through physical artifacts, life stories, our bodies, and the languages we use to make meaning of these, anthropologists expose the differences that allow us to speak of a diversity of cultures. Furthermore, the ideas we evolve about "cultural diversity" and "multi-culturalism," (or even "political correctness") evoke interpretations of cultural difference which must not be destructive.

Unfortunately, the power to discover difference does not always come with the ability or desire to respect it. Faced with this disjunction, what may anthropologists do practically (in the classroom, if no where else) to foster respect for difference? Foremost, we must avoid defining difference as negative, and demonstrate the effects of hierarchizing difference. As Mary Ann Medlin pointed out in the last *AnArchaey Notes*, "subculture" is often read as a "less than" culture. "Subculture" seems to deny the experience of her Black students. In a diversity of cultures, none should be recognized as superior.

Further, in line with anthropological emphasis on culture-in-context, differences may be shown as responses to particular problems. That is, different cultures solve similar problems in different ways. I vividly remember a film from one of my first anthropology classes. It was about terraced rice farming on an island in East Asia, and the impact of Western fertilization methods. Fertilizers were introduced into an intricate system that co-ordinated religious festivals and the flooding of the rice terraces by a solar-lunar calendar. At first, the fertilizers brought very high yields. In time, however, farmers saw their crop yield falling. It fell even below levels that were normal for the time before Western methods were used. More than the particular agricultural history of this island, I remember the film as an example of cultural diversity. Clearly, the flooding system could not be ranked as either inferior or superior to fertilizers; fertilizers have worked well in American agricultural techniques (although the long term effects are debatable). However, the flooding system worked well for that island. In other words, the difference in agricultural methods could not be ranked absolutely, and both were useful responses to the same problem: achieving high yield from a limited amount of land. Similar situations of cultural interaction, where differences can be made explicit, may allow us to explore the equation of difference with deficiency.
NEW FACULTY BOOKS

Knowing Practice: The Clinical Encounter of Chinese Medicine


This book is based on an eighteen month period (1982-1984) of study and participant observation at the Guangzhou (Canton) College of Traditional Chinese Medicine. The college is one of many government-supported institutions in China which trains doctors practicing a type of medicine which, with its 2000-year written history and its wide array of pharmaceutical and acupuncture techniques, differs fundamentally from "Western" biomedicine. Knowing Practice is about these differences.

About the fieldwork: In the course of wide-ranging conversations with faculty and students at the College, I sometimes pointed out apparent contradictions between textbooks, or I proposed clinical scenarios in which conflicting explanations might be equally plausible. My question often was, how do doctors know which statement or explanation is correct? Invariably the answer was, "we take experience (jingyin) to be our guide," or "we take practice (shijian) to be the main thing."

The long process in which I came to accept these answers as "the answers" for an ethnographic study of Chinese medicine led to the structure and argument of the book. I began to realize as I gained more familiarity with Chinese medical textbooks, clinical practices, and technical literature, that my questions about logical contradictions and hypothetical situations came from an intellectual environment quite different from that occupied (and generated) by my teachers in Guangzhou. Their answers were not so much evasive as they were effective in casting doubt upon the value of my questions. By following their advice and altering the abstract focus of my original interests, I was able to perceive "practice" and "experience" not as common-sense categories but as culture-specific formations.

To accommodate these important differences, what began for me as a study of Chinese Knowledge had to become much more attentive to clinical priorities in medical work. Texts remained important, but in a new way. In the book I see texts as weapons against illness, resources for action, rather than claims about nature or representation of truth. The emphasis of the study, then, remains epistemological in the broadest sense: but it organizes itself around a practical form, the phases of the clinical encounter.

About the book: Knowing Practice describes and analyzes the logical phases of the clinical encounter. This mundane practice, in which patient and doctor "look at illness" (kanbing) together, has proven in the more than a decade in which I have been studying it to be a remarkably sturdy form. Many kinds of new knowledge, including facts and techniques derived from "Western medical" sources, have been appropriated to its structure, which remains almost invariant.

By allowing practice, the form of the clinical encounter, to be the occasion and the organizing principle of my reading of the contemporary discourse and institutional life of traditional Chinese medicine, I show how the daily work of healing continues in relation to an ancient, vast, and still-growing literature of healing experience. The clinical encounter as it is described in the book both draws on and generates medical knowledge, disciplining doctors to the rational use of proven methods while allowing, even demanding, that they intervene creatively in the ever-new challenges of illness. In close relation to this everyday practical form, the collective accumulation of expertise through scholarship, teaching, and healing generates doctors as embodiments of virtuosity, a form of experience which links practice to history and practitioners to knowledge.

In Chapter 1 I place the practice of traditional Chinese medicine in its historical moment and briefly describe features of its institutional existence in contemporary China. One of the aims of this chapter is to identify the knowledge reported in the rest of the book as the possession and product of a particular group of people and set of institutions which came into existence at roughly the same time as the People's Republic of China itself. Chapter 2 introduces a few of the cosmological assumptions with which any reading of Chinese medical writing should be informed. A discussion of ancient philosophical formulations helps readers to see the sense of the technical medical material which follows. Chapter 3 provides a preliminary description of how work is done in clinics of Chinese medicine, focusing on the readily observable activities of doctors and patients in a hospital affiliated with the Guangzhou College. It also presents and partly reproduces three published case histories, the strangeness and technicalities of which are slowly unraveled in the course of the analysis to follow.

Chapters 4, 5, and 6 comprise the core of the book, analytically leading in and out of the recurring practical form which I call "the clinical encounter" and which Chinese doctors think of as "looking at illness" or "syndrome differentiation and therapy determination." Some general conclusions on an overview of the clinical encounter are taken up in Chapter 7, where the notions of practice and experience are considered and their usual meanings questioned.

In sum, Knowing Practice is a study of the discourses of traditional Chinese medicine organized around the idea that the clinical encounter can be seen as a form of practical logic. It ultimately posits a culture-specific kind of actor and agency, a notion that seems a worthwhile hypothesis for future work in the history and anthropology of China as elsewhere. It also
invites reflection on the idea that ways of knowing are everywhere continuous with modes of action and forms of the social. Perhaps the greatest ambition of the book is to join with a few others in English to introduce the "great treasurehouse" of Chinese medical literature into serious consideration by world scholarship of many kinds. The "vast body of records" that have arisen from "the Chinese people's experience in their long period of engaging in struggle with disease" are, when read on their own terms and with attention to the conditions in which they signify, a contribution to human health in the broadest sense.

* * *

In the Wake of Contact: Biological Responses to Conquest


The Columbian Quincentennial sparked a new wave of research into the effects of European expansion on the indigenous peoples of the Americas and Pacific Islands. This response is entirely appropriate because the political, economic, social, ecological, and demographic transformation set in motion by sustained interaction across the Atlantic Ocean, and soon thereafter the Pacific, collectively resulted in the cultural, social, biological, and environmental landscapes that we know today. This volume presents an overview of recent bioanthropological investigations of the demographic, epidemiological, and behavioral consequences of the European influx, encompassing such topics as disease transmission, dietary changes, cultural impact, and health status both before and after the arrival of Europeans.

The authors present individual case studies that use documentary records, archaeological data, and human remains from specific regions or ethnic populations. Geographic coverage includes Spanish Florida, New England, southern Canada, Great Plains, Southwest Coast, Southwest Pueblos, coastal California, Maya Lowlands, Ecuador, and Polynesia. These studies provide details on and interpretations of the complex changes experienced by native populations over time. In addition to the direct effects of contact, the book explores how precontact developments were influencing native population status when Europeans first arrived and at later points as they established long term, sustained contact.

The contributors to the volume provide a number of conclusions about contact between Europeans and native populations. Foremost among these is that the biological effects of new postcontact biological and ecological settings were highly variable. The effects of contact were not uniform, with all native groups experiencing sudden collapse with no survivors. Rather, many groups show a remarkable resilience with clear indications of accommodation, survival, and adaptation, despite highly challenging circumstances.

Most discussions about the effects of contact on human biology in the Americas have tended to focus on population size collapse in response to the introduction of Old World diseases. The investigations presented in this book underscore the fund of information available from other areas of inquiry, such as diet and nutrition, activity patterns, and other factors that influenced the lives of native groups during the last five hundred years.

* * *

Women in Pain: Gender and Morbidity in Mexico


This book emerges out of research spanning twenty years in rural and urban Mexico on diverse anthropological concerns, including peasant economic and political activities, gender roles, sickness, and ways of healing, especially as practiced by Spiritualists and physicians. For two years (1977–1979) as observer and as apprentice—I watched Spiritual healers at work. The majority of the healers, and a majority of their patients, were women. During a two year study of biomedical practice in a large hospital in Mexico City (1986–88), I found that the majority of the patients were women as well. Both in industrializing and industrially developing nations, morbidity is more common among women than men. This led me to pose the question I address: why is it that women experience more sickness than men, leading more women than men to seek treatment, be it from Spiritualist healers, or physicians? A simple question, but the answers are complex. Western understandings of ourselves as biologically driven organisms, may lead us to dismiss the question, saying that gender disparities in health are due to physiological differences. However, we must attend not only to biological variables, but to the meaning of sickness and suffering, in social, cultural and individual terms, and to ideologies bearing on notions of gender and sex.

When speaking about their sickness, men and women incessantly referred to their day-to-day relationships with their mates, children, parents and neighbors. Their discourses persuaded me that what I identify as life's lesions—embedded in existential conditions, contradictions and moral evaluations—are as virulent as any pathogen found in nature. To isolate an individual's life's lesions we must place that person's existence in its material and ideological settings under a magnifying glass. This, in fact, is the project of the book, to arrive at the totality of human sickness.

My initial contact was during a study of biomedical practice and patients' responses to it in a general hospital in Mexico City (Finkler 1991). I asked the randomly selected patients what was wrong, what symptoms they were experiencing, and why they came to the hospital. People poured out their lives and their distress. They spoke about the
"anger they made" and I followed with, "What had happened to make you angry?" People's responses to "trigger questions" revealed the underlying conflicts related to their experience of sickness.

Ten of the 205 women I interviewed were selected for this book. Forming part of the majority of the poor of Mexico, the women share similar rhythms of daily life, similar ideologies, and similar understandings about what constitutes a woman, and a man; yet, the resemblances dissolve as we look closely at the course of their lives. Each woman's narrative communicated a dominant theme in her life to which she repeatedly referred when speaking about her disorder. The life histories focus on aspects of each woman's life with which she associates her pain. As the women's lives changed, their perceptions of their pains changed as well.

In Chapter 1, I discuss the differential expression of symptoms among women and men. In Chapter 2 I develop the anthropological understanding of sickness, and the various non-biological theories propounded about affliction. Here I elaborate on the concept of life's lesions that I equate with anatomical lesions. In Chapter 3 my concern is with the "woman question," the various theories advanced relevant to our understanding of gender and sex, and women's roles in developing nations. This sets the foundation for my discussion in Chapter 4, which explores the relationship between gender and sickness. In Chapter 5, I furnish the ethnographic context of women's activities, male-female relations, and ideologies about women in Mexico from historical and contemporary perspectives. Chapter 6 presents an aggregate view of the population from which the women we meet were drawn and compares the sample population with a healthy group.

We discern that at the core of these women's lives there cries a thirst for dignity, left unquenched by their existence.

Thus, I have situated the ten women discussed in Chapters 7 through 15. In those chapters I briefly sketch Mexican cultural understandings of sickness and the differences between men and women's etiological explanations, as well as physicians' posture towards their women patients. I attend in some detail to the symptomatology for which the women sought treatment, to the medical diagnosis, to the health-seeking trajectories, to the history of their symptoms, and to their biographies within the context of their afflictions. I ferret out the major themes in their lives with which the women associate their disorders. Because sickness lacks a chronology and the experience of pain transcends measured time, the many experiences in one's life with which sickness is associated lose their chronological time. The women's narrations skip and jump. The narratives become gateways to Mexican ideologies and morality and demonstrate the ways in which society and culture interact with the personal experience of sickness and pain. We glimpse angers, pains, and each woman's perceptions of what made her sick. We discern that at the core of these women's lives there cries a thirst for dignity, left unquenched by their existence.

The book is meant to advance our comprehension of women's health and to add another dimension about women's physiological dysfunctions by identifying forces that must inform our grasp of women's health. It is my hope that the data I present will help improve the lives of poor women by advancing our insights into their individual suffering and their health. In this spirit, I hope that the book will furnish at least a partial reply to the question one of the women I discuss posed to me: "My old man never gets sick, there has never been anything wrong with him since I have known him for the past ten or twelve years, and why am I sick so often?"

* * *

God's Own Scientists: Creationists in a Secular World

Christopher B. Toumey (Visiting Lecturer), Rutgers University Press, 1994.

This book addresses the continuing attraction of creationism in late 20th-century America, even among many scientifically sophisticated people who are not fundamentalist Christians.

God's Own Scientists is adapted from Chris Toumey's dissertation, which was based on participant observation and other ethnographic methods with creationist activists, Bible study groups, and members of the New Religious Right in North Carolina. Its premise is that modern creationist beliefs cannot be reduced either to ignorance of science or to a narrow doctrine extrapolated from Biblical inerrancy; instead, it represents a broad cultural discontent with the moral disintegration of American society, combined with a remarkable faith in science itself. By opposing evolution, God's own scientists see themselves as upholding the moral authority of both science and religion.

* * *

Social Experience and Anthropological Knowledge


The aim of this book is to elucidate the process that takes individual experiences in the field to the production of general anthropological knowledge. In spite of its crucial position in our discipline, this process is far from clear. Anthropological knowledge is embodied in words, yet most social experience—
such as fieldwork—lies beyond language. Large areas of cultural experience cannot simply be called up and expressed in discursive statements. Physical presence is a prerequisite to access the lived experience of others. *Social Experience and Anthropological Knowledge* explores this paradox.

The book grew out of a session of the Second Meeting of the European Association of Social Anthropology in Prague in 1992. The meetings of EASA, its journal *Social Anthropology*, and the books emerging from the meetings are important arenas for scholarly exchanges among European social anthropologists. The contributors come from both established traditions of social anthropology and from former fringe areas of European anthropology. Besides individual articles by the editors, the volume has contributions from Tamara Koh, Ingrid Rudis, Judith Kempp, Wojciech J. Bursza, Pavlos Kavouros, Andre Gingrich, Thomas Widlok, and John Davis.

The contributors emphasize the value of fieldwork in the process of knowledge production. Against the background of recent debates in anthropology on subjectivity, they challenge the distinction between subjectivity and objectivity, redefine what we should mean by "empirical," and demonstrate the complexity of present-day epistemological problems by way of concrete examples. They trace the route from the field experience to the analytical results, showing how fieldwork enables the ethnographer to arrive at an understanding, not only of "culture" and "society," but also of the process by which cultures and societies are transformed.

*Social Experience and Anthropological Knowledge* shows a clear way out of the impasse created by postmodernism and its claim to have dismantled science. By demystifying subjectivity in the ethnographic process and re-emphasizing the vital position of fieldwork, the book is an overdue attempt to renew confidence in the anthropological project of comprehending the world.

* * *

**Evolutionary Ecology and Human Behavior**


When I was an undergraduate at Oregon in the late 1960s, a faculty advisor, lamenting the state of course requirements, said to me that no one should graduate from the university who hadn't been exposed to Darwin, Freud and Marx. His scowl and disapproving tone of voice made it clear that he couldn't control the curriculum, but I personally was to take this observation to heart. I gravitated to Darwin, enticed by *The Voyage of the Beagle*. I also swallowed a large dose of Freud in Norton Library and Vintage editions. Outside of Western history classes, I got most of my limited Marx in diluted or second-hand forms (the *Communist Manifesto* and *Che Guevarra*, among them).

With nearly 30 years of hindsight, the emphasis on Darwin was a fortunate choice. In the interim Freud's intellectual authority largely has collapsed (see Frederick Crews, "The Unknown Freud," *New York Review of Books*, November 18th, 1993) and even the influence of Marx seems to have attenuated. Much that currently is creative in marxism appears to be an attempt to save Marx-the-political-economist from himself (see for instance, Jon Elster, *Making Sense of Marx*, Cambridge University Press, 1985), or to move carefully selected ideas of his into areas of inquiry that he neglected (e.g., cultural marxism).

By contrast, Darwinism has never been stronger. *Evolutionary Ecology and Human Behavior (EEHB)* represents one of its several contemporary forms in the study of human behavior. The book was initinitiated in 1987. For almost a decade Eric Smith and I had been among about a dozen anthropologists who had been engaged in ethnographic study guided by evolutionary ecology models. We decided that a synthesis was timely.

We briefly debated writing it ourselves, but settled on a different tactic. We created an outline of topics and then commissioned individuals whom we considered to be the top scholars in the field to write about them. The goal was a unified and comprehensive survey, addressed to professional anthropologists and other behavioral scientists, and to their advanced students. We sought the consistency of a single-author textbook, matched to the vividness and authority of original research papers. Early reviews suggest that those goals were met, but it was slow work. Most contributions were rewritten several times during the five years it took to produce the book.

In two introductory chapters, Smith and I define evolutionary ecology as the application of neo-Darwinian theory to the study of behavioral adaptation in an ecological setting. We describe the relevance of this research to traditional anthropological questions, and the points at which it overlaps or complements other social sciences, especially economics. We argue that traditional enmities between the social sciences and study of human behavior from evolutionary perspectives have outlived much of their relevance.

The remainder of the chapters describe research on topics as diverse as polygamy, time allocation, primate social organization, subsistence decisions, the game of chicken, and relationships between resource access disparities and population stability. Most are guided by simple cost-benefit models, expressed in graphs or algebra. These models are designed to help us predict the choices people will make when faced with various socio-ecological options. *EEHB* studies are guided by principles of methodological individualism, rational choice and marginal analysis, much like those used in micro-economics. But unlike micro-economics, which takes as its setting market capitalism, these models consider the choices people face in non-market, ecological and social environments. What selection of resources from those available will optimize hunter-gatherer foraging efficiency, or reduce the risks of...
subsistence shortfalls? In what circumstances will it benefit a woman to become the second wife in a polygamous marriage? How does self-interest shape the balance of cooperation and competition to be found in various social settings?

An objective of EEBH is to demonstrate how this approach has had success in accounting for part of the diversity of human behavior, mainly in non-Western societies. Most of the models depict expected relationships between a variety of behavioral options and a range of environmental contexts. As an example, land tenure regimes ranging from defended territories to open access are hypothesized to be a function of specific patterns in the distribution and predictability of resources.

EEBH was published late in 1992. As of this writing (July, 1994), it has been in print only for a year and a half. So far, the published reviews have been very good, due largely I suspect to the quality of the authors who we were able to enlist in the project. But virtually all of the extant reviews have appeared in journals with a natural science orientation congenial to that of EEBH (e.g., Science, American Scientist, Human Biology, American Journal of Physical Anthropology, Animal Behavior). These reviews presumably are technically exacting, but they are unlikely to challenge the value or validity of the project itself. The social science reviews yet to appear will be a harder test of one of our pedagogical goals: to demonstrate to social scientists that evolutionary ecology is useful for explaining human evolution and variety. Not only is there lingering timidity in the social sciences about evolutionary analyses, some of it quite understandable when appreciated historically, but there also are fashionable cross-currents challenging the validity of science itself. If our message is effective in this community, we may exorcise a few social darwinist ghosts, but we also expect to provoke complaints from some that our attachment to evolutionary and scientific methods is naive or at best old-fashioned. Neo-Darwinism’s overall health and longevity are good reasons to believe otherwise.

* * *

Faculty Publications

Julia G. Crane
Carole L. Crumley
1994 Cultural Implications of Historic Climatic Change. Whether Archaeology?

Archaeology in the End of the Millennium, papers dedicated to Evzen Neustupny. Czech Academy of Sciences.
Sue E. Estrada
Judith Farquhar
Kaja Finkler
Carla Freeman
Glenn D. Hinson
Dorothy Holland
Norris Brock Johnson
Clark Spencer Larsen
NEWS FROM THE RESEARCH LABS OF ANTHROPOLOGY

Southeastern Archaeology, the journal of the Southeastern Archaeological Society, has been edited out of the Research Labs of Anthropology for three years. Dr. Stephen Davis, who continues to be very active with the society, was Editor of the journal from 1990 to 1993.

THE TAVERN HOUSE / EAGLE HOTEL

The Research Laboratories of Anthropology at UNC-CH investigated the site of the Tavern House/Eagle Hotel on the UNC campus during the 1993-1994 academic year. This project was initiated as part of the University’s Bicentennial Celebration and was funded by a grant awarded to Dr. Vincas P. Steponaitis, Director of the Research Laboratories of Anthropology, by the Bicentennial Committee.

The Tavern House was built between August 1796 and the end of the following year by John "Buck" Taylor, who was the first steward of the University from 1793 to 1797. The Tavern House, like other eighteenth-century taverns, provided food and shelter for travelers, and served as a center of community business and social activity. During the nineteenth century, several annexes were attached to the tavern building and the complex evolved into a boarding house and later into a hotel. By mid-century more than one hundred university students lived at the Eagle Hotel and many more took their meals there on a daily basis. The Eagle Hotel was demolished in 1892 and replaced by a Victorian-style resort hotel. After falling into disrepair early in the twentieth century, the buildings reverted to a men’s dormitory (Samford 1994).

The excavations at the Tavern House-Eagle Hotel site

Nineteenth century photograph of the Eagle Hotel & annexes.
were conducted as a field school in historical archaeology, offered by the Research Laboratories of Anthropology both semesters of the 1993-1994 school year. Course instructors were staff archaeologists Dr. R.P. Stephen Davis, Jr. and Dr. H. Trawick Ward. Jane M. Eastman was the graduate student assistant for the field school. The 22 students who enrolled in the course excavated the foundations of Tavern House, one of its annexes and several other features associated with these buildings.

Patricia Samford, an anthropology graduate student and historical archaeologist, wrote an historical overview of the property and developed a set of research questions for the project. The archaeological work at the Tavern House-Eagle Hotel site has provided clues about early student life at the University and also about the development of the town of Chapel Hill. The archaeological study of the Tavern House-Eagle Hotel site may also yield information about the town's relations with the surrounding area and the outside world.

resulting in a deposit that averaged about a foot in depth. The artifact assemblage from this deposit reflects the importance of food service to the operation of the hotel. In this zone almost two-thirds of all artifacts were food-related.

After completion of the fieldwork, a comprehensive analysis of the artifacts and spatial configuration of the site will be undertaken. The project has already contributed to our knowledge of the construction and operation of early taverns in North Carolina.

Hundreds of students and visitors toured the site during bicentennial celebrations throughout the year. The site was open for tours on University Day, Carolina Saturday, and Chapel Hill Revisited: Town Celebration. Elizabeth Jones, an anthropology graduate student, designed an artifact exhibit for Carolina Saturday that remained on display at the Research Laboratories of Anthropology following the celebration. The excavations on campus have not only trained university students in archaeological field methods, but have increased public awareness of archaeology and the University's rich history.

* * *

EARLY STUDENT LIFE
AT UNCCH

Two Anthropology Department graduate students, Sara Bon and Elizabeth Jones, conducted research as the Department’s contribution to the University’s Bicentennial Celebration. Their project was an ethnohistoric study examining early student life at the first state university. The research was supported in part by a Bicentennial Observance grant.

The central focus of the project was early student life from the period 1795-1860. Unpublished documents—photographs, letters, diaries, ledgers—held at the Southern Historical Collection provided the bulk of primary sources. This collection contains an exceptionally complete record. Other sources of information were the North Carolina Collection as well as interviews and family documents volunteered by descendants of members of the early University community.

The concerns of Bon’s research were the attitudes of faculty, students and their families, and administrators toward the innovative system of higher education, the public university. She identified two approaches to University curricula. First, a traditional “liberal arts” curriculum, based on the study of classical languages and works—the typical preparation of young men for a life in law and public service. The second of the curricula vying for inclusion was “practical” education, with less emphasis on classics, which was applicable to a variety of occupations, including agricultural and industrial ones. These two curricula reflected attitudes in society at
large, as did much of the debate concerning the creation of the public university in North Carolina, which did not have a mandated public school system until 1839.

The focus of Jones’ research was diversity in the early student population. While there was a glaringly homogeneous white male population, class and ethnic backgrounds were diverse. During the first period of the University’s history, many of the students came from families of recent immigrants. Jones’ work explores the connections between the place of origin in Europe, even within the same country—especially Great Britain and Ireland—and occupation and education in North Carolina.

* * *

**Distinguished Alumna Award for Mary Elmendorf**

UNC-CH presented anthropologist Mary Lindsay Elmendorf a Distinguished Alumna Award on October 12, 1994 as part of the University’s Bicentennial Celebration. Dr. Elmendorf graduated with honors in Psychology from UNC-CH in 1937. She began graduate studies here in Public Administration and Social Work. In the late 1960s she took her PhD in Anthropology from the Union Graduate School in New York.

![Mary Elmendorf receiving Distinguished Alumna Award](image)

Dr. Elmendorf worked as Chief of the Refugee Section of the American Friends Service Committee in Paris in 1945-46, a year before AFS was awarded the Nobel Prize for Peace. From 1953-60 she was Chief of the CARE Mission in Mexico, the first woman to hold that position. Since her work in Mexico, she has worked and traveled as a consultant for the World Bank, the United Nations Development Program, the Agency for International Development, the World Health Organization, and other agencies. A special interest of hers has been the role of women in programs to improve the supply of drinking water and sanitation in developing countries. Dr. Elmendorf has worked hard to convince development agencies to listen to the people, especially the women, affected by development programs.

Dr. Elmendorf conducted fieldwork for her dissertation in the Yucatan. She researched how Mayan women felt about the changes in their lives brought about by development projects. Her experiences convinced her that many development projects fail because they do not account for women as decision-makers. As she says, "It's not the impact of the project on women, it's women's impact on the success of the project."

Mary Elmendorf is the author of *The Mayan Women and Change* (1972), and *Nine Mayan Women: A Village Faces Change* (1976). In 1982 she received the Margaret Mead Award from the Society for Applied Anthropology and the American Anthropological Association for her role in improving health conditions in the Third World and her work in securing the acceptance of anthropology and the social sciences at the World Bank. In 1993 she was a delegate to the Earth Summit conference in Rio De Janeiro and gave an address on problems of world sanitation.

Today she is Affiliate Professor in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Florida; she has taught courses at Goddard College, Hampshire College, and the Union Institute.

Acknowledging Frank Porter Graham as a mentor, Mary Elmendorf has attacked social problems at their domestic sources while always applying a global perspective.

* * *

**Professor Yarnell Retires**

**Dr. Richard Yarnell** achieved emeritus status July 1. We want to take this opportunity to acknowledge his substantial contribution not only to his particular area of specialization, ethnobotany, and to this department, but more importantly to anthropology as a whole.

Dr. Yarnell grew up in east Texas. It was there during his stint in the Air Force that his interest in anthropology blossomed, even in the face of his bachelor's degree in geology from Duke University. With his Masters diploma in Anthropology from the University of New Mexico secured, he traveled to the University of Michigan where he received his doctorate in 1963. He taught at Emory University from 1962 until he joined the faculty at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 1971.

"Pioneer" may be an over-exercised term today, but from his work on the phytogeography of Pueblo ruins in the 1950s to the recent compilation of a comprehensive bibliography of works in ethnobotany, Dr. Yarnell heartily deserves this accolade. His broad interests include not only cultural ecology and subsistence, but also economic botany, the evolution of plant domestication, particularly in eastern North America, and Native North American cultures. His scholarship in these and other concerns in anthropology has laid a firm foundation for...
those who have followed him. His insights, enthusiasms, and scrupulous attention to detail are all hallmarks of his abilities whether in the lecture hall or the seminar room. In brief, Dr. Yarnell is a model anthropologist.

On his retirement, we wish to thank Dr. Yarnell for his dedication. We look forward to his continuing guidance and we will miss his daily good humor and graciousness.

* * *

**Professor Bachnik Accepts New Position**

Dr. Jane Bachnik, who resigned from the department in August of 1993, has accepted a position as Professor with the Japanese Ministry of Education at the National Institute of Multi-Media Education, near Tokyo. This is a national civil service position at a government-sponsored research institute. She can still be contacted at her present address/fax number:
401 Gardenia House
1-28-3 Shirasagi
Nakano-ku, Tokyo 165, JAPAN
FAX: 81-3-3337-2699

* * *

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

In November 1993, students and faculty from the Department of Anthropology formed the first university chapter of the Coalition for the National Institute for the Environment (CNIE). CNIE promotes forming the proposed National Institute for the Environment (NIE), a new national agency to address issues of the environment and to provide scientific evidence for policy-makers (see last issue of *AnArchaey Notes*). Our group is the newest member of the Washington, DC based CNIE, a collection of 6500+ individuals and 100 professional societies and organizations.

The goal of the UNC-CH Chapter of CNIE is to educate students, faculty, and administrators of the significance of the proposed NIE and to promote their participation and activism. The Chapter has made presentations to student groups such as the Student Environmental Action Coalition (SEAC), and plans to meet with students in the dorms to promote a letter writing campaign. A petition drive was held in "The Fit" to garner support for the NIE initiative, and to promote university awareness of the new UNC Chapter. The Chapter also set up a table at Bicentennial Day festivities.

Upcoming plans include a local radio interview with Dr. Carole Crumley and a student representative of the CNIE Chapter. Future objectives are to meet with local businesses, state agencies, and area research institutions in North Carolina to discuss cross-disciplinary environmental problems and encourage businesses' interest in the NIE initiative. Too, we are writing a handbook for other universities to use to start their own Chapter of the CNIE. The UNC-CH Chapter, which holds biweekly meetings, seeks the participation and involvement of all university students and faculty at UNC. For more information, please contact: Dr. Carole Crumley, Department of Anthropology, CB #3115, Alumni Building, UNC-CH, Chapel Hill, NC 27599, 919/962-1243.

**DEPARTMENTAL COLLOQUIA**

During the fall of '93 the Colloquium Committee presented a number of speakers. William Gesler from the UNC-CH Geography Department spoke on therapeutic landscapes. Peter Hervik introduced himself to the departmental community through his talk on methodological and epistemological implications of studying cultural models in practice. Carla Freeman spoke about her work in Barbados, presenting "High-Tech and High Heels in the Global Economy." V.Y. Mudimbe, from the anthropology department at Duke, presented "Tales of the Faith: African Religion as Political Performance." In spring '94 our speakers were: Lila Abu-Lughod, New York University, discussed her recent work on modernization in a Nile village, including her own and local audience commentary on a popular Egyptian soap opera. Judith Farquhar outlined the changes that are taking place in the popularity of traditional Chinese medicine as a result of the emergence of a market-oriented economic system. Viranjini Munasinghe, a Rockefeller Fellow at UNC-CH this year, discusses the persistence of East Indian ethnic identity in Trinidad and the persistence of East Indians as a political force in that country. Louise Lamphere, University of New Mexico, discussed her recent work on working women of color in New Mexico and the variations in gender roles that have appeared as a reflection of differing access to jobs in the local economy. David Chand, a Nuer political scientist from southern Sudan, presented an insider's view of the struggle of the Nilotic peoples for self-determination and religious freedom in southern Sudan and their plans for an independent future. Kamala Visveswaran, New School for Social Research, gave a talk entitled "Toward a Feminist Ethnology." Margaret Weiner presented "Optical Allusions: Bali and the Epistemology of Empire." Nancy Abelman, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, discussed her research in South Korea in her talk "Social Mobility Narratives in Contemporary South Korea: Women, Class, and History." Gayle Fritz, Washington University, delivered a speech on the topic "Seeking Early Farmers in the Lower Mississippi Valley: Finding Complex Fisher-Gatherer-Hunters." Finally, Margaret Scarry, gave a talk entitled "Chronological and Social Variation in Foodways in the Moundville Chieftdom."

The c oloquium drew interdisciplinary audiences and evoked brisk discussions.
Dr. C. Margaret Scarpy, formerly a research archaeologist at the University of Kentucky Museum of Anthropology, accepted our department's invitation to join us as an Assistant Professor. Dr. Scarpy received her PhD in 1986 from the University of Michigan.

Dr. Scarpy specializes in archaeology and paleoethnobotany. Much of her research in the southeastern United States has involved the analysis of archaeological plant remains and centered on the articulation between subsistence economies and social relations of the Native Americans and early colonists who lived in the region. Her dissertation research and much of her subsequent investigations have addressed the late prehistoric Moundville chiefdom of west central Alabama. She also has conducted archaeobotanical research at Spanish colonial sites in Florida, including St. Augustine and several Apalachee missions. Her Spanish colonial research focused on European adaptations to the Caribbean and Southeastern environments and their incorporation of Native American foods and technology.

Dr. Scarpy's research in the American Southeast will further enhance our department's strong program in that area. Dr. Scarpy has an excellent record of involvement in large, long-term research projects in the Southeast and of attracting funding for archaeobotanical research. She is continuing her research on the Moundville polity by examining how foodways varied between communities, status groups within communities, and social settings. In collaboration with her husband, John Scarpy, she is beginning a project that will investigate the economic and social organization of the Late Woodland, West Jefferson communities that gave rise to the Moundville chiefdom. She is also involved in several other investigations of late prehistoric societies in the southeastern United States through her archaeobotanical studies of plant remains from the Powers Phase sites in Missouri, from the Parkin site in Arkansas, and from the Bottle Creek site in Alabama.

Dr. Scarpy is the author of numerous articles. Some recent titles include: "Variability in Late Prehistoric Corn from the Lower Southeast," in Corn and Culture in the Prehistoric New World, "Plant Production and Procurement in Apalachee Province," in The Spanish Missions of La Florida, and "Herbs, Fish, Scum, and Vermin: Subsistence Strategies in Sixteenth Century Spanish Florida," in Columbian Consequences, Volume II (with Elizabeth J. Reitz). She has co-authored (with Elizabeth Reitz) a seminal monograph on subsistence analysis in historical archaeology, Reconstructing Historic Subsistence with an Example from Sixteenth-Century Spanish Florida, published by the Society for Historical Archaeology. She edited a volume on the archaeobotany of the eastern United States, Foraging and Farming in the Eastern Woodlands, published by the University Press of Florida. She has also written a more traditional archaeological monograph, Archaeological Investigations of the Riverbank Stabilization Project at Moundville, on salvage investigations at the Moundville site.

* * *

Dr. Margaret Weiner, who formerly taught at Franklin & Marshall College, has joined us as an Assistant Professor. She received her PhD in 1990 from the University of Chicago in Social Anthropology. She has an MA in Anthropology from Columbia University and a BA in Philosophy from Barnard College.

Her research interests include colonialism and postcolonialism, representations of Third World peoples, and constructions of knowledge. Most generally, she is interested in the historically mediated cultural imagination, both Euro-American and Indonesian. Much of her work so far has stemmed from ongoing research into Balinese epistemologies and rhetorics and Euro-American representations of the exotic. She has explored such themes as the hidden power relations of museum exhibitions, Dutch Orientalism, constructions of identity, practices of knowing, and the politics of Indonesian public culture in such domains as history and state-sponsored ritual.


Currently, she has two projects underway. Continuing her Bali research, she has been working with Balinese friends on texts about ritual and the past. Since such materials pose interpretive challenges even for Balinese, her goal is to understand how people learn to make them intelligible. She has also started research on the relationship between colonialism, constructions of modernity, and magic. By looking at a variety of sources—travel literature, newspaper reports, fiction, anthropological literature, film, state-sponsored propaganda—she hopes to explore the links between the political and cultural exclusions of colonial and postcolonial societies and anxieties over, contempt for, and attractions to, the kinds of discourses and practices Euro-Americans refer to as "magical."

* * *

Dr. Carla Freeman joined the department in fall '93 on a Post-Doctoral teaching appointment. Her PhD is from Temple University (1993) in Anthropology; her BA (Anthropology), from Bryn Mawr College (1983). Her research has focused on a
number of themes including gender, transnationalism, and popular culture. Dr. Freeman's dissertation fieldwork focused on the "off-shore" informatics industry in the Caribbean (Barbados and the Dominican Republic)—where multinational corporations now enlist the labor of Third World women to perform high-tech service work, thanks to new telecommunications facilities and computer technologies. This research brought together her interests in gender, development, and transnationalism, and the relationships between production and consumption, resistance and harmonization in the context of workplaces that simultaneously appear generically futuristic (highly disciplined and computer-centered) and traditionally West Indian (matrifocal and market-like).

Following two years of fieldwork in the Caribbean, Carla was asked to design and teach the two inter-disciplinary courses that constitute the new Women's Studies Program of the University of the West Indies in Barbados (1991-1992). She has published articles based on her dissertation research for both academic and popular audiences (Cultural Anthropology, 1993; Caribbean Week, 1992, Listen Real Loud, 1991). She now has a contract to publish High-Tech and High Heels in the Global Economy with Duke University Press. Earlier publications addressed women's multiple roles as producers/reproducers in Kenya (Critique of Anthropology, 1988), and the reinvention of home-based work in the "computer age" (Anthropology of Work Review, 1991).

She is currently leading a working group with Dr. Orin Stern of Duke University Anthropology Department entitled "Gendered Identities and Transnationalism" for the Duke-UNC Latin American Studies Program.

Observation. Dr. Hervik's interest in the interplay between local and external cultural models is also pursued by deconstructing his own social relations to a small corner group of Mayan people with whom he worked. From here native, interactional, and anthropological reflexivities are distinguished and the issue of social experience brought into a more general context in a book co-edited with Professor Kirsten Hastrup called Social Experience and Anthropological Knowledge (see review this issue). While in Chapel Hill Dr. Hervik has been working on a book based on his fieldwork dealing with social categorization, subjectivity, and lived identity of the Yucatec Maya people.

Dr. Hervik currently serves as editor of Folk: The Journal of the Danish Ethnographic Society. For information about the journal, contact Peter at:

Institute of Anthropology
University of Copenhagen
Frederiksholms Kanal 4
DK-1220 COPENHAGEN K
DENMARK

Faculty and Student Grants

Lesley Bartlett received a Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowship (1994-95; $5000 plus tuition) from the Institute of Latin American Studies at UNC-CH to study Portuguese.

Jennifer Coffman received a Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowship (1994-95; $5000 plus tuition) from the Center for International Studies an UNC-CH to study Kiswahili through the African Studies Dept.

Carole Crumley, Tom Hargrove, Elizabeth Jones, Sara Bon received a grant ($518,000) from NEH for an archaeological/ethnographic study of rural settlement in Burgundy from the late Iron Age through the medieval period.

John Doerfler received the Tinker Foundation Fellowship for summer pre-dissertation research ($1500) from the Institute for Latin American Studies, for research in Ecuador during the summer of 1994. He explored sites affected by corporate development and studied its impact on land use and the environment.

Dorothy Holland and Jean Lave received notifications that the School of American Research will fund their conference, History in Person: The Mutual Constitution of Endemic Conflict and Enduring Identities, scheduled for October, 1995.

Clark Larson and Bonnie McEwan (Florida Bureau of Archaeological Research) received $40,000 from the NEH, with a promise of $14,000 additional in matching funds, for a two-year project entitled "Archaeological and Bio-cultural Investigations in the Church at San Luis."

Greg McPhee received a Foreign Language Area Studies Fellowship to study Korean at Indiana University during summer, 1994. The fellowship covers room, board, tuition, and fees.

Donald Nonini was a Faculty MURAP Fellow in the Institute for the Arts and Humanities during summer, 1994. He is working on a book-length manuscript on the formation of identities among Chinese working-class men in contemporary urban Malaysia within the context of late British colonial rule, Malay postcolonial nationalism and homogeneity, and the emergence of the Asia-Pacific region in the global economy. In addition he served as mentor for a minority undergraduate in the Minority Undergraduate Research Assistant Program (MURAP). Nonini has also received a course development grant from the Mellon Foundation and College of Arts and Sciences at UNC-CH, for work during summer, 1994 on a course meeting the Cultural Diversity Perspective entitled "Space, Culture, Power."

Eric Poncelet has been awarded a Belgian American Educational Foundation Graduate Fellowship ($11,000) to conduct dissertation fieldwork in Belgium during the 1994-1995 school year. He will research environmental groups and industrial
corporations in Belgium which are taking action to deal with current environmental problems. His dissertation proposal is “The Cultural Production of Environmental Action: A Comparative Study.” Patricia Samford was a Winterthur Research Fellow ($1000) at the Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum, Winterthur, Delaware. During June, 1994, she researched English printed earthenware of the 19th century. Elizabeth Van Deventer has been awarded a one-year $10,000 Mellon Foundation Interdisciplinary Pre-doctoral Traineeship from the Carolina Population Center. The award also includes tuition and fees plus travel support for meetings. The traineeship is for anthropologists to gain a background in population issues, especially in Africa.

(UN) FIXING REPRESENTATION

Along with two other UNC-CH professors, Judith A. Farquhar organized "(Un)Fixing Representation," a conference sponsored by the UNC-CH Program in Social Theory and Cross-Cultural Research and the University Center for International Studies. The conference, held January 21-22, 1994, drew 250 people to presentations that questioned the relationship between representational material and that which it represents. The speakers—Donna Haraway, Adam Frank, Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, Peter Stallybrass, Patrick Brantlinger, Mary Kelly, and Timothy Mitchell—demonstrated, by their own empirical research as well as theoretical argument, how vital consideration of such issues drives research practice across disciplinary boundaries.

* * *

INTERPRETING CHINESE CULTURE

Judith A. Farquhar helped organize "Translation, Transcreation, Transportation: A Workshop in the Interpretation of Chinese Culture" held February 18-19, 1994 sponsored by the UNC-CH Curriculum in Asian Studies and funded by the Henry Luce Foundation.

* * *

NEWS FROM THE ANTHROPOLOGY STUDENTS SOCIETY

A.S.S. (the 'movement' to change the name failed) began the '93-'94 year by welcoming the incoming class and sharing [un]official information with them. In addition to the traditional fall and spring picnics, highlights this past year included an A.S.S. and department sponsored reception for faculty who had a book published in 1993. The book display table was quite impressive! Second semester brought elections and these results:

Co-Presidents: Lesley Bartlett
               Ken Williamson
Vice-President: Marco Brewer
GPSF Senator: John Doerfer

On a sad note, the department's volleyball equipment was permanently borrowed by an unknown felon over the summer. This has not stopped us from playing, although we would like to get back to our own court. Donations for new goods are welcome—send to the department c/o Dr. Robert Daniels.

BA Degrees Awarded

The following students received their BA degrees in Anthropology at the December, 1993 or May, 1994 Commencement:

* honors
** highest honors

Adam Jacob Amante
Kristen Ann Beifus
Benjamin Hodges Davis
Daniel David S. English
Jason Aaron Eshleman *
Virginia H. Fishburne
Muriel Taylor Flanagan
Barbara Shaffer France
Warren Glen Fryar
Amanda Jocelyn Gamble
Deepthima Krishne Gowda **
Rebecca Marie Haynes
Patti Jean Hicks
Thurston Cleveland Hicks
Jennifer Susan Jones
Valerie Darlene Jones
Jennifer Lee Kolb

Steven Jefferson Kurtz
Eleanor Alice Law
Mary L. Lowe
David Michael Mauldin
Sarah Grace Minnemeyer
Julia Kendall Morgan *
Patsy Marie Nix
Carlos William Reina
Brian Scott Riedel **
Megan Lee Riley
Wendy Alicia Robinson
Katharine Whitney Shonerd
Lisa Anne Smith *
Nathan Peter Snider
Jonathan Richard Walz **
Elizabeth Lee Williamson
Brian Jay Witt

* * *

MAs & PhDs

The following students successfully defended their theses or dissertations and received the MA or PhD degree:

I. Randolph Daniel (PhD, May 94)
Dissertation: Hardaway Revisited: Early Arctic Settlement in the Southeast

M. Ann Holm (PhD, May 94)
Dissertation: Continuity and Change: The Zooarchaeology of Aboriginal Sites in the North Carolina Piedmont

Timothy P. Mooney (MA, May 94)

Sandra Smith-Nonini (MA, Dec 93)
Thesis: Insurgent Health: Contesting Biomedical Hegemony in El Salvador
Student Awards

The Honigmann Prize The award of $100 is given each year to the outstanding UNC-CH graduate student in sociocultural anthropology.
93-94 Lesley Bartlett

The Manning Award The award of $50 is given each year for the outstanding dissertation.
93-94 Isaac Randolph (Randy) Daniel: Hardaway Revisited: Early Archaic Settlement in the Carolina Piedmont

Pelgar Award The award of $50 is given each year to a graduate student in recognition of successful work in applied anthropology.
93-94 Jennie Smith

Honigmann Award The award of $50 is given each year to the student who completed the best undergraduate honors project.
93-94 Deepthiman Krishne Gowda

* * *

New Students


David Fowler (BA, Anthropology, 1992, University of Rochester) Interested in political anthropology, ethnicity, issues of political inscription, contestation and reproduction, in Latin America and in the Middle East.

Britt Dee Harville (BA, History, 1993, University of Chicago) Interested in cultural studies, issues of experience, identity, discourse, and ideology, in the U.S.


Marianne Reeves (BA, Physical Anthropology, 1992, University of Virginia; Certificate of Graduate Study, Museum Management, 1994, University of South Carolina) Interested in paleopathology, skeletal biology and skeletal response to environmental stress, in the Near East and South America.

Christopher Rodning (AB, Anthropology, 1994, Harvard University) Interested in exchange networks among Mississippian and protohistoric populations, in southeast North America.

Sanjay Shahani (Diploma FAMU-Special, Documentary Filmmaking, 1989, Academy of Art, Prague, Czechoslovakia; MEd, Education, 1994, Queen's University) Interested in political economy, ethnicity, nationalism, ethnopolitics, colonialism, in India, and in South Asian diaspora in the U.S.

Susan Shaw (BA, Anthropology, 1991, Hampshire College) Interested in issues of identity, difference, community health and health care, in the contemporary U.S.

Bram Tucker (AB, Anthropology, 1994, Ohio University) Interested in ecology and evolution of culture, hunters and gatherers, mathematical models of optimal foraging.

Heather Walden (BA, Anthropology, 1993, Wayne State University) Interested in meaning of illness, decision-making, aging and gerontology, AIDS and HIV; addictions, including alcoholism, drug abuse, and food addictions, in the Ukraine.

DONORS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY

Anonymous
L. Jarren Barnhill
Paul Frederic Benjamin
Douglas Wesley Boyce
Margaret Ann Eisenhart
Patricia Anne Evans
Deborah Hallman Funderburk
Paul Randolph Green
John Robert Halsey
Charles William Hailey, Jr.
Eleanor Lynn Kay
Marita Fulton Kenyon
Richard Herbert Kimmell
Andrew Bryon Kipnis
Ann Kumar
Pamela Brown Kumar
Melissa Ann Lefko
Christine Joy Loken-Kim
Florence Mackenzie McMillan
Sandra Lynn Morgan
Tracy Taft Morton
Elizabeth Penton Mullen
Linnea Carol Ogren
Holy Peters-Golden
Paulette Pridgen
James Jefferson Reid, Jr.
Ananda Joanne Rowan
Teresa Glover Rutherford
Marc Jay Siegel
Kimberly Gruber Smith
Richard Harry Solomon
Carroll Delaney Spivey
Susan Buck Suttion
Joanne Taylor
John Allen Walshall
Donald M. Nonini

* * *

DONORS TO THE RESEARCH LABORATORIES OF ANTHROPOLOGY

Sandra Wright Ahrons
R.P. Stephen Davis, Sr.
R.P. Stephen Davis, Jr.
Richard P. Gravely, Jr.
Robert Winston Keeler
Clarence Kluttz
Lydia Gutierrez Lewis
Paulette Pridgen
Vincas P. Steponaitis

Donations should be addressed to The Arts and Sciences Foundation; New West; CB #6115; The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27599. Indicate the Department of Anthropology or the Research Laboratories of Anthropology as recipient.
LETTERS FROM THE FIELD

Eric Lassiter, ABD in the Social Systems Program, has spent the last year in Anadarko, OK working on his dissertation.

As many of you know, I have been working in southwestern Oklahoma in the Kiowa, Comanche, and Kiowa-Apache (KCA) community since 1988. I spent the summer organizing my notes and song recordings. Lately I've been finding some direction. My ideas seem to change weekly, but generally, I am attempting a collaborative ethnography on Kiowa song—one of the most vibrant song traditions in the area.

As English has replaced the vernacular use of Native language (except among elders), the KCAs have become further consolidated politically. Musical expression, especially the many KCA dance societies, has emerged as an important nucleus for the community. Many people here associate the loss of language with the loss of "culture," and sentiment about the importance of song seems to follow suit. A song text provides an example: "Where are the old people? Where have they gone? They have left us. The songs are the only thing we have left."

Defining Native American peoples in terms of musical sound challenges both popular and anthropological portrayals. While popular imagery and ethnographic descriptions rely on what can be seen (i.e., written), for the KCAs what is heard is the key. At their gourd dances (the most popular dance here) no one wears elaborate "Indian" dance outfits, which bores tourists and onlookers who have come to take pictures of "real Indians." But the KCA participants know hundreds of songs that convey powerful statements about what it means to live, and participate, in the community. (And lets not forget that it's just plain fun.) Anthropologists usually view these events and interpret them through simplified acculturation models. Ethnohistoric, symbolic, or ethnicity models do not entirely resolve this problem either, especially the subjective encounters with the many components of song. What people call "Spirit," a supernatural component, is intrinsic to musical sound, for example. Individual experience and encounter thus have emerged as my bases for understanding song's discourse within the community.

The most rewarding aspect of my latest sojourn has been narrowing the gap between the field work process and the written text. Discussing the ethnography day-by-day with my consultants has produced many insights both into the community and my own assumptions. My long-time friend, Billy Evans Horse, has been with me throughout this project. Our talks after his readings of my work have been priceless. We have had some involved debates, giving me both the opportunity to understand more fully his viewpoints and the occasion to clarify (and even recast) my research goals. Lately I have become more interested in how ethnography might provide well-informed critiques of how Native people are understood within anthropology and American society. Understanding this community in terms of musical sound presents a striking contrast. Billy's experiences with anthropologists over the past sixty-five years have provided the deepest insights into these epistemological problems. Archival research, for example, seems to be the cornerstone of Native American studies at the University of Oklahoma. Ethnography (especially conducting interviews) is compared with ethnohistorical documents to construct change and continuity narratives, with little regard for the discrepancy between Euroamerican concepts of history and how KCAs tell, interpret, and engage their own past. Anthropological and community constructions of history are intimately linked and this only complicates the problem. The recognition of this dilemma is nothing new, of course; but, a reading of many Oklahoma University dissertations, master theses, and books from OU Press seems to reveal a rather large gap between Oklahoma's Native communities and their representations.

Many anthropologists continue to justify their research with the "salvage ethnography" motif. This philosophy has produced an interesting relationship between anthropologists and "their Indians" in Oklahoma. Anthropologists are expected to act, ask, and write in the Boasian mode. Trying to break out of this mold has been difficult sometimes. When Billy and I discussed our dialogues as I have represented them in my early dissertation chapters, he wondered if I might be reprimanded for detailing his criticisms of anthropologists. (Billy often cites James Mooney's case. During Billy's grandfather's era, Mooney was barred from research here when he criticized the federal government and missionaries in an effort to defend KCA peyote rights.) Such discussions have forced me to identify and explain goals for my research that are responsible and relevant both to my consultants and to the discipline.

So news from this field site reports "collaboration is good." Though I am not sure if complete collaboration is possible (after all, I'm the only one who works on this stuff every waking moment), involving my consultants in the written product has proven very rewarding so far. I am sure if I were writing in Chapel Hill my text would suffer markedly. But writing here has its drawbacks. I miss everyone there. I especially miss the Chapel Hill music scene. I tried an Oklahoma bluegrass concert a while back, but it just was not the same.

Eric Lassiter

Tricia Samford, third year graduate student in archaeology, was Field Director for an excavation at Somerset Plantation in eastern North Carolina this past summer.

As I write these notes, it's 6 a.m. and the sun is beginning to rise over Lake Phelps. The great horned owls are swooping down across the yard in search of one last meal before retiring to the gloom of the cypress swamp for the day. In the house behind me, the rest of the field crew is beginning to stir.
It's mid-August and we're working at an archaeological excavation in eastern North Carolina at Somerset Place. This plantation, among North Carolina's largest in the 19th century, was once home to the Collins family and their 300 slaves. On its 125,000 acres, the slaves created farmland from the swamp using a complex series of canals and locks. Corn was the primary crop grown at Somerset, but there was also a thriving sawmill industry using the cypress trees cleared for the fields.

The only original plantation structures now left standing are the main plantation house and the outbuildings associated with its immediate operations. Typically no traces remained of any of the buildings where Somerset's African and African-American slaves had lived, worked, raised their families and died. To remedy this situation, the plantation is going to reconstruct some of the houses and other buildings associated with the slave community at Somerset. But before that can be done, archaeology needed to be done on the below-ground remains of these buildings (two houses, a chapel, a kitchen complex, and a slave hospital). I'm working for a private archaeology contracting firm, the Diachronic Research Foundation of Columbia, South Carolina, with a crew of eight professional archaeologists.

While the project has been exciting and successful, it has had its share of frustrations as well. The weather has a mind of its own at Somerset. The proximity of Lake Phelps sometimes diverts rain and thunderstorms away from Somerset, but it took awhile for me to recognize these distinctive weather patterns. Thus, we spent time covering the site with sheets of plastic to protect it from storms that blew over without touching us. But, just as often, the sky could be blue and clear, and five minutes later we were drenched to the skin, running about trying to protect cameras, notes, surveying equipment, and the site. Intense heat, humidity, and biting insects are a combination of which I never want to see again, have also plagued us—but these are standard archaeological problems. A bit harder to get used to has been the isolation. Running out to get a quart of milk is a major operation; so we've learned to plan our trips to town with care. We live in the caretaker's cottage at the plantation. Working and living with people who were strangers a few short weeks ago has caused some frustrations and tensions, but most problems work themselves out.

Some of the same factors which have caused frustration here have also brought rewards. African and African-American slaves, and farmers up until the present day, through backbreaking labor have cleared an enormous stretch of land which provides a sweeping vista of the sky and all of its moods. That vista, combined with the total darkness at night, provided us with a spectacular background for viewing the Persiadian meteor shower in mid-August. Red wolves, grey foxes, black bears, deer, nutria, tree frogs, and piliated woodpeckers have kept company with the great horned owls and provided us with nature breaks. Several times weekly we enjoy freshly caught brook from Lake Phelps.

The archaeology has been fantastic. The sites have suffered remarkably little later disturbance, and we have been able to gain architectural details which will enable the architectural historians to reconstruct more accurately the buildings. More interesting to me are the quantities of everyday debris that were discarded in the yards of the structures. It is possible to see how the Africans and African-Americans of Somerset lived their daily lives. The types of possessions they owned are revealed in the broken dishes, bottles, buttons, and musical instruments. Animal bones and fish scales tell us the types of foods they ate. The small size of these chopped bones suggest that the slaves were preparing stewed foods in West African fashion. Beads reminiscent of those worn by West African women as symbols of status and for their protective powers, have turned up with regularity in the area around the houses along the slave street. Somerset Place Plantation, with its excellent historical documents and well-preserved sites has turned out to be an ideal place to study the retention of West African cultural traditions in North America.

Well, the sky over the lake tells me it's going to be a clear and cool day. It's 6:30—time to start digging.

Tricia Sanford

---

Gove Griffith Elder (PhD, 1982) welcomes responses to his Opinions article. Contact him at 412 Hickory Drive, Chapel Hill, NC 27514, or telephone (919) 967-5403.

Patricia A. Evans (MA, 1986; ABD) of Washington, DC, joined the staff of the American Anthropological Association January 3, 1994 as Director of the Association's first Minority Issues in Anthropology program. Evans comes to the Association from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, where she monitored and assessed research projects. She also staffed the Board's Cultural Diversity and Equity Panel.

Evans holds a Master of Arts in Anthropology and is completing her dissertation for a PhD in Anthropology from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. At North Carolina, she was a University Fellow and a National Science Foundation Fellow. As a long-time resident of Washington, DC, she has been active in numerous civic activities and served on the Boards of Directors of several nonprofit organizations. She has been a member of the AAA since 1988. Evans has written several papers, including coauthorship of "Education Strategies for the 90's," for the 1991 national Urban League report of "The Status of Black America."

Evans will work with the AAA Commission on Minority Issues in Anthropology to implement a series of initiatives designed to attract persons of underrepresented populations to the discipline and the Association.

Emmitt S. Frazier (BA, 1975) writes, "I would like to heartily recommend a most unusual and long-needed new publication of which there have been four issues to date: The Ancient American, P.O. Box 370, Colfax, Wisconsin 54730 (6 issues per year, $19.95). A recent issue contains articles on: Mound Builders, 'Georgia's Last Indian Gold Mine,' The Bimini Wall, and some unusual standing stones in Connecticut."

William E. Hooper (BA with honors, 1977) writes "I am a practicing hand/orthopedic surgeon in Roanoke, Virginia, who now wishes I had taken more comparative anatomy while an undergraduate! I'm married and have one son, with another on the way."

Robert W. Keeler (BA, 1971) writes: "Except for two years writing my dissertation in historical archaeology at Historic St. Mary's City, Maryland (1975-77), I've been in the Pacific Northwest since graduating from UNC in 1971. I've worked in small museums, taught anthropology classes at Portland State University and Portland Community College, done contract archaeology, worked for the Oregon Council for the Humanities, married (Sally Hopkins) and am raising a son (Peter) who is now..."
almost 12. That's it in a nutshell.

Right now I am looking forward to a three month sabbatical leave from my job in 1994 during which I hope to do several interesting things: continue my research on Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century Jewish tombstone inscriptions and iconography in the West Indies (Barbados in 1990, maybe Surinam in 1994), finish editing a diary and a memoir by two Civil War soldiers; the diary by a Pennsylvania regimental assistant surgeon and the memoir by an Iowa private (both Yankees, I'm afraid), and complete an article for the Oregon Historical Quarterly on the social history of baseball in early Portland (1860s).

About the only folks I'm still in contact with from the department of my era are Tom Reifeld at UNC-Wilmington and Keith Egloff in Williamsburg, Virginia. I'd love to hear about and from others. Thanks for putting AnArcheay Notes together.”

Associate Director, Oregon Council for the Humanities
Suite 225
812 Southwest Washington Street
Portland, Oregon 97205
(503) 241-0543

Andrew Kipnis (PhD, 1991) writes “I have just started as an Assistant Professor at Northern Kentucky University and am adjusting to teaching three to four courses a semester. This summer I hope to complete my book Producing Guani: Sentiment, Subject and Subculture in a Rural Chinese Village, with Duke University Press. Last year I was a postdoctoral fellow at the East-West Center in Honolulu and the year before that the director of a junior year abroad program in Beijing with the Institute for Asian Studies. The mix of research, teaching and administrative responsibilities has differed radically in each of these jobs. Though glad for the variety of experiences, I am thankful that I won't have to move again this summer! Though my new job and two year old son keep me busy, I would welcome visits from fellow scholars in the Cincinnati area. I may be reached at
The Anthropology Program, NKU, Highland Heights, KY
41099-2206; (606)572-6401;
KIPNIS@NKUVAX.BITNET

William Lachicotte (PhD, 1992) will begin a two year post-doctoral research fellowship at the Harvard Medical School, Department of Social Medicine in September. He will work with Byron Good and others on ethnographic studies of psychiatric practice, especially as it regards issues of race. The fellowship is funded by the National Institute of Mental Health.

Anne Larne (PhD, 1992) just completed a term as Postdoctoral Research Associate in the Department of Behavioral Sciences, University of Kentucky School of Medicine. She moved in July to a research position at the Texas Diabetes Institute. Concurrently she becomes an Assistant Professor at the University of Texas Health Science Center, San Antonio. She will be conducting research with clinicians, health educators, and Mexican-Americans in order to develop more culturally sensitive patient education and treatment strategies for diabetes.

Kathryn J. Luchok (MA, 1984) received a PhD in Public Health in December, 1993, based on a dissertation titled Social Support and Women's Health During Pregnancy and Postpartum among the Yoruba of Nigeria. This work illustrates the value of anthropological thinking in international studies of women's health.

Charlotte Neely (PhD, 1976) has recently been named 1994-1995 Outstanding Professor at Northern Kentucky University where she is Professor and Coordinator of Anthropology. The award includes a $2,500 grant. She is the first anthropologist to receive the award, which recognizes excellence in teaching, research, and service to the community. Dr. Neely is the author of the book, Snowbird Cherokees, and numerous other publications. She does research with both North Carolina's Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians and Ohio's Shawnee Nation United Remnant Band. Neely is currently collaborating with Dr. Wendell H. Oswhat on the fifth edition of Their Land Was Theirs, a North American Indians textbook, and with South Carolina Educational Television on the film documentary, Snowbird Cherokees. She resides in Cincinnati, Ohio with her husband, attorney and anthropologist Thomas C. Donnelly, and their daughter, Bridgette. The Savannah native received her BA from Georgia State University and her MA and PhD from the university of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

John Gregory Peck (BA, 1972) is currently teaching at the University of Gdansk and also at the Medical Academy in Gdansk, Poland. E-mail address is POLAG@halina.univ.gda.pl and the home telephone number is 56-93-81. I'm hoping to do some work on the privatization process underway in the medical professions. I would welcome correspondence and/or visits, if you are in the area.

My address is Pilow 12A/6

Dick Preston (PhD, 1971) was through Chapel Hill recently on a "nostalgia trip." He is a professor at McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario. His work focuses on the Cree of James Bay.

As a lead into next issue's Opinions column, two UNC-CH graduates share their experiences in multi-disciplinary settings.

Laurie Price (PhD, 1984) is currently an Associate Professor at Northern Arizona University.

At the National Institutes of Health researchers have discovered "ethography"; the term approaches "buzzword" status in some quarters. A Branch director at the National Institute on Drug Abuse even came to the AAA meetings last year in Washington to chat with anthropologists about ethnography. The galloping enthusiasm for ethnographic methods can lead to welcome windows of opportunity. There may also be some blind alleys en route.

New opportunities include the following: offers to collaborate in multi-disciplinary projects (typically receiving some percentage of one's salary); increased credibility in submitting federal grant applications as the principal investigator; heightened tolerance for ethnographic methods in grant proposals; jobs doing ethnographically informed community outreach; consultant work training non-anthropologists to use ethnographic approaches.

Why have the new opportunities come about? Two factors come to mind. First is the increasing employment of anthropologists outside academic anthropology departments. Second is the zing appeal of ethnographic findings. Several years ago, the employment balance for new anthropology PhDs tipped to a majority in non-academic jobs. In addition, many university anthropologists have found their niches in other disciplines, e.g., education, law, psychology, medicine, public health. As these individuals go about their work, they give ethnography name-recognition, and usually it's a good name. (Unfortunately, in some settings, ethnographic methods are simply adopted without the name, a serious problem of disciplinary slippage.)

To me, the zing of ethnographic findings comes from their source in (participant) observation. Practice theory, Bourdieu's habitus, and recent developments in cognitive theory, all point to the implicit and unconscious character of much cultural knowledge. Observation, usually in combination with interviewing, is the best way to get at this. Take my recent field
research on HIV transmission among intravenous drug users in northern Arizona: findings have been heartily promoted by the National Institute on Drug Abuse because the observation-based design revealed multiple ways that people can transmit HIV without directly sharing (re-using) needles. These actions are so unconscious that interviews are completely inadequate to uncover the patterns. Good ethnographic research gives one an "aha" feeling (Mike Agar said this, I think), and suggests new, exciting possibilities for understanding human experience and behavior.

So what about blind alleys? I'll lay them out briefly. Federal institutions are increasingly prepared to endorse ethnography, but it seems a piecemeal and conditional endorsement in many ways. Ethnographic data collection is approved, but it shouldn't take too long. Ergo the rise of "focused ethnography" and "back page ethnography" (written comments on the last page of a standardized interview). In NIH proposals, ethnography still does best if it is "piggilybacked" onto more standard (psychology, epidemiology) sampling and methodological design. Budgetwise, there is little tolerance for the time investment needed to analyze fieldwork transcripts and notes. Issues of global history and power, which characterize many current paradigms for ethnographic analysis, are not accepted. Usually, agencies find these irrelevant or even distasteful. There may be a preference for an "ethnographic" format that is standardized to allow cross-site comparisons. Finally, this type of ethnographic work usually does not find its way into anthropological discourse, thereby missing feedback and the chance to make a contribution.

In summary, there are new opportunities to celebrate for ethnography vis-à-vis the national research scene. Each of us can find a way to explore these, I believe, and also to negotiate the alleys described above.

** **

Anne Larme (PhD, 1992) is an Assistant Professor at the University of Texas, Health Science Center. With her permission we reprint a portion of a letter she sent to a faculty member a few months after she had begun a postdoctoral position with the National Institutes of Mental Health.

You have probably gotten some idea of the intense "enculturation" I have been undergoing this year, in the medical setting. It's been very interesting and I have been trying to make the most of it, and fit it into my career plans. One of the most striking differences is how the CVs of anthropology students and post-doctorates look compared to those of psychology and sociology students! (I have been participating in student evaluations and admissions decisions, plus post-doctorate hiring). It is not uncommon for a psychology student to come out with 10-15 publications by the end of his/her training, all co-authored. I hate the bean-counting aspects of this game (here in the medical setting). They seem to go more for quantity versus quality. I think anthropologists are still more concerned with quality. On the one hand I admire that; on the other, the reality is that in this part of academia there are more bean counters than people concerned with quality. I have seen some very superficial research since I have come here. Lots of numbers and fancy statistical procedures to impress people, but very shallow in scope and conceptualization. It is truly a different world. I have come to a deeper appreciation of my methods and approach through this confrontation with the "other," and have become much more secure now that I see what quantitative health researchers produce. I am now focusing on meshing my approach with theirs, and learning how to communicate and convince people about what I do. So far, so good. I have learned a lot. I guess the publications dilemma will lessen after I get my next job and stop straddling the fence. If I go into an anthropology department, I can follow the training I received at UNC-CH for writing in-depth, sole-authored papers and go for quality versus quantity. If I go into a medical or public health setting, I'll have to learn to produce multi-authored papers on data sets that are small in scope (as compared to an ethnographic project). I'll have to learn to write in a more formulaic, less creative, way. Right now I feel torn in both directions.

I also wanted to say that I am aware and appreciative of your approach to mentoring and training graduate students. Health psychologists in particular co-author and mentor more than most anthropology professors, and the record of their students attests to the value of this approach for everyone. I wish more anthropologists would adopt that style of mentoring. I wouldn't want to forego the quality research that anthropologists do, but I see no reason why closer mentoring in terms of research and publications couldn't be combined with high standards. Now anthropology grad is are at a disadvantage in terms of both publications and confidence when they come out. They have trouble competing with other social scientists for jobs. Lack of publications is a problem for anthropology department jobs, as well as for non-anthropology department/non-academic jobs, but more so for the latter.

Sometimes I think I should just stop trying to make it in the "outside" world and go back into an anthropology department where I fit better, according to my training at UNC-CH. But I like collaborative interdisciplinary research. It suits my personality better than the "lone ranger" approach of anthropology. When people are open to different perspectives in an interdisciplinary team, the process of exchange is tremendously exciting and productive. I've had to become much more explicit about what I do and why it's valuable (and valid). Besides the clarity, I've also learned that anthropologists aren't the only ones who do qualitative research. In fact there are a whole variety of methods such as the grounded-theory approach in sociology and phenomenological psychology. I've had to learn to explain how "anthropology's ethnography" is both similar and different, again with the benefits that come from being explicit.

What will I do next? The process is so interesting and challenging I will probably be stubborn and make life difficult for myself and continue to try to make a career in a medical or public health setting. (Note: see "Life After" for the outcome.)

** **
I would like to include the following announcement in the *Life After* column:

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

I would like to suggest the following topic(s) for the *Opinions* column:

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Other suggestions:

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

---
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