Toward a Public Anthropology

Don Nonini

Recently I've had many occasions to reflect on the meaning of anthropology and publics, and on the significance of anthropological work and public life. Long interested in the cultural politics of labor and gender among diaspora Chinese in Malaysia, I've come to see that it is impossible to examine this politics without a broader understanding of public life in and beyond Malaysia. In fact, transnational publics who span the "Asia Pacific" (or "Pacific Rim") are implicated in public life in the nation-states travelled by diaspora Chinese—as transpacific business elites, tourists, overseas students, smugglers, and labor migrants. Moreover, I'm currently involved with two faculty colleagues (Dottie Holand and Cathy Lutz) and five Research Associates in a very exciting collaborative research project that will focus over the next two years on the connections between economic restructuring, cultural production, and processes of estrangement from the "public sphere" in five North Carolina communities. I've found myself asking: What processes form publics in North Carolina—or exclude persons from them? Are the processes of economic restructuring in North Carolina—which are creating new disadvantages for so many people—compatible with participation in our public life under the rubric of "democracy"? Furthermore, I recently planned a conference for the Spring semester (oh yes, while "on leave") on the theme of "public anthropology"—a conference that addressed the theme of how anthropologists engaged in research on critical social issues can reach out to broader publics. As a faculty member recently blessed by tenure, I am also haunted by the indictment of American anthropology by Fredrik Barth, with whom I agree, that "the relative weakness of anthropology in American society has come about through a failure of senior persons [in the discipline] to speak out in public arenas." Closer to home, I've been reflecting on several years' teaching practice, and my experience last year as Director of Undergraduate Studies, as these bear on the most intimate constituency that I and other teaching anthropologists have—our public of students.

For these and other reasons, I now find myself at a peculiar crossroad in confronting public life and publics. I'd therefore like to employ this occasion to say a bit about anthropology, various publics, and issues of responsibility, work, and career. To start with, here's the theme statement for the conference mentioned above:

Environmental activists participate in the "Ruckus Action Camp" in Murphy, NC, June 14-22, 1997. These activists, demonstrating one version of public anthropology, prepared dramatic commentaries on Nigerian environmental concerns for deployment in public demonstrations.

"Anthropology as a profession and discipline is currently at severe risk of being viewed by an increasingly large number of people as obscure, irrelevant, and dispensable as a presence in our universities, not to speak of beyond the academy. Recurrently, anthropologists have had difficulty communicating the importance of anthropological knowledges, skills, and perspectives to broader publics. These include individual citizens and citizens' groups, those belonging to disenfranchised and underprivileged groups, and those working for non-governmental organizations, corporations, local, state and national government agencies—and, even, university students themselves.

"Yet, paradoxically, this is also a period in which anthropological knowledges are increasingly pertinent to confronting such pressing contemporary issues and problems as globalization and internationalization, environmental crises both global and local, the negotiation of cultural diversity and ethnic and racial difference, the uses and abuses of biocentrism, the increasing economic desperation of large numbers of citizens, as well as warfare, sexism, racism, and the widespread violation of human rights around the world. Moreover, the
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notes from the chair

Dorothy Holland

As a new chair, this was my first year for fully living the contradictory mission of the university as bureaucracy and center of academic leadership. One of my adventures involved a quintessentially hybrid (academic/bureaucratic) product periodically required by the university: a strategic plan for the department. Along with the rest of the faculty, I spent much time this year planning, assessing the future, and envisioning (what we hope will be) our place within it. While our many hours of work may turn out to be simply more water under the bureaucratic bridge, the process did sensititize me to the prophets and prophecies of the changing terrain of academic and anthropological practice. Writing this column now gives me the opportunity to reflect on the goals that we generated. Next year the department will be reviewed by external examiners. As we prepare for that review, we will no doubt revise the goals we laid out in this year's strategic plan. Nonetheless, this year's plan provides—refracted, of course, by the hybrid demands of the document—our preliminary assessment of the future.

Economic restructuring, globalization, and transnationalism are affecting universities (especially public universities), the disciplines, and anthropology. These "macro-changes" have been interpreted in various ways. William Reading's The University in Ruins (Harvard, 1996) argues that the Humanities, and modern universities in general, have—with the decline of the nation-state—lost a significant part of their unifying mission of promoting and protecting a national culture. In place of that mission is emerging a "discourse of excellence" that mimics the corporate world. One of the candidates for UNC's Dean of Arts and Sciences position recently predicted that the next fifty years will see the demise of departments; their replacements will be interdisciplinary units dedicated to solving contemporary problems. Jim Peacock, recent president of the AAA, continues to ask whether anthropology as it is now constituted can survive in the 21st century.

Macro changes are made local to the UNC-CH campus by actions and commentary. Support for public education is said to be declining, North Carolina legislators elected in 1994, for instance, so questioned the state university system that they produced 19 (!) different sets of requests to document such things as "faculty productivity," "faculty (teaching) workload," and "post-tenure review." In response, our relatively new Chancellor has taken special pains to (re)build connections between UNC-CH and the state's political leadership. Two of his initiatives to shape the campus

The new terrain demands that we increase our efforts to bring anthropological perspectives to public policy, public debate, the conduct of public institutions, and the leadership of interdisciplinary programs.

These changes set the institutional context for the Department of Anthropology. Anthropology is (and must be) remarkable for its interdisciplinary potential; our faculty and students actively take advantage of interdisciplinary opportunities. Members of our faculty, for example, actively work with twenty-four other scholarly units, serving as chairs or directors (Anthropology faculty currently head the Asian Studies program, the Ecology Curriculum, the University Center for International Studies, and the Research Laboratories of Archaeology), as members of advisory boards, and as affiliated and jointly appointed faculty. We are also successfully participating in the Chancellor's initiatives. Not only do we have an outstanding candidate for the "knock your socks off" professorship, but the Research Laboratories of Archaeology—which is centrally important to our department's faculty and graduate students—has recently received new technology funding to complete a spectacular compact disc that presents archaeological data for both scholarly perusal and pedagogical purposes.

How are we, as a department, interpreting and responding to this "future" terrain which is already at hand? Our strategic plan lists four goals that we hope to accomplish by 2001: 1) sustain and enhance the educational and scholarly excellence of the department; 2) fully implement our new undergraduate major; 3) contribute to the development of a more anthropologically aware citizenry; and 4) explore new directions for departmental emphases.

The new directions proposed for exploration are telling:

1. Contribute anthropological leadership to University-wide research agendas on contemporary social issues—e.g., the global environmental crisis; the internationalization and globalization of institutions, practices, and discourses; the uses and abuses of science, particularly as they impinge on fundamental redefinitions of life and on characterizations of human biological variation, and applications in the non-academic world; and the emergence of new forms of ethnic and cultural diversity and related social divisions.

2. Develop the new field of public anthropology.
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▼ 2 ▼
Anthropology as a profession and discipline is currently at severe risk of being viewed by an increasingly large number of people as obscure, irrelevant, and dispensable.

Methods associated with anthropology at its best—ethnography, historical and cultural-contextual interpretation, ecological and evolutionary analysis—provide some of the best working tools for members of such publics to confront these issues and problems. They are integrative, multidimensional, and interdisciplinary, and provide a distinctive means for understanding and anticipating cultural, technical and political innovation in a rapidly changing world."

The statement goes on to say that there are "preexisting tendencies toward disciplinary (and subdisciplinary, and sub-subdisciplinary, etc.) specialization within anthropology, within what can be seen as an increasingly ramified and intricate division of labor associated with the post-war academy. Increasingly, anthropologists write for and speak to a very small number of other 'peers'—anthropologists—those closest to their own specializations—and ignore other constituencies, except for those providing funding for their research. Teaching—a means of reaching another less specialized public—our undergraduate and graduate students—is often depersonalized, and almost always seen as an ordeal, taking time away from vital research tasks associated with professional career advancement."

"These practices are not only self-interested, but also represent a great disservice toward the discipline of anthropology, and toward the publics we ought to serve through our knowledge, but so often do not. They are both self-defeating and tragic. They are self-defeating because a discipline which cannot provide a convincing and compelling rationale for its existence and vitality to those who are not its practitioners is doomed to decline and eventual extinction—and there are many signs that, for anthropology, this process is already well underway. They are tragic because, as we noted above, both the knowledge and methods of anthropology have so much to offer to publics desperately in need of both."

So much for programmatic. What relevance does all this have given the political economy of American anthropology, taken in its broadest sense? All too briefly, I see anthropology as a discipline subject to the following constraints:

- A continued glut in the market for anthropology Ph.D.s for academic positions; for the last twenty years, anthropology graduate departments have produced, on average, 400 Ph.D.s per year, while over the last ten years alone, only between one third and one half have been hired to "tenure track" positions;4
- Increased casualization of and increase in size of the non-tenure-track/tenured academic labor force in anthropology, with a decrease in size of the tenure-track/tenured labor force, and a more distinct bifurcation between these two sectors;5
- The "leasing of the Ivory Tower," with pressures toward coopting natural and social science research, including that of anthropology, to serve private corporate interests through consultancies, corporate grants, endowed professorships, licensing and patenting agreements, etc.;
- An increase in the costs of higher education for students and taxpayers alike (in part due to the hidden cross-subsidies required by such leasing and the burden of an hyperchristianized administrative elite needed for its management5), leading to educational disenfranchisement for larger segments of the population;
- Connected to all of the above, a decreased legitimacy for the intellectual mission of the social sciences, with stasis or even decline in the size of departments teaching supposedly "irrelevant," "wasteful," and "non-applied" social science content and approaches, such as those of anthropology, with increased work loads (and more frustrating working conditions) for those who actually teach students;

(Cont. On Page 4)
all of the above factors working to the deep disadvantage of anthropology at publicly funded universities in particular, as the "voter rage" of the "angry American" against our public institutions (in the face of deep-lying economic anxieties and seemingly intransigent civil divisions) leads to further widespread decline in support for anthropology and other social sciences and humanities.

A period of deep crisis is not far off, and I have a few points to make in connection to it. First, in the face of the above developments, the very existence of American anthropology within and beyond the academy is at stake. It is urgent that anthropologists make a case for the continued viability and relevance of an anthropology that addresses crucial social issues, one with many distinctive voices and perspectives, but which uses language accessible to the new and broader audiences a public anthropology must learn to serve. As Barth pointed out, academic anthropologists, particularly those who are senior and graced with tenure, have a special responsibility—one that they have, in my opinion, so far failed miserably to undertake. This effort will require major reorientations in research agendas, teaching methods, preprofessional preparation, and assessment of professional performance if a public anthropology is to develop. Only through an anthropology that persuades multiple publics of the profound value of anthropological knowledges will our discipline find the allies it needs to survive into the next century, particularly in the face of the strong political and corporatist forces allied against it.

Second, the emergent bifurcation between the increasingly small number of academic anthropologists holding tenure-track and tenured positions and the expanding number of those holding insecure casualized positions must be overcome by an initiative on the part of the former, if a public anthropology is to flourish. We can't expect an increasingly demoralized number of our finest young anthropologists with no economic security, low "salaries" based on course piecework, and no work benefits, to engage in the original research for and communication to broader publics that is essential for a public anthropology. Anthropologists may need to relearn the meaning of "proletarianization," particularly as it applies to their own, and those with more privileges will have to show greater solidarity (and share more resources) with colleagues disadvantaged by the new academic labor market.

New Ph.D.s in anthropology will increasingly need to look for employment beyond the academy. Some will no doubt join the growing number of social scientists employed by corporations or engaged in the academic "leasing" alluded to above, as consultants and "experts" on the growing regions of the new global economy (e.g., the "emerging market" nations of Asia and Latin America), on managing multiculturalism or "cultural resources," on marketing research, transnational business activities, and so on. Although some may eventually become economically secure, they will engage in such work outside of a public anthropology that seeks to provide knowledges freely to broader publics, often historically disadvantaged ones; their "publics" are the private clientele who purchase them and limit the dissemination of their work. These anthropologists may or may not play "progressive" roles within the organizations for which they work, but that is another matter.

An increasing number of nonacademic anthropologists, however, will confront the opportunities and necessities of setting out on their own personally-defined paths of intellectual development within "civil society," between the academy on one side and private employers on the other. These trajectories promise no institutional guarantee of high salaries or tenure. As is true for some anthropologists at present, many will deploy their professional skills and knowledges by working occasionally or on a contract basis with or for development NGOs, local state, and federated governments, church groups, human rights organizations, et al., often while finding other paid employment to pay the bills. They will need to cultivate talents in improvisation, bricolage, and innovation. Yet their work may contribute most to a public anthropology because it aligns their professional practices with the requirements of communicating to and learning from the broader publics that anthropology, if it is to survive, must learn to confront.

They, like casualized academic colleagues, deserve solidarity and aid from more privileged anthropologists—not only for ethical or political reasons (although these do matter), but also because their work at its best can illuminate to the fullest the practice of public anthropology. And public anthropology, and indeed anthropology as a whole, need all the help they can get.

We can't expect an increasingly demoralized number of our finest young anthropologists with no economic security, low "salaries" based on course piecework, and no work benefits, to engage in the original research for and communication to broader publics that is essential for a public anthropology.

---


2. Frederick Barth, "How Others See Us: An Interview with Frederick Barth," Anthropology Newsletter, February 1997, p. 60.


9. Senior and more secure anthropologists can start by ridding themselves of an illusory meritocracy (like Weber's Protestant Ethic) that views casualization as a sign of having less professional promise, intelligence, or talent.
CAROLYN MERRITT retires after 30 years

After 24 years of distinguished service to the Department of Anthropology (and 30 to the University), Carolyn Merritt retired in June 1996 from her position of University Administrative Manager. She initially joined the Department as Administrative Secretary from having come from the Personnel Office only seven years after the Anthropology Department’s founding. At a time when basic departmental structures weren’t even in place, she adroitly applied her administrative skills, moving Anthropology from near-confusion to some semblance of order. As Professor Emeritus Donald Brockington recalls, “When she came here, things were a mess. She came in and straightened things out.” Professor Emeritus John Gulick, the Department’s first chair, wholly agrees, stating that “the Department would have fallen apart without Carolyn Merritt.”

In her long tenure with Anthropology, Ms. Merritt steered the Department through more than its share of tumultuous times, negotiating constant fluctuations in University funding, ever-changing administrative rules (and their accompanying file-in-triplicate format!), and recurrent shifts in staff and faculty. From her initial appointment as departmental secretary, Ms. Merritt expanded her skills and responsibilities to achieve the position of Administrative Assistant I in 1982. Six years later, she was promoted to University Administrative Manager. She grew into the job, and the job grew with her. When budgeting, registration, and other university operations went online, for example, she learned the ways of the computer and became a virtuoso of cyber-administration. Through careful, ongoing study, she mastered the complex and occasionally arcane rules of University and State administrative procedure, and used that knowledge to make all of our lives easier.

Department members particularly appreciated Carolyn Merritt’s perseverence and follow-through. She got work done despite the fact that it was often far more than one person could be expected to handle, no matter how experienced or able. “Carolyn Merritt gave students and faculty long service that was always informed and technically proficient,” recalls Bruce Winterhalder, department chair from 1991 to 1996. “Her strongest skills and daily achievements were invisible to most of us because she succeeded so often in shielding us from the day-to-day hassles of administering the Department. She did this well despite the often idiosyncratic and untimely demands brought to her by students and faculty alike.” Jim Peacock—twice chair while Ms. Merritt was at the administrative helm—echoes these sentiments, noting that “Carolyn was intelligent and savvy about how the system worked, and she served the Department well.”

Further Transitions

Carolyn Merritt’s departure was only one of many changes in the departmental office. Late last spring, Brenda Moore “went downstairs” to replace Estella Stansbury as Secretary for the Research Labs of Archaeology. Ms. Stansbury retired in April 1996 after putting in her 30 years of service (apparently the magic number). In a feature on Ms. Stansbury in the University Gazette, Vin Stepnovitzis wrote, “Estella has been an extraordinary asset to the RLA for the past 30 years. Her dedication to the University is unsurpassed, and her experience will be impossible to replace. We’ll all miss her greatly.” Ms. Moore says that she was initially nervous about stepping into Ms. Stansbury’s shoes, but that Estella helped make the transition smoother; “I really appreciated Estella’s help in getting me settled in this job. I’ve always had an interest in history, and archaeology is a very exciting field of study. As the only office assistant, most of the department’s business matters are directed my way, and I like being able to work in a relatively independent manner.”

Shortly after Ms. Moore’s move, Supronia Cheek received a long-overdue promotion from Office Assistant III to Office Assistant IV. During the long summer of 1996, when the Department struggled to find replacements for Ms. Merritt and Ms. Moore, Ms. Cheek single-handedly ran the office. Not only did she answer everyone’s questions, negotiate all the requisite paperwork, and do three jobs at once, but she also managed to orient Dottie Holland to her new job as Chair of the Department.

After Ms. Merritt’s retirement, a succession of capable temporary staff helped to smooth the transition while the search was underway for a new Administrative Manager. Ms. Elva Garza made a return appearance to the Anthropology Department after a brief stint here in 1988-1989 as Secretary III. Unfortunately her tenure here as Administrative Manager was cut short due to medical reasons. During Ms. Garza’s illness, Ms. Betty King helped to keep things running under Ms. Cheek’s capable direction. Finally the Department was fortunate to find—a long search—Ms. Kay Hill, formerly University Administrative Manager at the Department of Social Medicine. Ms. Hill has had a long and varied career in administration, ranging from Health Affairs to the Department of Radio, TV and Motion Pictures. She says that she was attracted to this position because it appealed to her sense of adventure: “I thought it would be a challenge. Academics has changed a lot since I was here before, and I’ve been looking forward to coming back.” Her goals for the coming year(s) are both varied and ambitious; they include securing better computer systems for faculty and students, and implementing new organizational procedures in the Department Office. We wish Ms. Hill luck on her plans, and are pleased to have her competent hands at the wheel of this often-wandering ship of fools . . .

Last but not least, the Department is happy to welcome Ms. Karen Dunn as Office Assistant III, thus completing (for the first time in a year!) the new office staff in Room 301. Ms. Dunn joined us in May 1997, from the Mebane (NC) world of real estate.

“This position has turned out to be as exciting and promising as it seemed in my first interview,” she said. “Carolina and Chapel Hill have opened up a whole new world for me.”
Looking Back

John Honigmann, June 7, 1994–August 4, 1977

On the twentieth anniversary of his passing, AnArchaey Notes would like to commemorate the life and accomplishments of John Honigmann, longtime UNC anthropologist and chair of the Anthropology Department from 1970 to 1975. Colleagues and former students alike remember him with affection and admiration.

Born in the Bronx, NY, Honigmann received his B.A. from Brooklyn College (1942) and his Ph.D. from Yale University (1947). In 1952, after teaching at the State College of Washington and New York University, Honigmann joined UNC’s Sociology Department. He was the first anthropologist hired in Sociology’s new Anthropology Curriculum (a program jointly developed by fellow faculty anthropologists John Gillin and Guy Johnson), and brought to UNC a distinguished record of ethnographic study among Native American communities in the Canadian North. In the next few years, Honigmann played an instrumental role in restructuring the Sociology Department to become the Department of Sociology and Anthropology. At the same time, he broadened his research interests, studying cultural patterns in an Air Force Bomber Squadron and conducting fieldwork in northern Pakistan.

In the late 1950s, Honigmann worked with John Gillin and colleagues in the Dept. of Epidemiology to found the program in Medical Anthropology. In the mid-1960s, he applied this same organizational energy to the creation of the Southern Anthropological Society, a regional association that benefited from Honigmann’s boundless enthusiasm and unflagging drive. He was elected president of the SAS in 1970; that same year, he became the second chair of UNC’s Anthropology Department, which had gained full departmental status in 1965. Two years after completing his chairmanship, in 1977, Honigmann was appointed Kenan Professor of Anthropology. Just four months later, he died of Parkinson’s Disease at age 63.

Honigmann’s many monographs on Native American cultures in the Canadian North, and his widely respected texts on culture and personality, demonstrate his deep commitment to recognizing the role of the individual in the construction of culture. Honigmann’s theoretical interests centered on processes of sociocultural change, acculturation, and development, and on the relationship between individuals, culture, and society. His The Development of Anthropological Ideas (Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey, 1971) remains one of the most balanced and thorough histories of anthropological thought.

As an active participant in department and campus activities here at UNC, John Honigmann and his wife Irma (who often acted as his co-researcher and co-author) regularly opened their home to colleagues and students. Fellow faculty members and past students remember Honigmann as a commitment and energetic departmental chair who “did not fear making hard decisions” and was “a formidable spokesman for what he considered right.” When especially passionate about an issue, Honigmann would even relinquish the chair at a department meeting in order to argue his case (Gulick et al. 1978: 634). His colleagues also remember Honigmann as a scholar of encyclopedic thoroughness and crisp lucidity.

---

Apologies

What would a newsletter be without its share of mistakes? In our last issue, we made a rather glaring one in misspelling the name of our faculty colleague, Margaret Wiener. Somehow, we managed to misspell her name directly above an image of her award-winning book, whose cover prominently displays the correct spelling. Our deepest apologies to Margaret.

---

JOHN HONIGMANN

Perhaps the best way to close this remembrance is to quote the eulogy read by faculty colleague John Gulick at John Honigmann’s funeral service on August 6, 1977:

We are here to give thanks for the life of John Honigmann and for the life he shared with us.

Last Spring, we rejoiced with him in his Kenan Professorship, hoping that he would live for an ample time to enjoy it. But though that was denied him, we know that he was blessed with satisfaction in his work. He gave himself to it and found joy in it, and his accomplishments were many. We admired his energy, discipline and devotion. We also learned to understand his passion for the integrity of the individual person—Eskimos, Indians, students, indeed all individuals in their struggles against the massive inhumanities of establishments, large and small.

Ruefully, we remember our disagreements and misunderstandings with him and the missed opportunities to know him better. But we know that these are among the realities of life, and the realities of life John Honigmann accepted, it seemed to us, with grace and lightness—but never with flippancy. If he was ever depressed, he never showed it to us nor burdened us with it. Rather, he always carried himself briskly, with vigorous step, and good-humored countenance.

We remember that not once, not twice, but countless times, John and Irma offered their kindness and hospitality to us. At their home, there were study groups with students, dinners for interesting visitors, and of course the annual picnic that grew larger every year. All were welcomed, and all partook of the warmth, the informality, the caring, and the good fellowship that prevailed.

We offer thanks for the life of John Honigmann. We offer thanks for his love for his family and for their love for him. We offer thanks for his love of his work, and for his love of life itself.

▼ 6 ▼
ENVIRONMENTAL IDENTITIES: in and against the environmental movement

Dorothy Holland recently received a $144,866 National Science Foundation research grant for a three-year study of environmental action. The study involves two universities, with Professor Willett Kempton directing a companion project at the University of Delaware.

Holland and Kempton will collaboratively address the apparent contradiction between the limited scope of pro-environmental action in the United States and the high degree of professed pro-environmental sentiment. They take the perspective that the environmental movement serves as a medium through which personal affect, understanding, and (especially) action toward the environment develop. Environmental groups vie directly with one another and with anti-environmental groups for legitimacy and authority, and indirectly with capitalist concerns that appropriate environmental sentiment to sell their products. In the welter of environmental messages—couched in words drawn from science or spirituality or fears about “radicals”—some environmental actions and actors get defined as significant and good, while others get ridiculed or overlooked. Within these social and cultural contexts, people gradually develop a sense of their place in the world of environmental action, and use this sense to reorient their action and reorder their lives.

Separate research teams will conduct fieldwork in North Carolina (where Dr. Elizabeth Taylor, Kim Buansi, and David Eckert are working with Holland) and in Delaware/Maryland, ethnographically studying different kinds of environmental organizations (e.g., an excessive consumer goods group, a property rights organization, an eco-populist group). They seek to learn about the groups as contexts for the construction of environmental action and the development of environmental identities. The teams will also conduct in-depth interviews with some 100 individuals who are either members of, or outsiders reacting to, these organizations. In addition to furthering anthropological theory about the ways that identity mediates between collective and individual action, the project will speak to debates between and among government agencies, activist groups, and corporations about the “public” and its environmental concerns. To partially accommodate the usual statistical couching of these debates, and to learn more about different environmental groups around the country, the project will conclude with a survey generated from the ethnographic research and administered nationwide.

Ford Seminar on Medical Cultures

Judith Farquhar of the Department of Anthropology, Della Pollock of Communication Studies, and the University Center for International Studies received a Ford Foundation grant for the 1996-97 academic year to fund a lecture and workshop series titled “Internationalizing and Diversifying Health Research: Cultural and Methodological Challenges.” The lectures by visiting speakers were co-sponsored by the University Program in Cultural Studies’ Medical Cultures program. These speakers gave public talks attended by both Ford Seminar and Medical Cultures people, and then appeared at the Ford Seminar workshops for more informal conversation in a multidisciplinary environment.

The goal of the Ford Seminar was to encourage and support multidisciplinary and exploratory research on medical and public health practices, cultural and national differences, illness experiences, and the complex relations among these broad domains. Presentations focused in particular on the relationship between social science and humanities approaches to research, and on the methodological challenges presented by these various approaches.

Visiting speakers included members of the UNC community, as well as:

- Paula Treichler, of the Institute for Communications Research at the University of Illinois/Urbana-Champaign, who has published widely on AIDS, sexuality and biomedicine;
- Margaret Lock, professor of Anthropology and Social Studies of Medicine at McGill University;
- Anne Balsamo, School of Literature, Communication and Culture at the Georgia Institute of Technology;
- Paul Farmer, physician and anthropologist;
- Arthur Frank of the University of Calgary;
- Hilde Nelson of the University of Tennessee;
- Allan Young of McGill University;
- Lisa Cartwright of the University of Rochester; and
- Bruno Latour, author of Science in Action, The Pasteurization of France, and We Have Never Been Modern.

The Ford Seminar provided opportunities for faculty and graduate students from many disciplines to meet and discuss compelling issues raised by visiting speakers. In the process, we were able to exchange views across disciplinary divides, opening up questions of research and method to critical and imaginative approaches from diverse quarters.
Fran's Unwelcome Visitation

by Diane Levy

In a surprise move last fall (September 1996), Hurricane Fran visited the Triangle, leaving a path of destruction and a few deaths. In Chapel Hill and the surrounding area, thousands of trees fell, including a fair number of the large old trees on campus. Amazingly enough, the Davie Poplar, wired to a number of trees around it, didn't fall. It may have tilted a little further from the storm, but it is still standing.

Fran did do some good. The lack of electricity and running water (for a couple of weeks for some) brought us closer together. Carla Jones let a number of fellow anthros store frozen blueberries and peppers in her freezer and was generous with her shower as well. Tricia Samford and I learned that quiches make the perfect après-hurricane meal because they use up most everything in the rapidly-warming refrigerator. Our gas stove helped. Tricia also discovered the meaning of resourcefulness the morning after the storm. Faced with coffee beans and no electricity (and a dire need for caffeine), she did a reasonable job with her mortar and pestle.

A year and a half later, signs of Fran are still abundant. Many trees are down around the area and there are even a few power lines that sag. At least the one held up by rope in front of Judith Farquhar's house has been jerry-rigged a little more permanently. Then there's the poison ivy—the News and Observer reported in June that this year's bumper crop of poison ivy is "Hurricane Fran's final assault on the Triangle," what with all the new open space from downed trees. We can only hope it's really the final assault.

Predictions for this year's hurricane season are for more storms than last year. But what's that they say about lightning?

Anthro-ball
Nomads Struggle for Life in New Court, Despite Fountain

Bram Tucker

For more than two decades, the weekly Anthro-Department volleyball game has been a thriving institution, binding together faculty, students, and random passers-by in a common bond of athleticism, teamwork, and mild competition. The game has provided a unique arena in which everyone from postmodernists to primatologists can join together, far away from the polemic concerns of the Discipline, in a common demonstration of the sad physical affects of staring at a computer screen too long. Except for random comments like, "You spike better than Foucault!" and "Even a knuckle-walker could hustle faster than you!", the players leave anthropology—the meat and marrow of their lives—behind once they enter the court.

In its heyday, the weekly volleyball game—traditionally played on Friday evenings around 4:30 (weather permitting)—regularly attracted more than a dozen anthropologists. Now the tradition barely survives, as a few brave torch-bearers struggle each week to find the requisite number of players to attempt a game.

The single greatest reason for the drop in volleyball enthusiasm is the loss of the traditional anthropology volleyball court. In the Golden Years of Anthro-ball, the game was played in the round sandy spot between the front entrances of Bynum Hall, Carr Building, and Playmakers Theater. Although this location was not perfect, it was close to Alumni Building and thus attracted scores of frantic students on warm Fall and Spring days. In the early years of Anthro-ball, the physically inept graduate student competed for the space with the residents of Car Building, which was then a dorm. Even after Car was converted into a bureaucracy building, Anthro-ball players had to contend with arboriculture interference ("tree ball!") and worse yet, traffic. The court stood in the center of a traffic roundabout. More than a few volleyballs were flattened by sport-utility vehicles.

The Golden Years ended with the coming of the Ugly Fountain (hereafter referred to as the "UF" for simplicity), which was constructed in 1995 at the center of the Anthro-ball court. Though the UF had been planned for years, the anthropologists did their best to delay its construction. An archaeological survey of the UF site recovered ancient remnants of culture, suggesting that volleyball had been played at this site for millenia. The survey also left a 1 x 1-meter test-pit in the court's northeastern corner; players cheerfully stepped around the hole, trusting that this spot would never be developed. But volleyball courts don't last forever, especially when the university thirsts for more fountains. Players arrived at the court one Spring day to find the site...

(Cont. on page 9)
Anthro-ball
(CONT. FROM PAGE 8)

destroyed.

While one anonymous graduate student has called the new UF "garish," he also pointed out the strange resemblance of the tiered stone benches—or whatever they are—to the earthwork tiers at the Poverty Point site in Louisiana.

Since the construction of the UF, Anthro-ball has adopted a nomadic existence. And in keeping with traditional anthropological theory, the shift from sedentary life to nomadism has dramatically reduced the population of participants. At first, in Spring 1996, under the brave leadership of chief Bob Daniels, the Nomads attempted to conquer the sand court between Grimes and Ruffin Dorms. However, competition with the young natives proved to be overwhelming, and the poorly adapted Nomads were scarcely able to move on the sandy terrain. Then, in Fall 1996, Nomad leader Joe Herbert lead the stragglers to Carmichael field, where they ran nimbly and freely in the grass again. Yet since this move, the number of participants has so dwindled that actual games have become impossible. The Nomads have yet to purchase donkeys or small-stock.

You can help save this dying tradition! Meet in Alumni Building, outside Bob Daniels's office, at 4:30 each warm Friday ...

Visit Anthropology on the Web!
http://www.unc.edu/anthro/

Fire up your favorite browser and jump to the Anthropology Department's new webpage. Here you can find information on current research projects, the Department, related University programs of interest, and biographical data on faculty and a few brave grad students. (Students—we need your bios!) Tell us what you'd like to see by clicking on the mail button, or send us your "Life After" form in this newsletter for inclusion in a possible new page on graduates from our esteemed Department.

UNC Society for Anthropology Students

Anthropology Student Brownbags

by Christopher Rodning

Sponsored by the UNC Society for Anthropology Students (SAS), student brownbag events remain a staple of life in the department at Chapel Hill. During academic terms in 1995 and 1996 many students and faculty in Anthropology and related departments contributed to workshops, presentations, and roundtable discussions, often held at lunchtime in the student lounge. The schedule for 1997 looks to continue the tradition. Brownbags provide a forum for students to present on current research, to rehearse academic conference presentations, and to get feedback from fellow students and teachers. It is important to note that while graduate students have led most of these programs, undergrads are encouraged to contribute—and have contributed—as lecturers and listeners.

Many of the presentations have focused on graduate field research and relied on slides. Julie Flowerday, for example, gave several presentations of her vivid images of landscapes and settlements in the mountains of northeastern Pakistan. Julie is interested in how landscapes have changed in the past several decades, and photography provides an excellent medium for comparisons and conversations with her consultants. Bram Tucker showed slides from his fieldwork among foragers and farmers of the arid woodlands of southwestern Madagascar. Bram is a human ecology student interested in the economic strategies of people traditionally characterized as hunters and gatherers, but whose participation in local and global markets is very complex. Jennie Smith gave a presentation on her ethnographic research and involvement in rural communities of Haiti. Part of her work relates to the activities of community organizations for agricultural workers. Hager El Hadidi spoke about Egyptian spirit possession cults. As part of her presentation, Hager played recordings of songs and translated them. An undergraduate anthropology major, Kitty Rainey, discussed archaeology at several prehistoric sites in the North American Southwest, comparing architecture from different locations (and telling stories about contending with forest fires while in the field!).

Other presentations provided graduate student opportunities to discuss their ideas for fourth-semester papers, dissertation chapters, or published papers, or to revisit earlier projects in an effort to revise and expand. Victor Briemberg gave a pair of lectures on the development of telemedicine technology in North Carolina (linking rural clinics to major regional hospitals) and its effects on the philosophy and practice of medicine. Marc David drew from previous ethnographic and historical research to discuss continuities and changes in carnival traditions among Cajun communities in southern Louisiana. Chris Rodning gave a presentation based on a paper prepared for an Appalachian archaeology conference and looked towards further dissertation research in the archaeology of western North Carolina. Rachel Watkins packed the house for her dynamic presentation on archaeological, osteological, and historical investigations of an eighteenth century African American cemetery in Manhattan. She discussed how African American funerary rituals in New York reflected African heritage and were adapted to conditions of life in this British colony and American city. Her presentation, like many others, drew interest from beyond the Anthropology Department.

Still other presentations have provided opportunities for students to rehearse papers written for academic conferences, including the following which were presented at annual meetings of the Southeastern Archaeological Conference. Chris Rodning gave a paper on aboriginal water travel on waterways of the northern Gulf Coastal Plain of Alabama, Mississippi, and Florida, and a paper on Cherokee gender traditions as reflected in the spatial layout of burials and buildings at an archaeological site in N.C.'s Appalachian Mountains. Jane Eastman discussed the archaeology of communal feasting at 17th- and 18th-century villages on the Dan River in north-central North Carolina. Liz Monahan gave a paper coauthored with Trawick (CONT. ON PAGE 10)
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Colloquia and Related Talks

Bill Lachineotte

During 1997's Spring Semester, the Department organized a series of nine colloquia that exhibited the usual diversity of academic fields, research topics and geographic sites. We heard and discussed the work of scholars and researchers from within the Department and across the University, and from universities and organizations elsewhere. The following is a brief list of speakers and their topics.

1/9 Margaret Conkey (Anthropology, UC-Berkeley), “Beyond Art and Between the Caves”

1/29 Keith Wailoo (Social Medicine, UNC-CH), “Pain and Suffering in Memphis: Representations of Black Health in the 20th Century American South”

2/19 Catharine Newbury (Political Science, UNC-CH), “Genocide and Politics: Rethinking Ethnicity in Rwanda”


3/19 Ken George (Anthropology, Univ. of Oregon), “Designs on Indonesia's Muslim Communities: Art, Islam, and the Public Sphere” (colloquium cosponsored by the Curriculum in Folklore and the University Center for International Studies)


4/16 Alan Benjamin (Anthropology, UNC-CH), “Reversing the Gaze: Research, Representation and Reciprocity with Jews of Curacao”


We had the opportunity this semester to bring back Chris Walker, Thomas Gates and Ken George, graduates of this department or of associated programs whose varied careers reflect the different paths anthropologists take. (They work respectively in information technologies [business], cultural heritage [for the Yurok Tribe of California], and academic anthropology [University of Oregon].) Alan Benjamin continued the tradition of having Ph.D. candidates present their dissertation work to the entire department. Kim Diehl, a Senior Honors student, initiated a new one in which we hope to have an occasional forum (perhaps in panel format) where future Honors students present their projects to the department as a whole.

This semester's colloquia emphasized "public anthropology"—anthropology practiced in the divided political and economic landscapes of contemporary industrial and postcolonial societies and directed toward the public (as well as scholastic) discussion of these arenas in which we live and work. This theme culminated in a "mini-conference" organized by Don Nonini and sponsored by the Department, the Society for Anthropology Students, and Duke's Department of Cultural Anthropology. The conference, titled "Towards a Public Anthropology: Strategies and Prospects," took place April 5, 1997, and featured a variety of paper presentations, panel discussions and workshops. The plenary speakers were Leo Chavez (UCI), Micaela Di Leonardo (Northwestern) and Brett Williams (American University).

It was, in sum, a year of rich and spirited interchange that we will strive to continue in 1997-1998.

Brownbags

(CONT. FROM PAGE 9)

Ward, Steve Davis, and Marianne Reeves discussed the clustering of graves which possibly represents a group cemeteries at an early 18th century Oceanech settlement on the Eno River. Amb VanDenwater spoke about collections of canid bones from Halliday and other archaeological sites in the uplands of the Mississippi Valley of Illinois, and clues they hold to the domestication of dogs in native populations of that region. Finally, Greg Viles discussed the archaeological evidence for strategies of domination and resistance by chief elites or other groups living in the Mississippi Valley of Illinois prior to the arrival of European groups to the region.

Several brownbag events have taken the form of workshops, roundtable discussions relevant to both undergraduates and graduate students. Topics have ranged from strategies for publishing in anthropology and pursuing academic appointments to grant proposal writing and development. Spearheaded in recent years by Thad Goldbransen, Ann Kekalau, Stacey Langwick, David Fowler, and Chris Rodning, frequent roundtable discussions of opportunities in anthropology have drawn dozens of undergraduates interested in fieldwork and internships during their college careers, as well as in graduate studies and other paths in anthropology. Archaeology students Joe Herbert and Chris Rodning led discussions about opportunities in contract archaeology and its history in the discipline. Thanks to the organizing efforts of Lesley Bartlett, graduate students gathered to exchange information and advice on opportunities for seeking funding for coursework, research, and writing in graduate school. Many thanks to all the students and faculty whose attendance and input have made these events successful.

Brownbag organizers and presenters deserve thanks for their efforts in preparing these events. Those students and teachers who attended enhanced our discussions with their own contributions. Thanks also to the many faculty and research associates who have shown interest in presentations by students. For more information on current activities by the UNC Society for Anthropology Students, check out their webpage at http://www.unc.edu/~akakalo.
FEAR AND THE FIELD:
Reflections on Work in Brazil

Lesley Bartlett & Ken Williamson

August. Hell-hot Ken Williamson afternoon. After a three week trip through the Northeast of Brazil, we arrived in Rio. Ken was going to stay with Lesley for a week in her apartment in the dingy North Zone before returning to the Northeast. We first picked up a small suitcase that Lesley had left behind during her temporary stay with a family in the South Zone, site of Rio's upper-class beach scene. Broke after our trip, we then asked a couple of police officers where to catch the bus. They smiled upon discovering that Lesley is American; when they asked "Him too?" Ken is black; Lesley is white. They adamantly warned us to take a taxi; "the bus is too dangerous," they said. But we had come to interpret such comments as baseless overconcern, the product of a widely-expressed fear of the darker, the poorer. It was broad daylight, a Sunday afternoon. So we climbed on board a bus. It was full. Lesley sat with the suitcase half hidden while Ken hovered above and beside her in the aisle.

Two stops later, a group of mulatto and black boys rushed on through the windows, over the streetcar, cramming each other into the narrow door. The driver and the fare collector obviously had no power. We glanced at each other: "We were nervous, but immediately identified ourselves as classist and racist; they were just boys having a day of fun at the beach.

As we jostled through the tunnel toward the North Zone, the boys yelled, laughed, sang, and joked; everyone else was quiet. Glancing back occasionally, Ken could see them pointing to different people and nodding or shaking their heads. Suddenly the crowd pushed forward to the front of the bus, where a young yellow-skinned guy was sitting, listening to his Walkman. Several of the boys attacked him, ripping off his headphones and raining blows on his head. A girl sitting behind him jumped in tearing off his shirt. Someone went through his pockets. The driver looked in his rear-view mirror and then determinedly stared ahead. A few guys in the group intervened to prevent further blows. The bus pulled to a stop and the group got off—right at the main plaza next to Lesley's apartment. We rode to the next stop before exiting and walked in silence back to Lesley's new home.

This event points to the ways in which race, class, gender, nationality, and geographical location affect the fieldwork experience. In this instance, Lesley wasn't the object of the robbery and assault, although apparently she had been considered a candidate. The youth probably avoided her because Ken was present—but was this because of some sense of racial solidarity, or did it have more to do with Ken's evident strength?

Being white, female, and obviously foreign in a place inundated by tourists to (what suggested about her class status) making Lesley more of a potential target of crime. Yet the same factors that restricted activities to some situations afforded definite privileges in others. Whiteness undoubtedly facilitated negotiations with Brazilian bureaucrats, and adult literacy learners were often flattered and intrigued by an American's interest in their studies (one woman collected autographs of the foreigners she met).

Race, gender, and geographical location offered Ken greater protection from violence in the field. His ability to "pass" for Brazilian (people often commented that he had a more Brazilian "jeito," or manner) made him less a target of robbery. Being male and living in Salvador, a city where crimes against foreigners are fewer than in Rio, reduced the likelihood that he would be a victim.

Nationality, however, complicated Ken's field experience. Some people suspected him of working for the CIA; others resented him for being rich (many believed that all Americans are); still others sympathized with him for being a victim of American racism. For the most part, black, politically conscious Brazilians expressed racial solidarity with Ken; yet they sometimes distanced themselves by commenting how "bourgeois" African Americans are. One consultant, who had often spoken with Ken about how blackness unified people all over the world, said angrily one day, "You Americans act like you own the world." Ken, who had already talked at length about what it means to be black in America, smiled and shrugged his shoulders. The consultant continued, "I know, I know. But still, you Americans order everyone about!"

Issues of safety, crime, and structural violence had definite implications for our fieldwork. Lesley's mobility was limited by her vulnerability. Constantly warned by middle and working class informants not to enter certain areas of the city and not to travel at night (which was necessary for her work in adult literacy classrooms), she found it hard to discern the likelihood of danger, and thus difficult to make informed decisions about participation. The threat of violence limited Ken as well. He too was continually warned of the city's dangers, with his consultants cautioning him not to venture out at night, never to go out unaccompanied, and never to wander out into the "periphery," the city's poorest suburbs where the most structurally marginalized lived. The constant warnings of calculable risks dramatically circumscribed our thoughts of where we might go and what we might study.

Discussing how fear of violence limits one's fieldwork is not easy. One runs the risk of falling into racially- and class-coded discourses, and obsessing so much over the fieldworker's safety that one loses sight of the sheer violence of poverty faced daily by many of our informants. Nevertheless, we encourage colleagues to consider issues of violence and safety in their own preparations for fieldwork and in the training they offer others who are about to enter the field.
The Field

Nervous? Yes, I suppose I was, though it was only partially due to the erratic traffic circulating through the Bois de la Cambre park in central Brussels. Aren’t all anthropologists nervous when they first arrive at a field site? One would think so. But what about our discipline’s illustrious ancestors? Were the Malinowskis, Meads, and Evans-Pritchards of the world nervous when they first set foot on the soils of the Trobriand Islands, Samoa, or Sudan? Surely so. But they had good reason. After all, they were on the periphery of a still “unexplored” and “unknown” land. Me, I was just off to visit the office of an environmental non-governmental organization (NGO) located in a medium-sized European city (and we’re not even talking the margins of Europe here; we’re talking the capitol of the European Union—as center as Wallerstein’s center can be).

As I reflect back on my first encounter with the “field” that cloudy afternoon in late September, 1994, I can’t help but recall some of the formative fieldwork experiences of anthropologists who went before me—impressions that have stayed with me throughout my graduate training: Bronislaw Malinowski and the profound isolation he experienced during his years with the Trobrianders; Marjorie Shostak and the perpetual requests for tobacco made by her Kung acquaintances; Renato Rosaldo and the unthinkable prospect of losing one’s spouse in the field. I had derived from these and other examples a rather celebratory model of what anthropological fieldwork was supposed to be like, in which the anthropologist obstinately overcomes hardships in the field and perseveres to make a difference in the discipline. Marcus and Fischer (1986:34) call this the anthropologist as “hero” syndrome.

What bothered me, frankly, was that the fieldwork I was about to conduct among influential environmental groups and powerful industrial organizations in the European Union (EU) just did not seem to fit the model. My fieldwork included no week-long trip by slow boat or Land Rover to my field site; no shabby tent to live in or rickety cot to sleep on; no foul water to drink; no swarming flies, mosquitoes or exotic diseases to avoid; and no new languages to learn upon arrival. If anything, I was going to get soft and fat drinking beer and eating chocolate while watching reruns of American pop-TV. So why should I be nervous about my fieldwork? After all, my research setting barely fit this traditional representation of the “field.”

But if office buildings in Brussels are not the “field,” then what are they? Perhaps the real issue has less

Adventure has no place in the anthropologist’s profession; it is merely one of those unavoidable drawbacks, which detract from his effective work through the incidental loss of weeks or months.


to do with how we define the “field” as an object and more with how we approach “fieldwork” as a process. It became increasingly clear that my research differed from these other ethnographies not so much in the quality of my “field” as in the verticality of my focus: that is, whether I was studying “down” or “up.” Studying “down”—which I take to refer to Western anthropologists’ study of peoples in technologically less-developed societies—has been the mainstay of anthropological research for many historical reasons, including anthropology’s links to colonialism and the division of labor among social scientific disciplines. Studying “up,” in turn, implies studying the economically rich and/or politically powerful in complex, industrialized societies (or, at a minimum, studying anyone who is wealthier and more powerful than the fieldworker). Though this latter pursuit has been far rarer than the former, I place my own research—a study of multi-stakeholder environmental partnerships bringing together representatives of business government, and environmental NGOs to produce consensus-based solutions to environmental problems—squarely in this camp.

Studying up, like studying down, does have its challenges. Rather than the close scrutiny, frequent interruptions, and recurrent demands for goods and money often experienced by ethnographers studying down, anthropologists studying up are forever having to persuade the subjects of their studies to grant them the time of day. In a world ruled by time—cost-efficiency, these anthropologists are often a pains to convince their consultants that anthropological research is worth the time—and therefore the money—being asked of them. The anthropologist quickly becomes a burden if local participants remain unconvinced about the project’s “value.” And I, for one, often felt quite uncomfortable requesting time from informants who did not like being taken away from running governmental departments, managing powerful businesses, or directing influential NGOs. At first glance anthropological research can seem quite consequential when placed into competition with such activities. I am not, of course, arguing that these constraints apply only to situations of studying up; this is obviously not the case. I only want to emphasize that doing “engaged anthropology”—i.e., using our skills and our resources for the benefit of the people being studied—is often a necessity rather than an option when studying up.

First Contact

I find a parking space just up the street from the building where EuroEnvironment, a federation of European environmental NGOs, has its main office. The building, a relatively recent concrete and glass structure, sits on a busy street in a low-rent neighborhood that also serves as home to much of Brussels’ immigrant population. I had visited EuroEnvironment the previous summer and selected them as the primary site for my fieldwork, based on their status in the environmental arena and their history of coordinating significant collaborative projects with business and government. I enter the

(CONT. ON PAGE 13)
glass front doors and approach the tiny concierge's desk, but no one is present. Recalling my earlier visit, I take the elevator to the second floor and make my way toward a door next to a cardboard "EuroEnvironment" sign. Upon entering, I immediately happen upon a middle-aged woman and ask for directions to the Secretary General's office, noting that I have an appointment at 2:30. She points the way and asks me if I am the student from South Carolina. I nod my head and smile. Pretty close! At least I'm expected. Despite the half-dozen faxes I had sent to EuroEnvironment in the months preceding my arrival, I had this nagging fear that my arrival would be met with one of those "Who are you, and what are you doing here?" responses...I enter the office of the Secretary General to find him staring intently at one of myriad file folders stacked high upon his desk. A tall, slender man of about 50, with a receding hairline and dressed in a neat suit, Mr. Tilmann conveys the same air of professionalism that I associated with him from the year before. He greets me with a smile and informs me that someone else will also be attending our introductory meeting. We make small talk for a few minutes, discussing events since my arrival in Belgium, and are subsequently joined by a woman in her sixties, also dressed in a business suit. She too welcomes me with a nod and a smile. Mr. Tilmann introduces her as Mrs. Schaeffer, EuroEnvironment's scientific advisor.

I begin our meeting by describing my intended fieldwork. Although I had explained my research during my earlier trip and had confirmed it with a number of letters, I wanted to make very clear why I had chosen to work with their organization. After reviewing my project's objectives, I discuss the proposed research design, methodology, and schedule.

During my introduction, however, I notice a number of knowing glances passing between Mr. Tilmann and Mrs. Schaeffer. An uncomfortable feeling comes over me—a suspicion that I have something that interests them but of which I am still unaware. I also get the impression that they know more about the feasibility of my project than they have previously indicated. When I begin talking about doing fieldwork with industrial as well as environmental groups, they both laugh heartily. Responding to my inquiry, they remark that recent run-ins with representatives of the industrial sector have led them to conclude that there is little if any real value in studying industrial groups. They recommend that I confine my research to environmental groups such as their own. I'm confused. "But wait a minute," I protest to myself. "You were the ones who suggested studying these collaborative initiatives between environmental NGOs and business groups in the first place. I've written all of my grant proposals accordingly. You can't just tell me that it isn't a good idea anymore." I couldn't believe it—I hadn't even started and my research design was already changing.

Already a bit discouraged, I continue describing the proposed fieldwork with different corporations and NGOs. Only a few minutes pass, however, before Mrs. Schaeffer again interrupts my monologue. Chuckling, she announces that I am, or would be, the perfect spy—the perfect spy, that is, for industrial groups wishing to know more about the resources, strategies, and agendas of environmental groups. Mr. Tilmann, to my dismay, appears to agree with her. Though I can understand the reasoning behind their quasi-accusation (which no doubt arose, at least in part, from their knowledge of my former work in the electric utility industry), I thought that Mr. Tilmann understood and appreciated the impartiality of my anthropological approach. I try to counter their allegation by arguing that I am also obtaining similar information from industrial groups. Though they admit to the evenhandedness of my approach, they nonetheless reiterate that I am still the perfect spy, though perhaps for some purpose of which they're yet unaware.

As I finish my presentation, Mr. Tilmann explains why he has chosen to accept my project and grant me office space, equipment, and cooperation for the next twelve months. I am stunned when he declares that his primary reason for accommodating me is my engineering background and my experience with energy policy (apparently, EuroEnvironment was in need of just this very area of expertise). Here I have just finished making a long and hopefully persuasive argument about the importance of applying anthropological approaches to the study of environmental partnerships, and he tells me that he's primarily interested in my knowledge of energy policy. It has been five years since I have paid any attention to, let alone worked in, that area! And while we had earlier discussed how I might use my energy-sector background to help his organization, I certainly didn't view this as my primary reason for being there. I am only partly reassured when he then mentions, as his second(ary) reason for accepting my project, the utility of anthropologically studying the cooperative process so that future partnerships might be better designed.

"Oh no," I think, "what have I gotten into?" My initial urge to panic, fortunately, is tempered by the recollection that I am trying to do engaged anthropology—to give something back to those I study in exchange for the opportunity to do fieldwork among them. I had hoped that the feedback I would give EuroEnvironment on better addressing some of the problems inherent in the environmental partnership process would suffice as compensation. But if they really want me to do energy policy work on the side... well, I will do my best.

This moment of felt altruism disappears altogether when, at the meeting's end, Mr. Tilmann pulls a thick file off a shelf and hands it to me as my first assignment. The project, he explains, entails analyzing and then preparing EuroEnvironment's official position on the European Commission's energy efficiency policy. I am told that I should complete this report within the next two weeks, as it will determine whether or not EuroEnvironment chooses to accept the Commission's invitation to critique EU energy policy at an international conference in Florence in five weeks' time. As EuroEnvironment's "energy expert," I should plan to attend the conference and, if I wish, to make the presentation.

Needless to say, I am flabbergasted. This isn't what I
Xerum Bat: Photography, Narrative and Narrator

Julie Flowerday

In the summer of 1992, while on a pre-dissertation grant to the valley of Hunza, I went on a photographic hunch. The valley of Hunza lies in the Karakoram mountains of northeastern Pakistan, sandwiched by the Himalayas to the south, the Hindu Kush to the north and west, and the Mustagh Ata to the northeast. In my hand, I carried contact prints of photographs taken in the valley sixty years earlier by Col. David L.R. Lorimer. I returned to Hunza in 1993-1995 to see how the landscape and people's activities had changed since Lorimer's visit.

The story I'm going to relate concerns the tracking of just one of Lorimer's 175 photographs. The narrative begins in 1992 with my search for a magic boulder. It ends three years later on my second trip, when I discovered the importance of understanding the deep connections between photography, narrative, and narrator.

The photograph I chose depicts Xerum Bat (Split Boulder), a large tetrahedral-shaped boulder that Lorimer described as being associated with magic and drama. I had two reasons for wanting to see Xerum Bat. First, because iron pegs may have been transfixed in the boulder to bind malignant spirits within it. Lorimer reported such claims for other boulders in Hunza, which boasts a longstanding local tradition of blacksmithing. The idea of iron pegs intrigued me because little has been written on the spiritual use of metal by the Hunzukuts (people of Hunza).

Second, I wanted to learn of any tales connected to the boulder, because Xerum Bat was the only boulder that Lorimer had singled out for photography, and because it was located in the heart of the Hunza settlements with the oldest sacred traditions. Though Lorimer recorded no single tale for the boulder, it appeared in two of his published tales and apparently had played a prominent role in local magic and politics.

The day I set out in search of Xerum Bat, I approached two adult men standing at the junction of a road and a path. When I asked if they could direct me to the boulder, one immediately responded in English, saying he knew the location because it was on his land. Delighted, I pulled out the contact print and began telling him about my interest in Xerum Bat. He smiled and introduced himself, telling me that he was a founding member of the Hunza Cultural Association.

I started to pull out my small tape recorder, but he looked at me sternly and told me I could neither record nor photograph him. So I put my equipment away and opened my ears.

We then walked to the boulder. At first, I didn't even see it. All that remained was a jagged contour close to the ground. "What happened to it?" I asked. He said his father had begun blasting it out of the ground many years ago, and that now he too was doing this. When I asked "why," he replied simply that a road was being built nearby and that he would have an option to build a hotel or a shop alongside it. The boulder served as a source of income, as its pieces could be used as blocks for buildings or for the road. "Did the boulder have iron pegs in it?" I asked. "I don't know," he responded. "Some people say it did."

When I returned to Hunza (1993-1995) to do my dissertation fieldwork, I was eager to find tales associated with Xerum Bat and to see how closely the resembled a folktale Lorimer had recorded for another boulder, the Bur Buj. What follows are two tales. Lorimer recorded the first, "The Man Who Supped with the Pflüs. A Story of Former Times" (Tale #20), in the 1930s. I recorded the second, which I have entitled "A Tale of Xerum Bat Told in the 1990s," in 1993.

*Tale 1:*

"One day a goat belonging to a man got lost. [As he went on] looking and looking for it night came down on him. He was returning to his home without having seen it and as he came along there was a light in the Buri Bun [a boulder like Xerum Bat] and there were Pflüs [spirits in the nature of men] dancing. He also went in, they say, and mixed with them, and danced, and then sat down among them.

"After dancing, the Pflüs brought food for a wedding party and at the end when they had eaten they brought a skin. Then they demanded from all the bones of their shares of the meat, and collected them. There was one rib short. That rib the man to whom they had given it as his share, had hidden from them. Then they made a rib of wood and threw the bones into the skin, and on shaking it up the goat came to life. When the man looked he saw that it was his (CONT. ON PAGE 15)
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(Cont. from page 14)

own goat. The Pfuts drove it out and then they went off as a wedding party to the house of the Sughuralo Pfut.

"When the man, having departed thence, came to his home that goat of his was there at the door. On the morrow, when he slaughtered it, one rib was missing and in its place was a wooden rib.

"Besides this, the man, had brought a dance tune from the Pfuts' house. They still call that the 'Pfuts' Tune' and they play it even at the present day."

Tale II:

In 1993, I asked Mr. Nurideen, a man in his mid-30s, if he knew any stories about Xerum Bat, as the boulder's remains were close to his home. At first he denied knowing any such tales, but then he told a story that he attributed to a tailor who had come to his house on the occasion of his sister's marriages.

"The tailor said, 'I had some goats and sheep many years ago. And one time some sheep didn't come back home. And I went to look for my sheep before winter time. And when I came near the Xerum Bat, my senses were normal but I felt dream-like.'"

"The tailor said, 'This story was told to me by my grandfather.' He said it was at the time of the wedding of a pfut. He [the tailor's grandfather] saw the other pfutang.O [plural of pfut]. They were slaughtering his sheep for the wedding ceremony. He saw one sheep with two broken ribs [yal.muye]. When the ribs broke, the pfutang.O said, 'Oh, two ribs are broken.'"

"At that time one pfut made these ribs from the juniper tree for the sheep."

"While the one pfut was making the ribs from the juniper tree, the man who was in a dream-like state [i.e., the tailor's grandfather] decided he had to leave that place because he would get into trouble with the pfutang.O. He backed away slowly, slowly [and escaped]."

"In the morning the people shouted a lot. 'Oh that man's sheep have been killed by an urk' [a wild variety of cat smaller than a snow leopard]. The people went there and looked at the two sheep. They were already dead. In the one sheep the ribs included two wooden ones.

"The tailor's grandfather [saw the excitement] went to look at the sheep, and asked, 'What happened to the sheep?' The people said that the sheep were killed by the urk.

"He [the tailor's grandfather] responded, 'No, I saw yesterday that the pfutang.O slaughtered the sheep.' That man then looked at the ribs and saw the two ribs of wood. He knew that this had happened by the phutang.O. And then the people said, 'Human and pfutang.O nature are the same.' The people know that the phutang.O give us losses. This was the Xerum Bat story.'"

Both narratives share a common plot and rely on a common proof—the wooden rib—as evidence of the protagonist's mingling with the pfutang.O. What is striking, however, is how the second tale's narrator distances himself from the narrative. The first teller relates the story as accepted fact, even offering the still-played song as evidence of its widespread acceptance. Mr. Nurideen, in contrast, initially denies any knowledge of Xerum Bat stories, and then offers one only after dissociating himself from it, attributing it instead to a visiting tailor, who in turn knew it only through his grandfather.

In tracing the difference between Lorimer's photograph and a contemporary representation of Xerum Bat, a microcosm of change became visible. On the one hand, because of Lorimer's 1930s' photo, I could trace the boulder in the 1990s. This led me to discover that the boulder was being demolished to meet the future needs of a member of the Hunza Cultural Association. He saw no contradiction between his actions and his 'cultural interests.' While he may have felt uncomfortable with my questions, he clearly felt that his priorities were not my affair. We must also assume that he felt this way about any objections to his boulder-blasting that might have been raised by local residents.

On the other hand, by comparing a 1930s' folktale associated with another boulder with a 1990s' tale for Xerum Bat, we can document a change in one resident's perception of the boulder. While the two tales parallel each other in narrative form, motif, and other features, they grossly diverge in the matter of narrative voice. The contemporary narrator is no longer connected to the tale; the narrative, in turn, inferentially belongs to another, more remote time.

These narratives suggest how the combination of photography and narrative can open doors of ethnographic understanding that might otherwise remain closed. In cases like this—invoking changes that can be photographically documented on the landscape—photography emerges as a valuable fieldwork tool.

Xerum Bat, 1990s.
NEW WORDS TO AN OLD TUNE
(CONT. FROM PG. 14)

I expected of my first field visit. Haven't I just finished explaining to them that I am here to study them and their participation in the partnership process? I know almost nothing about EuroEnvironment. How then can they not only give me work that has me serving as an expert in a technical area about which I know very little, but also expect me to represent them at an international meeting in front of the very EU representatives whose policies I am supposed to criticize? Unbelievable! When, in defense, I stammered that I might not have the expertise that they are looking for, they responded, "We'll see." At this point, I am unceremoniously handed over to the office secretary for further instructions.

The Act of Engagement

I was quite distraught that night as I settled down for bed. The only thing that did make sense was the obvious need to keep a journal to write down such bizarre experiences. Not knowing what to make of the afternoon's developments, I couldn't rid myself of the feeling that the policy project was some sort of test. A test to see how exploitable I was? A test to see how dedicated I was to their organization, or even to my own research project? A test to see if I was a spy? What a dilemma. Taking on the project would demonstrate my commitment to repay EuroEnvironment for their cooperation, but in so doing I would risk not only losing valuable research time, but also possibly making quite a fool of myself on the European stage. Turning down the project, in turn, would potentially cast doubt on my true motives. In any event, this was not the way things were supposed to have started.

After some deliberation and soul-searching, I chose to take on the energy efficiency project and, with it, the risk that I would fall in love with the challenges of reforming Europe's energy policy and leave my research project—and the field of anthropology—forever behind. This, for better or for worse, did not come to pass. I wrote up a report on the EU's energy efficiency policy with my best critical eye (which, I must admit, was far more influenced by my anthropological training than my engineering background) and presented it to Mr. Timm in mid-October. November came and went with no comment on the report, and without a trip to Florence. My research, meanwhile, was starting to pick up steam.

The Nature of Fieldwork

The lesson I learned that first day is that the hazards of the field come in many shapes and sizes. In the end, the unexpected twists and turns that seem so fundamental to fieldwork experience happen in any and all "fields," whether studied down, or sideways. One does not have to have near-death experience in the field to come away with that sense of awe and appreciation that do fieldwork in a strange place, with strange people, and in strange conditions engenders. Perhaps I was not so ironic then, that the experience recounted above turned out to be rather comforting a completed my first uncertain day as a fledgling ethnographer. The episode helped me to recognize that I was just the latest in a long line of anthropologists who, in the process of conducting fieldwork, were left vulnerable to forces that did not understand nor could they have predicted suppose that, ultimately, this is the nature of work—this willingness to embrace the uncertainty inherent in the act of leaving that which one knows well for that which one does not.
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WHAT DO YOU THINK?

the South...

One of UNC's most exciting new initiatives is the Center for the Study of the American South, a center that promises to bring together scholars, students, policy makers, journalists, and a host of others whose interest is the South. Their goal, simply put, is to study local knowledge—to explore the cultural crucible that surrounds us, engaging in conversations that freely cross disciplinary and geographic boundaries, reflecting on the past, considering the future, and addressing the ever-shifting contexts of the present. Anthropologists as students of culture, are particularly well-suited to contribute to these conversations; many of our faculty, in fact, are actively working with the Center. In the next AN, we'll move away from the broad topics that our Opinions section has covered in the past, and begin a series of regional issues, using place as the frame for exploring issues and ideas. In honor of the Center's establishment, we'll begin the series by looking at that which surrounds us—the South. Please send your comments and contributions to the editor, at the address given on page 2.
"What? Ugali again!"

UNC DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY 1996 SUMMER SCHOOL ABROAD
ANTHROPOLOGY 161: Peoples of Kenya (Dr. Robert E. Daniels)

Jeffrey L. Takacs, MA (UNC-CH)

DRAWINGS BY HELEN CHANG

A Kenya joke: What time will the sun come up tomorrow?
Answer: Anywhere in Kenya is about 5 feet from the equator (which divides the country in half), so sunrise and sunset are always at 6:30—am and pm, respectively.

This past summer, I served as Teaching Assistant for Dr. Robert E. Daniels’ Anthro 161. After spending the winter working on my Master’s thesis, it was the most enjoyable trip I’ve taken in a long time. I think our 13 students agreed.

We divided our stay in Nairobi between a collective stay at a “guest house,” or hostel, and paired home-stays in upper middle-class neighborhoods. The home-stays were particularly enlightening, especially since students of Africa often ignore the existence of middle- and upper-middle-class Africans in Africa. Nearly all of the home-stay parents had lived, traveled and/or studied abroad, and nearly all aspired to send their sons and daughters abroad as well.

While in Nairobi, we contracted the services of Mr. Okeyo N. Ogalla, a professional Swahili language teacher. Mr. Ogalla—whose name indicates that he is ethnically and linguistically a Luo from western Kenya, making Swahili at least his second language—taught us for ten hours over five days, and used, I swear, five words of English the entire time. I have never seen an instructor who so consistently grasped the attention and aroused the excitement of language students. (Although Mr. Ogalla was the single-best language teacher I’ve ever had, Swahili is nonetheless the fifth language that I have completely failed to master.) The homestays and forays into downtown Nairobi gave us ample opportunity to practice our clumsy language skills.

Dr. Daniels’ lectures began the night we arrived and continued when we headed north towards Mount Kenya and then on to the edge of the Somali desert. Daniels certainly has a flair for the dramatic: his visual aids for his discussion of The Flame Trees of Thika were the Flame Trees of Thika. There they were, all over the place. To experience diversity first hand, we visited Isiolo, where desert meets highland and Islam meets Christianity. Remember Mos Isley spaceport in Star Wars? Same place, without the puppets.

The highlands of Kenya are remarkable for their bounty: everything from bananas and pineapples to tea and coffee. Of course, most of the latter two are for export, evidence that the chains of the new colonialism continue to bind long after the British troops have left. At the same time, these cash crops are so productive that a few acres will pay for a child’s school fees, and Kenyans fully understand the relationship of education to economic security. “On the farms, we have plenty of food, but no money for school,” a mother of six told my wife and me. Despite this, Kenya’s economy is not stable enough to promote long-term growth: many of the plywood booths in Nairobi’s “Blue Market” are gift shops owned and operated by tri-lingual college graduates.

Once you cross the Rift Valley in the middle of Kenya, you reach the territory where speaking Swahili becomes almost as useful as a welder in a fireworks factory: not very. This is the land of the Kalenjin, the home of Kenya’s president. It is also where Dr. Daniels did his fieldwork in the mid-1960s, among the Kalenjin-speaking Kipsigis. We were able to watch “Uncle Bob” grow happier and happier every day, until last, in Kericho, we saw him pull out his rungu—a man’s walking stick/club/calling aid and carry it about as only a Nilotic-Sudanic person can.

After this came the unforgettable three-day homestay in Itenbe. Except for British colonial outposts, there are no cities or towns in Kenya. The

(CONT. ON PAGE 20)
TWO MOONEY FELLOWSHIPS
AWARDED BY RLA
Vin Steponaitis, Director, RLA

The first two annual Timothy P. Mooney Fellowships—each comprising a $1,000 research stipend—were awarded over the past year to doctoral students working in the Research Laboratories of Archaeology.

The 1996-97 Fellowship went to Jane Eastman in support of her dissertation research on the Saratown site, a 17th century Indian community in Stokes County, North Carolina. Jane used the funds for radiocarbon dates and for travel to obtain data from comparative collections.

The 1997-98 Fellow is Patricia Samford. She is currently engaged in archaeological research on eighteenth-century African-American slave sites in Virginia. The fellowship funding will support an analysis of food residues in pits that occur beneath the floors of the houses in which the slaves lived.

The award is supported by an endowment that was created in memory of Tim Mooney, a graduate student in archaeology whose life was tragically cut short by an automobile accident in 1995. With the generous support of UNC faculty, staff, and students, as well as Tim Mooney’s family and friends, the endowment has now grown to about $24,000! This endowment currently supports an annual award of $1,000; as the value of the endowment grows in future years, so too will the annual amount of the Fellowship stipend.

Additional contributions to the Mooney Fund are welcomed. Checks made out to the “Timothy P. Mooney Fund, UNC-CH” may be sent to the following address: Arts & Sciences Foundation, 104 New West, CB# 6115, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-6115.

Native American History
and the Archaeological Field School
Christopher Rodning
UNC Research Laboratories of Anthropology

Continuing its tradition of archaeological research on native settlement in the Carolinas and Virginia Piedmont, the UNC Research Laboratories of Archaeology have been conducting fieldwork at sites dating to the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. These sites, located at a bend of the Eno River near downtown Hillsborough, NC, document intermittent native settlement dating from the 11th through the 18th centuries. Fieldwork has concentrated on the Fredricks site, an Occaneechi village dating from 1680 to 1710, and the adjacent Jenrette site, a Shakori village dating from 1660 to 1680. The Field School—a five week summer program—serves multiple purposes, advancing the research interests of RLA archaeologists while providing UNC undergraduates an opportunity to learn and develop their skills in archaeological fieldwork through an excavation that takes place near Chapel Hill.

During previous summers’ work, field crews excavated the palisaded portion of the Fredricks site and the southern end of the Jenrette site. Researchers recorded information on the shape and dimensions of burials found at the Jenrette site, documenting the kind, quantity, and location of associated mortuary goods. Graduate students specializing in bioarchaeology visited the site to determine the age and sex of interred individuals. Several subterranean pits at the Jenrette site—once used for storage, refuse, and cooking pits—contained abundant animal bone, carbonized plant material, aboriginal pottery, stone tools, glass beads, and other artifacts. Field school excavators added the locations and arrangements of these (CONT. ON PAGE 19)
In recent years, UNC archaeologists have worked with local Native Americans who trace their ancestry back to the residents of these and related archaeological sites in the Piedmont. Local Native American leaders have visited sites to learn about what has been uncovered during excavations and to offer prayers for burials uncovered during fieldwork. At powwows celebrated in downtown Hillsborough, Native American leaders formally recognized this riverside locale as an important site in regional Native American history. At these and similar events, UNC archaeologists were on hand to exhibit maps and photographs from archaeological investigations and to answer questions about Native Americans who were living in the region when Europeans arrived.

This kind of interaction makes archaeology accessible to many publics and serves to convey anthropological knowledge to nonacademics interested in the archaeology and history of the Piedmont region.

RLA Changes Name

As of July 1, 1997, the name of the Research Laboratories of Anthropology (RLA) officially changed to the Research Laboratories of Archaeology. The main reason for this change, which had been contemplated for quite some time, was clarity. Archaeology is, after all, at the center of everything we do in the RLA. And having the word Anthropology in the name, particularly in the possessive construction, often caused people to assume that the RLA is administratively part of the Anthropology Department, which is not the case. Over the years, the latter misunderstanding gave rise to much confusion, both inside and outside the university. We hope that the new name will ultimately lessen this confusion; and it will still allow us to keep our tried and true acronym—RLA!

From a historical perspective, it’s interesting to note that in the 1940s the RLA was often (although not consistently) called the Laboratory of Archaeology. Joffre Coe changed the official name to its present one in the 1950s—as he himself told me—to give Anthropology a home on the UNC campus. This was, of course, long before the Anthropology Department came into existence, which wasn’t until 1965. But once Anthropology gained departmental status, then Coe’s rationale for our name became moot, and the seeds of confusion were sown.

The name change will in no way diminish the RLA’s ties with the Anthropology Department, which remain as strong and important as ever. The RLA depends on the Anthropology Department for most of its students and faculty Research Associates; at the same time, the Department relies on the RLA to provide virtually all the offices, labs, and equipment for its Archaeology Program. This synergistic relationship has worked to the benefit of both units for the past thirty years, and I’m sure it will continue working that way for many years to come.—VS.
In the Research Labs for Archaeology, Steve Davis received $18,627 from the Virginia Dept. of Historic Resources for his research on three excavated sites in Henry County. Dr. Davis also received $5,000 from the North Carolina Division of Archives and History to continue Phase II of the "Projectile Point Classification Project."

Vin Steponaitis received an Instructional Technology Award from the UNC Chancellor's Office for the development of computer-simulated teaching aids. Also in the RLA, Clark Larsen received a UNC University Research Council publication grant.

"Upstairs" in anthropology, recent Department addition Marisol de la Cadena had a successful year in funding her research on "Race, Ethnicity, and the Struggle for Representation: De-Indianization in Cuzco Peru." In 1997, Dr. de la Cadena received both a Junior Faculty Development Award and a grant from UNC's Institute for Research in the Social Sciences. For 1997-98, Dr. de la Cadena received $30,000 from the National Endowment for the Humanities, and won the Richard Hunt Writing Award from the Wenner Gren Foundation. Norris Johnson received grants from North Carolina State University's Japan Center (for his research on the Tenryu temple and garden in Kyoto, Japan) and from the Northeast Asia Council of the Association for Asian Studies.

Paul Leslie received $15,000 from the Andrew Mellon Foundation and the Carolina Population Center for his work on health and reproduction in a semi-nomadic population in Turkana, Kenya. In addition, he was appointed to a 3-year term as Fellow at the Carolina Population Center.

Jim Peacock received an IRSS Summer Grant to study an Indonesian aircraft factory in Mobile, Alabama; he also received research funding from the Smith-Bookends Program in Politics, Media, and Public Life, and from the UNC Center for International Studies. Jim additionally received NUCEA's Creative Programming Award for the Memory Conference held last year at UNC.

Margaret Wiener's recent book, Invisible Realms, was awarded the prestigious Victor Turner Prize in Ethnographic Writing at the 1995 American Anthropological Association annual meeting. In the summer of 1996, Dr. Wiener was a Visiting Scholar at Cornell University's Southeast Asia Program, and an Affiliated Research Fellow at the International Institute of Asian Studies, Leiden. The following fall, she was a Hettie Lane Fellow at UNC's Institute for the Arts and Humanities. She also received a junior faculty development award and a grant from the Southeast Asia Council of the Association of Asian Studies to do research for a new book on popular and scientific discourses about magic, focusing on the Netherlands Indies, but also looking at British social anthropologists and novelists, and at post-colonial Indonesia.

Donald Nonini was recently engaged in a listing in Who's Who in the South and Southwest. Catherine Lutz was chosen as a member of the selection committee for the Victor Turner Prize in Ethnographic Writing. Glenn Hinson received the Access Teaching Award from UNC's Learning Disabilities Center for his efforts to create an accessible classroom environment for undergraduates with learning disabilities. In October 1996, Kaja Finkler served as invited lecturer at the University of Freiburg in Germany, where she developed a collaborative research program and presented public lectures to medical students. In the winter of 1996-97, Carole Crumley was a visiting lecturer at the University of Vienna in Austria. From there she traveled to Rome, where she held a Fulbright Research and Teaching Fellowship at the Universite de Franche-Comte in Besancon. That spring she also lectured at the University of Umea, Sweden.

Among graduate students, Bram Tucker won a Fulbright grant for his research on human ecology of the Mka forager-farmers in south-western Madagascar. He also received an L.S.B. Leakey grant to fund a second year of field research. Jennie Burnett received a $14,000 Democratization Award from UNC, and won a Training Award from the National Science Foundation for summer research. Jennie Smith and Lisa Aldred both won Carolina Society of Fellows awards ($15,000) for their dissertation research in 1996-97. Finally, R.J. Lopez and Amber van der Walker each received a four-year, $14,000 National Science Foundation pre-doctoral research award.

**Department Awards**

The Honigmann Award, recognizing the year's best undergraduate honors project, was awarded to Carmen Drye. In 1997, Lisa Aldred received this year's Honigmann Prize, given for outstanding graduate work in sociocultural anthropology. Thomas Maher received the 1997 Manning Award, honoring the year's most exemplary dissertation. The Polgar Award, recognizing outstanding work in applied anthropology, was awarded to Sandy Smith-Nonini.
Bioarchaeology: Interpreting behavior from the human skeleton
Clark Spencer Larsen
Cambridge University Press, 1997

This book focuses on the relevance of skeletal remains to the study of the human condition and human behavior, exploring how skeletal and dental tissues from archaeological settings reveal life history both at the individual and population levels. In short, this book provides a synthesis of bioarchaeology, an emerging discipline that emphasizes the human biological component of the archaeological record.

This book takes a population perspective, referencing individual case studies only because they collectively help to build a larger picture of biological variability in earlier societies. The population approach is critical for characterizing patterns of behavior, lifestyle, disease, and other aspects that form the fabric of the human condition. The discussion underscores the importance of culture in interpreting population characteristics. Dietary behavior, for example, is highly influenced by culture. If an individual is taught that a specific food is "good" to eat, then it becomes fully appropriate in that cultural context to consume that food. Other factors, of course, mediate the consumption of foods within a society (e.g., environment, local plants and animals).

However, cultural behavior plays an essential role in determining people's diets. In writing this book, I deliberately avoided providing the reader with a laundry list of methods for skeletal analysis; instead, I present an agenda for studying human remains as a cumulative record of human behavior and adaptation. This approach is central to the biocultural perspective offered by anthropologists—we must seek to envision past populations as though they were alive today, and then ask what information drawn from the study of skeletal tissues would help us to understand members of populations as functioning, living human beings.

Bioarchaeological findings have proven important in many areas of scientific and scholarly discourse. Within anthropology, the use of human remains in interpreting social behavior has been especially fruitful in mortuary studies. The stories told by human remains are also reaching audiences outside of anthropology; they are seeing increasing use in history, economics, and nutrition science. Scholars who study long-term trends in health and nutrition, for example, have typically based their analyses on parish and plantation records, genealogies, and vital registration data; recently, they have begun adding human skeletal remains to their data set. The emerging role of skeletal remains has recently been underscored by the historian, John Coatsworth (1996:1), who highlights the "masses of evidence" provided by bioarchaeological investigations and the important role they play in understanding historical developments.

Building on the study of human remains, the unifying theme in this book is behavioral inference. My discussion of behavior is not limited to physical activity; rather, I consider behavior in a wider perspective, examining physiological stress, exposure to pathogenic agents, injury and violence, physical activity, dietary and nondietary uses of the face and jaws, dietary reconstruction and nutritional inference, and population history.

Because my geographic area of expertise is North America, the book is slanted toward studies dealing with skeletal remains from this continent. Moreover, North America is especially well-studied, at least in comparison with many other areas of the globe where the scientific tradition of bioarchaeology is not as well established. Although the book has this geographic bias, I also use skeletal data from other continents when illustrating key topics.

The volume makes many of its points by contrasting and comparing data sets from skeletal assemblages representing human populations from different levels of sociopolitical complexity and differing subsistence regimes. Because of the vagaries of dietary reconstruction in the archaeological past, anthropologists usually characterize human groups broadly, using terms such as "foragers" or "farmers." The reader should recognize that these terms are overly simplistic and do not adequately convey the underlying complexity of human adaptive systems. Nevertheless, these categories help us to better understand behavioral and adaptive features of different groups, and therefore facilitate the reconstruction and interpretation of past lifeways.

Far more important to the focus of this book, however, is that these contrasts and comparisons add an important dimension to the growing discussion in anthropology that seeks to understand the causes and consequences of adaptive and behavioral shifts in the past.

In many ways, human skeletal and dental tissues are remarkably sensitive to the environment, providing what Stanley M. Garn has referred to as "a rich storehouse of individual historical events." This book provides a tour of the vast holdings in this storehouse, displaying the knowledge gained about earlier societies based on the study of their mortal remains.
The Cultural Production of the Educated Person: Critical Ethnographies of Schooling and Local Practice
Bradley Levinson (Ph.D., UNC-CH 1993), Douglas Foley, and Dorothy Holland, eds.
Albany: SUNY, 1996

Around the world, modern schools are central to the social and cultural shaping of the young. Relatively new to history, especially for peoples situated on the margins of industrialization, institutions of mass schooling often remove children from their families and local communities, encouraging a mastery of knowledges and disciplines that have currency and ideological grounding in wider spheres. As articulated early on by Durkheim and others, these schools have served to inculcate the skills, subjectivities, and disciplines that undergird the modern nation-state. No matter how the knowledgeable person is locally defined, or which skills and sensibilities count as indicators of “wisdom” and intelligence in the home and immediate locale, schools interject an educational mission of extra-local proportions.

Set in the space between the local and the national, modern schools thus provide a contradictory resource to students who might benefit from their teachings and credentials. Ironically, while offering certain freedoms and opportunities, schooled knowledges and disciplines may at the same time further draw students into dominant projects of nationalism and capitalist labor formation, or bind them even more tightly to systems of class, gender, and race inequality. On a more personal level, subjection to the schools’ ministrations can yield a sense of self as knowledgeable, as “somebody.” Yet it can also encourage a sense of self as failure: encounters with formal education can leave students feeling responsible for their lowly social standings.

Schools have also proven themselves a contradictory resource for those who would fit the young into a particular vision of society. Not surprisingly, schools and education often become sites of intense cultural politics. Local educational practices and ideologies may be pitted against those of national priority. Groups identifying themselves by ethnicity, or perhaps by moral orientation, may feel unfairly subjected to the educational values of more powerful groups. Struggles—sometimes submerged and virtually invisible, sometimes clear and dramatic—erupt. Politics can engulf the curriculum. Coalitions form and reform, trying to appropriate the schools to their own ends. And students, often the voiceless objects of education reform, become recalcitrant.

The Cultural Production of the Educated Person explores these conflicts and contradictions. This volume presents eleven original case studies, ranging from Taiwan to South Texas, that address the social and cultural projects of modern schools, and the contestations or accommodations—dramatic and not—that emerge in, around, and against them. Our definition of “school” is broad, yet specific: a state organized or regulated institution of intentional instruction.

We include not only formal educational programs for the young, but also “non-form government training schemes, adult education, and the like.”

We define “education” even more broadly. Following the long-standing anthropological practice of distinguishing education from schooling, we recognize that all societies provide some kind of training and some set criteria by which members can be identified more, or less, knowledgeable. Distinct societies as well as ethnic groups and microcultures within those societies, elaborate the cultural practices by which particular sets of skills, knowledges, and discourses come to define the fully “educated” person. In this volume, for instance, Tom Sh Lai describes how the great tradition of Chinese Confucianism has defined the notion of educated person in terms of filial devotion and service, while Rival describes the Huoarani educated person as constituted by certain culturally salient activities, such as chanting and toolmaking.

We consider local forms of education as significant, whether or not they are legitimized by formal institutions. Some educators may have difficulty treating these forms seriously or considering them alongside those enabled by school. Yet such a vision is necessary. Otherwise, there is no vantage point from which to appreciate the shape and degree of contestation that goes on around schools even in places where modern schools have been in place for over a century. Nor is there ample scope to recognize that, despite a group’s seemingly homogeneous cultural production is ongoing, and hegemonic definitions of the educated person may be contested along lines of gender, age, and—in stratified societies—ethnicity and class.

The case studies in this volume chart a new direction in “critical” educational research. Such research is fundamentally local and ethnographic, yet mon beyond the school to examine links between local cultural practices and community, the region, the state, and the economy. Along with this broader interpretive perspective, we also urge a more extensive comparative basis: Challenging the Eurocentrism of most prior critical research, we draw on study of schooling in a variety of locales to address the global dimensions of educational process and change.
Sequence and Space in Pompeii
Sara E. Bon & Rick Jones, eds.
Oxbow Monographs, 1997

In AD 79, an eruption of Mount Vesuvius buried Pompeii as a complete and functioning Roman city. Its fabled preservation has produced detailed information about ancient lifeways of a kind rarely found in the archaeological record. It has also provided an abundance of riches in the form of household goods and decorations. The wealth of this unusual assemblage has inspired what amounts to the intellectual plundering for only the most aesthetically rewarding topics, with most studies exploring the way that elites decorated their houses and created public spaces. Granted, not all of the research conducted at Pompeii restricts itself to this narrow range of possible topics. Yet only in recent years have studies exploring the site’s temporal depth or using all available data been conducted with any frequency.

Following the new trend of more critically and comprehensively using data, Sequence and Space in Pompeii gathers together current research that analyzes both the rich AD 79 contexts and the archaeological contexts associated with occupation back to at least the sixth century BC. Following a preface by Pompeii’s current archaeological superintendent, this edited volume presents papers that introduce two new excavations in pre-AD 79 occupations (Bon et al.; Carafa); offer innovative, technologically aided approaches to re-interpreting the city’s architecture and layout in the first century AD (Dobbins; Robinson); use whole new classes of data—environmental and skeletal—not often examined by Pompeian researchers (Richardson et al.; Lazer); and demonstrate how recombining various data classes provides a far richer view of first century AD life than that offered by the old art and architecture school (Leach; Jansen).

Although archaeological interest in Pompeii is more than two centuries old, this volume contends that the great names of Pompeian archaeology have not said all there is to say about the site (Jones and Bon). The irony of Pompeii is that this allegedly “sealed” site has been plundered by archaeologists, who have significantly disturbed the famous artifact assemblages, and perhaps by the Romans, who may well have combed the city immediately after the earthquake (Bon; Whitehead; Dyson). Furthermore, Pompeii had a long settlement history before it became a Roman colony in the first century BC; several research projects are investigating this history in conjunction with the alluring first century AD contexts (Bon et al.; Carafa). Contributors to Sequence and Space in Pompeii address both the development of the site before it was buried and the changes to the remains that have occurred since its discovery (Bon).

The cohort of international collaborators represented in this volume bring new techniques and new disciplines to bear on the key archaeological categories of sequence and space; in so doing, they fashion a new frame for better understanding this legendary site. Seeking to re-evaluate the status quo of received wisdom, their interdisciplinary research presses beyond the boundaries of classical archaeology, exploring new analytic ground with rigorous, intensive, and innovative investigation.
BON, SARA E.

CRUMLEY, CAROLE

DAVIS, R.P. STEPHEN, JR.

DE LA CADERA, MARISOL

ESTROFF, SUE E.

EVANS, TERENCE M.S.

FARQUHAR, JUDITH
1996 Craig Calhoun Tradition's Radical. UCIS GlobalView 10 (16), October.

HOLLAND, DOROTHY C.

LARSEN, CLARK S.

LESIEU, PAUL

LUTZ, CATHERINE
1997 [with Lesly Bartlett] Discipline, the Uniform, and Citizenship: High School Military Training, Thar and Now. The Urban Review.


MORRISON, ELIZABETH J.


SCARRY, C. MARGARET


SCARR, JOHN F.


SKINNER, DEBRA


STEPONAITIS, VINCAS P.


WINTERHALDER, BRUCE


BA DEGREES
1996-97
Dorothy Ruth Burnworth
Nina Marie Cavallaro
Laurie Delia Creech
Misty Anne Crooks
David Elliott Dascal
Theresa A. Dreija
Julia Elizabeth Fiskin
Jennifer Marie Hair
Justin Bradley Hauser
Keith Eisner High
Gregory Neil Jansen
Patricia Kaye Jernigan
Jennifer Lynn Jones
Mary Melissa Lehman
Rocio Lozano-Gangi
Marc Anthony Mancarella
Elizabeth Beatrice Mcneary
Anne Ashley Mcdonell
Robert Keith Miller
Carmen Leigh Morgan
Matthew Dyke Nicholson
Julie Josephine Nickle
Salem Chandler Norris
Lauralyn Ann Pearson Pryor
Victoria Elizabeth Reessler
Matthew Ginswood Rundell
Melissa Ann Salvanish
Bryan David Shanks
Bradford Read Spangler
Scott Randolph Stafford
Daren Ricardo Trudo, Jr.
Kenneth Leigh Westbrook
Brian Mark Wingate
Clarissa Nichole Youngblood

MA DEGREES
1996-97
Hager El Hadidi
Deepa Savitri Manandhar
Charles Seagle

PHD DEGREES AWARDED
1996-97
Rebecca R. Henry
Embodiment and NHTSD QAB SIB (Diabetes).
Applying among Natural Science of the Body in
Foreign Context

Thomas O. Maher
Time, Space and Social Dynamics during
the Hopewell Occupation of the American Bottom

Dena K. Plemmons
Between Madness and Reason

Elizabeth J. Aldred (Lisa)
The Commodification, Fetishization and Legal
Construction
of Native American Spirituality

Alan F. Benjamin
Ethnicity as Classification of Social Space: Ethics,
Identity and Curacpoa Jews

Linda Carnes-McNaughton
Transitions and Continuity: Earthenware and
Stoneware Pottery Production in Nineteenth Centtu
North Carolina

V.Ann Tippitt
The Early to Middle Archaic Transition in the Georgia
Carolina Piedmont: A View from the Gregg Shoals Sit
life after

Lisa Aldred (Ph.D. 1997), one of our most recent graduates, will be moving to Bozeman, Montana, this summer, where she'll join the Center for Native American Studies at Montana State University as an assistant professor. The Center does both teaching and research, and maintains close ties with the seven tribal colleges in Montana; in addition to its advocacy work for Native Americans, it hosts a variety of mentoring programs for Native American students. Lisa will be teaching introductory anthropology courses, and courses in Native American law and contemporary social and political issues.

Randy Daniel (Ph.D. 1994) recently joined the Department of Anthropology at East Carolina University as an assistant professor.

Andy Kipness (Ph.D. 1991) will be taking a leave of absence from his position as assistant professor at Northern Kentucky University to spend the 1997-98 academic year teaching anthropology at the Chinese University of Hong Kong. Andy recently celebrated the publication of his book, Producing Guanxi: Sentiment, Self, and Subcultures in a North China Village, by Duke University Press (Durham, N.C., 1997). This ethnography explores how relationships are formed in a North China village and what they have to do with kinship, gender and local politics; at the same time, it asks broader questions about how guanxi (social connections) have been conceived in various Chinese contexts.

Eric Lassiter (Ph.D. 1995) has completed his first year as an assistant professor of anthropology at Ball State University in Muncie, Ind. Eric's revised dissertation has recently been accepted for publication by the University of Arizona Press; tentatively titled The Power of Kiowa Songs: A Collaborative Ethnography, the book is scheduled for release in Fall 1998.

Diane Levy (M.A. 1995) received her Master's of Regional Planning from UNC-Chapel Hill in Housing and Community Development in May 1997. She is currently employed at UNCG's Center for Urban and Regional Studies, and by the time you read this will have figured out her next move!

Sharlotte Neely (Ph.D. 1976), a professor of anthropology at Northern Kentucky University, recently received a prestigious Faculty Senate Leadership Award from her university's Faculty Senate.

Laurie Price (Ph.D. 1985) is now an associate professor in Anthropology at Northern Arizona University. She is currently re-connecting with Ecuador, her original field site. This involves work with applied projects there (community development and health) and also research and the production of an ethnographic video on the "Año Viejo" festival that occurs all over Ecuador on New Year's Eve.

Brian Riedel (Anthropology 1994) is moving to Houston this August to join the Anthropology Ph.D. program at Rice. He’ll be concentrating on the cultural reproduction of sexualities and on personal narratives, with special attention to inflections of class, race, age, and gender.
This large stoneware jar hails from one of the two North Carolina pottery sites studied by Linda Carnes-McNaughton in her dissertation, Transition and Continuity: Earthenware and Stoneware Pottery Production in Nineteenth Century North Carolina (1997). Linda combined archaeological, documentary, and oral historical evidence to chart the technological transition from earthenware to stoneware production at the Solomon Lay Site in Alamance County and the Daniel Seagle Site in Lincoln County. The cobalt decorations on this jar read:

SOLOMON LAY REFINED STONEWARE
STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHATHAM COUNTY FAMILY JARE 1855

The phenomenon of Scottish-American heritage gatherings in North Carolina is exemplified in this image of David Dysart, appearing here with his spiked targe and detailed costume at one of the South’s many Highland Games. Celeste Ray insightfully probes the search for identity and community in Scottish-American organizations and celebrations in her dissertation, Scottish-American Heritage: Community and Celebration in North Carolina (1996); this image is one of many that grace that work.

**kinship as performative...**

In keeping with the practice of anthropological application, grad students and faculty in our department have been deeply involved in the actual enactment of kinship. Below are the material results of their labor, with forthcoming work to be reported in AN’s next issue...

- Walter Parks Daniels, born to Bob Daniels and Elizabeth Hahn on December 25, 1996
- Lily Beth Hinson, born to Glenn Hinson and Sally Peterson on September 9, 1996
- Nicholas Rafael Lopez, born on February 15, 1996, and adopted by Rafael J. Lopez, Jr., and Victoria Bender on October 15, 1996
- Rosalia May Preiss, born to Alison Greene and Andrew Preiss on March 12, 1995
- Spencer Larsen, born to Clark and Christine Larsen on November 29, 1996
- Austen Coffman Linder, born to Jennifer Coffman and Fletcher Linder on May 7, 1996
Militarism in the Schools: JROTC, AFSC and Anthropology

Lesley Bartlett & Catherine Lutz

Several years ago, we were contacted by Harold Jordan of the American Friends Service Committee's Division of Youth and Militarism. Harold has dedicated years of his life to publicizing the dangers of militarization in public schools and to helping community groups organize against it. He was concerned by the surge in federal funding for Junior Reserve Officer's Training Corps (JROTC) programs. In the early 1990s, the program doubled in size, involving 310,358 students in 2,267 units by 1994. Harold asked us to write an analysis of the JROTC curriculum that he could distribute to parents and concerned citizens to give them a perspective on the program different from that presented in JROTC promotional materials. Sharing a concern that schools were being redirected in ways not consistent with public educational or democratic goals, we agreed to take on this task.

A review of the curriculum revealed several problematic areas. JROTC texts suggest that cultural citizenship is primarily achieved through military service; they distort historical events by focusing on military history while marginalizing all other aspects of the American past; they downplay the importance of civilian control of the military; and they define leadership as respect for constituted authority and the chain of command rather than as critical thinking and democratic consensus-building.

After completing the textual analysis, aided by documents secured through Harold's diligent Freedom of Information Act requests, we began to question the social effects of such a program. The program is most often found in non-affluent schools and in schools with a high proportion of non-white students, who now represent 54% of JROTC cadets. Within the schools that have units, participation by minorities is proportionally higher than participation by whites. Navy JROTC units, for example, recruit 9% of their schools' minority students compared to 7% of their white students.

The expanded JROTC program justifies its expense by claiming to provide discipline for “at-risk” students. As many educators have noted, the “at-risk” label is a racially coded discourse connected to a discredited deficit model of education which stems from stereotypes and leads to tracking. The “at-risk” label has been increasingly applied to students (often black and male) at
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younger and younger ages, with no specification of precisely what “risks” the students run. JROTC’s actual policy on students at risk of school failure is exclusionary: federal law (10 US Code 2031:54) states, “No [JROTC] unit may be established or maintained at an institution unless the institution agrees to limit membership in the unit to students who maintain acceptable standards of academic achievement and conduct.” Likewise, JROTC claims to reduce the drop-out rate, although the Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps units do not collect such statistical information. Nevertheless, the unsubstantiated claim to aid “at risk” students rallies support for the program. Even more disturbing is the kind of “discipline” propagated by the program, which includes unquestioning submission to authority and the glamorization of weapons.

Not surprisingly, the ultimate beneficiary of the program is the military itself. While JROTC claims that it is not a recruiting tool, an Army regulation (32 CFR 542:5:3c) states that JROTC “should create favorable attitudes and impressions toward the Services and toward careers in the Armed Forces.” In fact, the program contributes significantly to service recruitment: 45% of all cadets who complete JROTC enter some branch of the military. JROTC instructors act as military recruiters, screeners of the ill-suited or improperly-tempered, and pre-trainers for military work. Military manpower sociologists and strategists have written for many years about the problem posed by declining populations of 17- to 19-year-olds and of English-literate youth. They have also stressed the importance of “pre-enlistment programs” for the military’s training goals.

Poorer schools are significantly affected by the burden of extra program expenses. While the federal government shares the cost of the program in its start-up years, schools must still pay for extra classrooms, utilities, additional facilities (such as a firing range) and the salaries of the two instructors required by every unit. Overall the program can be quite expensive; Durham, NC, for example, spent $194,000 for JROTC in 1995. Such costs often involve hidden trade-offs for schools, some of which have dropped other educational programe (e.g., art or remedial reading) due to fiscal shortages.

Working with a civic organization was a rewarding experience in a numity of ways. We knew our work would be useful to local groups making decisiv about the establishment or continuation of JROTC units in their schools. 30 copies of the report have been circulated at cost to school boards, civic groups and individuals who want to know more about the program or wseek an alternative point of view. We provided a service to the AFSC, which has little staff time to devote to major research efforts. And, under Mr. Jorda tutelage, we learned much about writing for a general audience.

Thanks to the AFSC’s experience in bringing their reports to the attentiveness of the media, our study gave concerns over JROTC a larger circulation, hopeful stimulating wider public debate. The report was cited, for example, in Washington Post editorial that criticized the use of the program. The Post cited the study in a lengthy feature focusing on the District of Columbia’s many JROTC units. Similar articles in the Christian Science Monitor and the S. Francisco Chronicle also used the study. The study was featured in a half-hour cable T.V. program on JROTC produced by The Center for Defense Information. Locally, the study was ignored by a TV journalist (with whom we spoke) who produced a 15-minute segment on JROTC for North Carolina News, but was featured (along with a rejoinder of a local JROTC commander and positive comments about the program by JROTC cadets) in Durham’s Herald-Sun newspaper. Such media reporting is relatively rare for research that appears in academic journals.

We feel that by denaturalizing “common sense” assumptions through our comparative perspectives, using solid research design principles, analyzing competing discourse, writing clearly, and publishing in accessible formats, anthropologists have much to contribute to American public policy debates.
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AnArchaey Notes is back again, and back on schedule, after surviving a year of rather dramatic changes. Not only does the Department now have a new chair and a (largely) new office staff (see the Transitions section), but we also have a restructured and revitalized undergraduate curriculum, with added courses, a new advising system, and a reorganized major. In the physical realm, our venerable building miraculously survived the batterings of Hurricane Fran (though unfortunately we can’t say as much for the surrounding grounds—several of the quad’s grand oaks are now firewood). And we managed to survive a year’s worth of construction, as Alumni finally gained its long-promised elevator (meaning that halls—and some offices—were blocked for months on end, while we all worked to the drone of drills and foundation-shaking vibrations). In the midst of all this, we somehow met the Administration’s call for a 5-year Strategic Plan, and managed to admit a strikingly skilled and diverse cohort of new graduate students. Add to the loss of our volleyball court (a blow to many!), the shift in the RLA’s name, and the growing interdisciplinary demands on our faculty (Jim Peacock, for example, recently became chair of the Center for International Studies), and you’ll get a sense of the kind of year it’s been...

This year’s issue addresses many of these changes, while maintaining the format established in the past. As promised, we’ve kept the departmental history column (sparked by John Gullick’s reflections in the last issue), and have expanded the Opinions/Notes from the Field sections to include longer essays by graduate students. The theme for this issue is “What Kind of Training?”, discussion of the relationship between academic training, ethnography, and the pragmatic application of anthropological understandings.

The most significant change you’ll notice this year is the return envelope tucked into the fold, marking our first formal request for financial support. University funding is restricted. We have to turn to other sources, like you, our readers, in order to fund events and activities that will benefit our graduate students and our majors. Towards this end, we’re attempting to build our truefund so we are better able to purchase/upgrade student computers and equipment; provide partial funding for student travel to conferences and field sites; hold special faculty/student conferences such as the one on publ andropology; and to generally improve the intellectual and physical environment for our students. Thanks to past donations and other sources, the principal now stands at $20,000; our near-term goal of $35,000 will generate signification annual interest that can be applied to student needs. For the coming year, half of all donations received will be applied to the trust fund’s principal, while the other half will directly support graduate student activities. If you wish to contribute, please use the enclosed envelope and make your check out to the “UNC Dept. of Anthropology.” All contributions are deeply appreciated—w value and intend to honor your commitment to supporting quality graduate curricula and research.