Contents

Introduction

Speaking the Same Language?

Joshua D. Englehardt and Ivy A. Rieger

This volume presents a critical evaluation of an issue seemingly ever present in Americanist anthropology: the relationship between cultural anthropology and archaeology. In the 70 years since Philip Phillips's (1955:246–247) famous axiom "[New World] archaeology is anthropology or it is nothing," anthropologists have questioned whether archaeology truly is part of anthropology.[1] Today, few anthropologists of any geographical or subdisciplinary background would deny that there exist key differences between the theoretical trajectories, discourses, research foci, funding options, conferences, writing styles, analytical techniques, and field methods in each anthropological subfield. We agree with those who argue that such diversity is a positive attribute that can lead to new and innovative forms of scholarly contributions and collaborations (e.g., Earle 2003; Gillespie et al. 2003). Nonetheless, we have discovered through practical experience—as have many colleagues—that this diversity can also lead to miscommunication, feelings of alienation, and, in the most extreme cases, a rigid separation of anthropologists and their subdisciplines from one other due to feeling that they no longer have anything in common.

In short, many wonder not only if archaeologists and cultural anthropologists can—or should—productively collaborate, or if we belong in the same academic departments or discipline as a whole, but also if we are even capable of speaking a common language, and if engaging in mutually intelligible discourse is a goal for which all anthropologists should strive. Rather than repackaging the "sacred bundle," as Segal and Yanagisako (2005) termed it, or calling for the resurgence of a

holistic anthropological ideal steeped in feelings of Boasian nostalgia, the chapters of this volume instead explore the following questions: What are the benefits of speaking the same language? How can a renewed emphasis on subdisciplinary dialogue and collaboration benefit anthropology as a whole as it is currently practiced in the twenty-first century?

To establish the basic parameters for this discussion, we depart from the broad definition of anthropology offered by the American Anthropological Association (AAA): "the study of humans, past and present." The AAA defines *cultural anthropology* as the examination of "social patterns and practices across cultures, with a special interest in how people live in particular places and how they organize, govern, and create meaning." *Archaeology*, as defined by the Society for American Anthropology (SAA) is "the study of the ancient and recent human past through material remains."[2] Nuancing these definitions—or reading between the lines— reveals a common focus on culture that is at the heart of our discipline (Flannery 1982; Watson 1995). Understanding the distinct yet interrelated aspects of human culture is thus the ultimate goal of each anthropological subdiscipline—this is what anthropologists should, and do, study. In this sense, the roles, goals, and foci of anthropology's four primary subfields complement and weave back into each other, forming a complex disciplinary whole that is greater than the sum of its individual parts. From this perspective, and following the definitions above, each subfield is part of anthropology, just as anthropology as a whole is formed by its subdisciplines. Anthropological subfields thus need each other to provide meaning and relevance to the discipline itself, as well as to contextualize the work of researchers in its subfields. If one rejects this premise, then anthropology truly is nothing more than a "dubious," made-up discipline, as Wallerstein (2003) suggested.

Of course, these assertions are debatable, and have been the subject of much previous scholarship (e.g., Anderson 2003; Barfield 2003; Borofsky 2002; Clifford 2005; Earle 2003; Gillespie et al. 2003; Longacre 2010; Nichols et al. 2003; Smith 2010, 2011; Sugandhi 2009; Wiseman 1980a, 1980b, 2002). Indeed, the practical reality of how the anthropological subdisciplines interact with one another is much different than that suggested by idealistic pronouncements of holism or its benefits. Still others may question whether a palpable division between anthropological subdisciplines really exists, and if so, if we as anthropologists—or the public in general—should even care. In addition to the fundamental questions outlined above, each chapter in this volume seeks to address these critical issues. Although perspectives may differ, all of the chapters here share an interest in highlighting commonality, tangibly demonstrating the benefits of collaboration between cultural anthropologists and archaeologists, and rekindling an intradisciplinary dialogue that has lately grown sterile.

SYMPTOMS OF DISCIPLINARY MALAISE

In recent years, some scholars have argued that archaeological aspirations to objectivity ill suit the field to the postmodern subjectivity espoused by some cultural anthropologists, who (arguably) appear to hold that "science" is only one of many ways to understand empirically observable facts (Dreger 2010). Others have suggested that although anthropology needs archaeology, archaeology does not necessarily "need" anthropology, and that it is high time to end the hierarchical relationship in which archaeological data are subordinated to anthropological theory derived from ethnographic accounts (Smith 2010, 2011; Wiseman 1980b, 2001). Still others—ourselves included (e.g., Hepp and Englehardt 2011)—have wondered if archaeologists and cultural anthropologists are even capable of speaking the same language at all, given the immense differences in our recent historical trajectories. Meanwhile, both anthropologists and archaeologists have grown increasingly out of touch with the general public, often abbreviating the immeasurable educative value of highlighting the relevance of anthropological research to a broader, nonacademic audience.[3]

We first began to critically question subdisciplinary divisions at the 2009 AAA meetings in Philadelphia. At that conference, which inspired the concept for this volume, the editors attended a session together during which one of the presenters began his talk with the following observation: "the vast uncertainty of post-Fordist employment matrices has created a nostalgic melancholy for the futurity of the past conditional." Neither of us was sure what he was talking about, and the remainder of the talk offered little clarification. By the end of this session, we were unsure as to how any of the arcane conclusions presented could contribute to our discipline as a whole or to our own research. In short, we felt as if the presenter had made little effort to place his research in a context of mutually beneficial intelligibility that did not exclude nonspecialists.

Our discomfort was heightened at the 2010 AAA meetings in New Orleans. During that conference, prominent themes for panels and presentations included "circulation," "education," and "migration," apparently a selection of the "hot topics" of that time. A less-charitable reading of these conference themes might suggest, however, that we had failed in our independent quests for anthropological relevance if we did not explicitly focus on these issues. We began to critically question the audience to whom the AAA meetings were actually marketed and which perspectives were actively represented. Every subfield except cultural anthropology, for example, is grossly underrepresented at what is supposedly a national meeting of *all* anthropologists, a lamentable reality that negatively affects potential opportunities for collaboration between the subdisciplines. Although the themes of the AAA meetings change yearly, the predominance of cultural anthropology is overwhelming, creating an atmosphere of exclusion for other subdisciplines or those

cultural anthropologists whose scholarship does not directly relate to the themes of the meeting.

In New Orleans, a linguistic anthropologist colleague remarked that the constant relegation of linguistics to the figurative basement of anthropological inquiry was the precise reason for which members of that subdiscipline "broke off and started having [their] own meeting." Several archaeologists noted that they "did not feel welcome," "couldn't find many (or any) sessions of interest to them," and felt that the meeting environment was "stuck up" or "stiff." Others commented that they greatly preferred the SAA annual meeting, where the environment was, in their opinion, more welcoming and jovial, and the sessions presented were more relevant to their own research. However, one could just as easily argue that the SAA meetings are similarly exclusionary, privileging archaeology over other subfields. These comments suggested to us that there was a distinct possibility that we, as anthropologists, were unconsciously fracturing our discipline because we inherently felt more comfortable among our "own kind."

Of course, we are not the first to notice such disquieting trends in our discipline. Robert Borofsky (2002) conducted an extensive literature review of 100 years of *American Anthropologist* (the AAA flagship publication) in an attempt to determine whether disciplinary holism has been actively promoted by contributors to that journal. His analysis revealed that, despite being espoused by the AAA, the concept of holism was a myth, insofar as only 9.5 percent of the articles (311 of 3,264) used intradisciplinary data or methods in any significant way (Borofsky 2002:463). Similarly, in their introductory chapter to *Unwrapping the Sacred Bundle*, Segal and Yanagisako (2005:11) asked cultural anthropologists "when was the last time that research on hominid evolution or primates was helpful to you in thinking about your ethnographic data?" The very need to ask the question itself suggested that the concept of holism represented a shallow philosophy that many American scholars preach, but few, if any, follow. Borofsky (2002:472) concluded that part of the contradiction inherent in modern anthropological discourse resided in the fact that anthropologists tend toward specialization at the same time as we aspire to be an intellectually holistic discipline. Laura Nader (2001:610) noted that oscillation between the contradictory tendencies of evident fragmentation and avowed holism had led to a disciplinary identity crisis: "with increasing specialization we divide and subdivide and still call it anthropology." Innumerable scholars have weighed in on the issue (e.g., Clark 2003; Earle 2003; Fox 2003; Gillespie 2004; Gillespie et al. 2003; Gosden 1999; Kuper and Marks 2011; Peirano 1998, to list but a few), and yet we are no closer to resolving the impasse.

Anthropology at large seems torn by the issue of the placement and articulation of its four appendages, and it appears that the "sacred bundle" as it stands in 2017

has not so much been unwrapped as it has been split apart, its various components forcibly extracted and separated from one another. Intensive specialization within and between the subfields has provided fuel for serious discussions regarding whether the proliferation of diversity represents the "doomsday march" of anthropology, or a more general maturing of the discipline (Chrisman 2002; Clarke 1973). Too frequently, it appears that anthropologists of all stripes are simply not engaging in a common dialogue—whether by conscious choice or lack of training—despite overlapping subject matter, a significant quantity of shared method and theory, and a common history (Flannery 1982; Gosden 1999:9; Watson 1995). Although we recognize the variable and shifting nature of the historical relationship between cultural anthropology and archaeology, as well as a great degree of mutual feedback that has affected both subdisciplines (and, by extension, anthropology as a whole), never before has our discipline been as polarized as it now appears. In short, it appears that anthropologists are simply not speaking a common language.

POTENTIAL CAUSES OF DISCIPLINARY DRIFT

In a previous publication on precisely this issue (Hepp and Englehardt 2011), we identified two major trends that appear to underlie this growing rift within American anthropology. The first trend involves the applications and misapplications of postmodern theoretical discourse in the discipline. The second trend involves the debate regarding the place of the concept of "science" in anthropology.[4] To many archaeologists, cultural anthropology has become so infused with postmodern thought as to become nearly unintelligible and impossible to apply in archaeological research, as evidenced by our confusing experience during the panel on "Post-Fordist Affect" at the 2009 AAA meetings. We do not suggest that archaeologists cannot or do not successfully integrate the postmodern critique into their research. However, the specific misapplication of postmodern social theories to archaeological contexts for the sake of being "on-trend" can result in a dangerous game of obfuscation that damages both the production of archaeological knowledge and the scientific replication of research results. Although postmodernist approaches to sociocultural analyses encourage archaeological and ethnographic researchers to move beyond strict positivism and engage systems of meaning in ways that can be useful to anthropological research, too often such perspectives are couched in an incomprehensible quagmire of jargon and espouse a methodological relativism that many find overly subjective, antiscientific, and inappropriate for the discipline at large.

The second trend is almost the inverse of the first: gravitation toward rigid empiricism and positivistic models on the part of archaeologists; "archaeology with

a capital 'S'" (Flannery 1973). While new theories and methods developed outside of anthropology have great potential to advance the discipline, archaeologists, in their zeal to be considered "hard scientists" and to "quantify" culture, may fall into the same patterns of inappropriate borrowing, misapplication of fashionable techniques to anthropological questions, and the employment of the same sort of pseudo-technical jargon that they find so distasteful in some cultural anthropological discourse. To wit, when theory or method from any school of thought inappropriately infiltrates anthropology, it has the potential to reinforce barriers among the anthropological subdisciplines because of inherent disagreement from camps on both sides as to how, or if, such concepts should be used.

Of course, we do not suggest that interdisciplinary exchange is necessarily objectionable—indeed, many productive advances have resulted from such cooperation. When, however, we indiscriminately apply trendy new theories or methods without regard to either the context of their development or their applicability to strictly anthropological inquiry, we do our discipline a disservice by disguising poor arguments—founded on metaphor or analogy rather than actual evidence—with the bells and whistles of sexy formulae and unfounded conjecture. Inappropriate borrowing from any paradigm results in alienation from the interlocutors, subjects, and objects of our studies. Worse still, it divides us from the very colleagues who, by virtue of a shared subject matter and history, may be in the best position to assist in reframing new approaches for broader anthropological application.

Both trends belie a fundamental discord in the conceptualization of anthropology as (either) a scientific or a humanistic discipline that is perhaps also related to subdisciplinary alienation. The aforementioned controversy surrounding the inclusion of the word *science* in the AAA mission statement derived from a decision to remove the word "because the board sought to include anthropologists who do not locate their work within the sciences, as well as those who do."[5] Leaving aside the logical conclusion that omitting the word would seem to exclude—rather than include—those anthropologists who consider themselves "scientists," the decision immediately angered a large number of archaeologists and physical anthropologists, who traditionally consider their subdisciplines to be overtly scientific in nature (see, e.g., Flannery 1973; Smith et al. 2012; cf. http://www.unl.edu/rhames/AAA /AAA-LRP.pdf, accessed June 11, 2013). Outside observers quickly noted that the issue of "science" has consistently proven a source of division within anthropology, suggesting that the debate is among the reasons that so few archaeologists, linguistic anthropologists, or physical anthropologists attend the AAA meetings: "they go and meet with their own actual disciplinary types . . . so that the real scientists don't have to deal too much with the fluff-head sociocultural anthropological types who think science is just another way of knowing" (Dreger 2010). The varied sentiments

of professionals inside and outside of anthropology regarding the status of the term *science* reveals the presence of a tense debate regarding attempts to reconcile differences that have emerged as an apparent result of the inherent diversity present in the field.

A detailed treatment of the conceptual debates regarding the categories of "science" and "humanities"—and anthropology's (or any of its subdiscipline's) place within or between one or the other—could fill entire volumes. Although some of the chapters in this volume do address the issue, exploring these categories is not a fundamental aim of this collection. Nonetheless, it bears mention here that regardless of where one's inclinations lie, such conceptual diversity should not preclude dialogue or collaboration among anthropologists of all stripes. In fact, we would argue that the unique disciplinary situation of anthropology, spanning both the natural and social sciences—or, if one prefers, the sciences and the humanities—is one of its main strengths, and offers anthropologists a variety of opportunities and practical benefits.[6] Anthropology's focus on human culture opens itself to any number of scientific or humanistic approaches. Polarization and gravitation toward extremes, however, erodes that strength. Instead, it may result in disciplinary anomie and attempts to pigeonhole ourselves (and our colleagues) as either "scientists" or "humanists."

To these proximate causes of disciplinary drift we also add the role of academic structure, administration, and subject matter in creating disciplinary divisions. Budgetary and administrative concerns, student interest, and differing perspectives on the goals and objects of anthropological study have resulted in, for example, the merging of anthropology and sociology departments (e.g., Lehigh University), the differential classification of anthropology courses as either "sciences" or "humanities" (e.g., Florida State University), the separation of cultural anthropologists and archaeologists in distinct academic units (e.g., Boston University), the creation of new academic units (e.g., the School of Human Evolution and Social Change at Arizona State University), the lack of truly "four-field" departments, and, in extreme cases, the closure of anthropology departments as a whole.[7]

We should clarify that the nature of our disciplinary rift is complex, and the potential contributing factors outlined above are not intended to serve as an exhaustive list of the problems we confront. The difficulties we face are multifaceted phenomena. Increased specialization, departmental or administrative organization, acrimonious debate, and a general absence of productive dialogue all currently contribute to a heightened sense of alienation felt among many members of all anthropological subdisciplines. Nor do we consider these issues questions of "blame" that can be easily attributed to the misapplication of one particular viewpoint or theoretical position, or the decisions of academic administrators. Anthropologists must also

recognize the role that we ourselves play—tacitly or otherwise—in current disciplinary malaise. Such recognition can only come from critical evaluation and dialogue, such as that offered by this volume. In the end, archaeology and cultural anthropology have critiqued one another for nearly a century; recent crises may therefore stem from shifting relationships and changing practitioners rather than a fundamental discord between anthropological subdisciplines. Nevertheless, the question remains: what does recent and arguably more pronounced subdisciplinary polarization mean for the future of anthropology as a whole? This is a far more cogent query than any sort of theoretical navel-gazing, blame-shifting, or alarmist cries that the sky is falling.

PRACTICAL CONSEQUENCES AND TOPICAL RELEVANCE

Subdisciplinary polarization has recently resulted in calls for the disarticulation of a holistic anthropology, most of which involve the separation of archaeology (e.g., Smith 2010, 2011; Wiseman 1980a, 1980b, 2001, 2002). Following Wallerstein (2003:453), these scholars argue that the "social construction of the disciplines as intellectual arenas . . . has outlived its usefulness and is today a major obstacle to serious intellectual work." Anthropology, it is argued, is not the most productive intellectual context for archaeology, and currently serves to limit the scope and efficacy of archaeological research. Archaeology, in other words, simply does not "fit well within anthropology" (Gillespie 2004:13). In addition, diversity and specialization within anthropology "increases the distance between disciplines of inquiry as the techniques and theories that are developed at the advancing edges of fields become ever more remote from their common roots" (Brenneis and Ellison 2009). Has our common study of human cultural experience become so broad that hyperspecialization is necessary to make meaningful contributions to research, thus leaving no time for holism?

In addition to these intellectual arguments, there exist more aggressive perspectives that, although obviously not universally shared, nonetheless influence the trajectory of the discipline as a whole. Some cultural anthropologists have implicitly dismissed archaeology and physical anthropology as "dimly related hangers-on," while others have noted that archaeologists are "irrelevant" and "have nothing to offer the discipline as a whole." Conversely, some archaeologists have suggested that anthropology is a "parochial discipline" that severely limits the intellectual horizons of archaeology and that cultural anthropologists are consciously alienating archaeologists and attempting to "drive them out" of the discipline (Morgan 2011; http://publishingarchaeology.blogspot.mx/2011/01/american-anthropologist-implies-that.html, accessed July 12, 2013).[8] The mere existence of both the debate itself and

such drastic perspectives of dissent strongly suggest a growing barrier between sub-disciplines that, for some, is becoming too high to scale. One may think that such dry and abstract arguments are contained solely to infighting within the discipline. We would argue, however, that disciplinary polarization (real or imagined) carries several practical consequences that are both cause and effect of a growing divide.

As detailed above, for example, anthropology departments are being fundamentally reorganized or unceremoniously shut down. This issue is a personal one for the editors—and two contributors to this volume—insofar as we were students or professors at Florida State University when the department was, for all intents and purposes, forcibly disintegrated in 2009. Although departmental or subdisciplinary infighting was not the only—or primary—cause of this (and other) cases of reorganization or closure, it certainly played a factor, as revealed in emails sent by university administrators.[9] This case even became politicized outside the boundaries of academia, when Florida Governor Rick Scott declared that training anthropologists is not a "vital interest of the state."[10] In this instance, the failure of anthropologists to demonstrate the value and relevance of our discipline—among other factors—contributed to the administrative decisions made by the university. Subdisciplinary division severely limits our ability to present a unified front and tangibly demonstrate disciplinary relevance in response to such critiques. In short, it makes administrative decisions such as this one that much easier.

A less-drastic consequence of disciplinary fragmentation is the fact that four-field training across all subfields is decreasingly integrated in educational curricula at both the graduate and undergraduate levels (Anderson 2000; Gillespie 2003, 2004).[11] Echoing Borofsky's (2002) findings regarding the holism avowed, but not reflected, in *American Anthropologist*, Segal and Yanagisako (2005:6) noted that, despite a nominal commitment to the four-field model in syllabi and course materials, the perceived sense of unity encouraged in such courses is rarely reiterated in actual practice: "students are likely to be socialized into some minimal, yet sturdy, acceptance of the orthodox status of the four-field model." This model of unity is therefore couched in the terms of a normative status quo, in which individual scholars make a "hollow pledge of allegiance" to holism that may or may not represent an actual intellectual commitment (Fox 2003:151).

Meanwhile, public interest in the discipline has ebbed, and what little attention it does receive is due primarily to controversies, departmental closures, infighting, and the like. Furthermore, the majority of public knowledge about ethnographic and archaeological research comes not from peer-reviewed journals, books, or conference presentations, but from cable television channel programs, subscriptions to *National Geographic*, and the occasional syndicated newspaper or online news article. The public face our discipline presents is one of near-constant crisis, a seemingly

arrogant disinterest in engaging with laypeople, and petty squabbling over esoteric issues of minimal relevance to a general audience (Nader 2001:617; Sugandhi 2009). These lapses in dialogue with the public and between anthropological subdisciplines can and do create dangerous schisms that may result in permanent separation and, at worst, a dissolution of academic departments and a departure from public interaction altogether.

SHOULD WE CARE? OR, ANOTHER VOLUME ON THIS AGAIN . . . ?

We recognize that the divisions and potential consequences discussed above may not be as dire as some may believe. Variability in the historical relationships of critique between cultural anthropology and archaeology may have simply resulted in the illusion of recent intradisciplinary discord. Alternately, it may simply be that such tension (or "crisis") is the rule rather than the exception in our discipline.[12] Moreover, we are cognizant of the fact that our own experiences may have negatively impacted our assessment of the situation. Finally, we are acutely aware of the fact that this volume is not the first to address this topic: it may be argued that the issue has received sufficient attention in previous treatments dating back decades (e.g., Brenneis and Ellison 2009; Clifford 2005; Flannery 1982; Gosden 1999; Nichols et al. 2003; Peirano 1998; Phillips 1955). What, then, is the benefit or contribution of yet another volume on this topic?

To these potential critiques we would respond first that the very fact that we are *not* the first to notice or critically question these issues is in itself evidence of their continued relevance. The presence of the debate itself suggests that the relationship between cultural anthropology as archaeology is as muddled—or uneasy—today as it was in 1955. This is a debate that has not been conclusively settled, and the fact that the issue has received extensive previous treatment does not imply that we should avoid what many consider to be the elephant in the room. The nature of academic inquiry necessitates revisiting and reevaluating the positions taken and conclusions reached by previous scholars.

Further, although differences of opinion between anthropologists as to the nature, extent, and potential impact of disciplinary fragmentation certainly do exist, it is evident that anthropology finds itself in a troubling position—in terms of departmental reorganization, loss of touch with the public, and a fight to demonstrate its continued relevancy to policymakers and academic administrators. Anthropologists of all stripes should—and do—care about such a lamentable situation and what it holds for the future of our discipline. We recognize historical variability in subdisciplinary relationships, as well as a multiplicity of causes, effects, and degrees of disciplinary division. Understanding and addressing these complex phenomena, however,

can only be achieved through more careful and critical comparisons, such as those offered in this volume. At the risk of hyperbole, if we fail to address—or revisit— these issues, anthropology runs the risk of falling into a vicious circle that perpetuates the fight for relevancy in which we currently find ourselves.

MOVING FORWARD . . . ?

Opinions remain mixed on the issue of specialization and cohesion in anthropology. We do not pretend to offer prescriptive conclusions to the troubling issues of holism and subdisciplinary scholarly belonging in Americanist anthropology. However, we do hold that what cultural anthropologists and archaeologists have in common continues to be greater than what differentiates them. Both study human relations, both draw from a common, fundamental body of theory and method, and both believe that their "interlocutors," whether living or dead, convey messages worth listening to. Although archaeologists and cultural anthropologists approach their analysis from a diverse variety of angles, we are all, in essence, looking at the same questions, despite the semantic and political issues that currently divide us. Such shared history, theory, method, and object of inquiry are what define us as a discipline.

We recognize that some colleagues may feel that disciplinary cohesiveness has been lost, and that there is simply no going back. Even granting this, however, a schism between archaeologists and cultural anthropologists is against their mutual interests, distancing them from each other and further alienating them from laypeople and policymakers. And even if separation is the most logical alternative, we still owe it to ourselves and our colleagues to engage in productive dialogue. After all, a permanent separation of archaeology from anthropology would not proscribe the free and open exchange of data, results, and ideas between archaeologists and cultural anthropologists. The discussion, then, should not hinge solely upon arguments regarding whether the discipline is holistic, or idealistic pronouncements of what anthropology "is" or "is not," but instead should encourage the diversity and subdisciplinary dialogue that already exists within anthropology, despite inherent differences in focus and methodology.

As James Clifford (2005:24) suggested, anthropology as a field needs to go through a process of "disciplining" that is less about "creating consensus than about managing dissent, less about sustaining a core tradition than about negotiating borders and constructing coalitions." We believe that this view should be embraced in anthropology in order to keep the discipline salient in the coming decades. Further, we agree with Clifford that although there will always be reassignments and shifts within the discipline, there are several core tenets that all subfields continue to share, thus keeping the discipline whole. Therefore, we argue that anthropologists

should collectively strive to produce scholarship useful to a wide range of scholars and publics located inside and outside of the discipline, not simply to a select group that shares a particular theoretical, methodological, epistemological, or philosophical perspective. Such insularity serves only to create barricades to intradisciplinary collaboration and dialogue.

We have argued that such research, driven by robust theoretical and methodological dialogue between subfields is, in fact, taking place and can be nourished and sustained through mutual engagement and an active transference of cogent ideas (Hepp and Englehardt 2011). We hold that excessive specialization fosters narrow approaches to anthropological questions. Likewise, focusing on differences between the subfields results in the active exclusion of research that does not conform to one's own theoretical and methodological perspectives. Holism, on the other hand, adds depth to research. This is not to suggest that all archaeological studies must necessarily involve ethnographic data, or that archaeologists should be tethered exclusively to anthropological theory. Instead, we argue that productive complementarity should be a primary goal of anthropological research.

Anthropology is situated in a unique position, a discipline united by the paradigm of culture that sits astride both the "humanities" and the "sciences." We are better served by taking advantage of the best of both, and by avoiding gravitation toward one extreme or the other (Kuper and Marks 2011). Anthropologists need not fear sharing information with other fields, or using data generated and methods employed within these disciplines. Rather, increased transparency and clear communication regarding the ways in which novel theories, methods, and emerging technologies are used can result in more fruitful intradisciplinary dialogue. Such communication, in turn, reignites inter- and intradisciplinary exchange, in ways that positively benefit both ethnographic and archaeological research and ultimately have the potential to bridge the widening gap between us. This volume both defends that proposition and attempts to offer tangible examples of such productive discourse and collaborative research.

STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION OF THIS VOLUME

This volume critically examines historical, current, and future relationships between cultural anthropology and archaeology by reevaluating the ways in which cultural anthropologists and archaeologists communicate with one another. In a general sense, we aim to investigate what defines anthropology as a discipline through an exploration of the theoretical relationship between historically contextualized research and contemporary social theory in cultural anthropology and archaeology. By providing a forum wherein the current relationship between cultural anthropology and

archaeology in academia can be discussed, we hope not only to encourage dialogue between subdisciplines, but also to showcase practical and theoretically relevant applications of archaeology in cultural anthropological research, and vice versa.

Contributors approach these goals by posing a series of questions that are relevant to the future of both archaeology and cultural anthropology: In what sense has archaeology remained part of anthropology? How can cultural anthropologists utilize archaeological data in their research? What is the best use of ethnographic data in archaeological investigations? What are the potential benefits of such collaborations for the discipline as a whole? What is the practicality of actively including archaeological theories, findings, and perspectives in ethnographic studies? What are some examples of specific intersections between cultural anthropology and archaeology in the Americanist tradition? Should archaeology and anthropology remain allied, or is separation preferable? Thus, the volume as a whole actively seeks to engage issues surrounding what we see as an increasing schism within our discipline. By reaching across ever-thickening partitions, the contributors reveal how both sides can benefit from the other, how a freer exchange of data, methods, and results between subfields can serve both ethnographic and archaeological research, and how increased collaboration can lead to fuller, more productive anthropological debates and an anthropology more accessible to the broader public.

Since a principal goal of this volume is to address the benefits of speaking a common language by renewing emphasis on subdisciplinary collaboration, the volume gives equal voice to members of each subdiscipline and includes perspectives from outside of Americanist anthropological archaeology (e.g., European archaeology, classical archaeology). Like this introduction, the first and last chapters are coauthored by a cultural anthropologist and an archaeologist, and the intervening chapters alternate between members of each subdiscipline. The volume ends with two concluding chapters—one by an archaeologist and one by a cultural anthropologist—in an attempt to give equal voice to both "sides." In doing so—and including an equal number of contributions by archaeologists and cultural anthropologists—we hope that the volume will be seen as a fair and balanced discussion, rather than as a controversial "call to arms" that exhorts one side to adopt the perspective of the other. Rather, the volume seeks to highlight the benefits of bridging disciplinary divides and speaking a common language for both interpretivist and empirical, scientifically oriented anthropologists.

INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Individual chapters engage intradisciplinary issues to bridge disciplinary divides. Through a combination of historical, theoretical, and practical perspectives, each

contributor provides a critical reevaluation of the contemporary relationship between archaeology, cultural anthropology, and the broader discipline of anthropology. Each chapter provides a unique perspective on the state of affairs in various areas of the discipline, including discussions regarding Americanist, European, and Mexican archaeological and cultural anthropological traditions.

The volume begins with Vincent LaMotta and John Monaghan's examination of the relationship between cultural anthropology and archaeology through a comparative analysis of Mesoamerican and Pueblo Southwest research contexts. LaMotta and Monaghan cite past collaborations between archaeologists and cultural anthropologists in these two regions to make the argument that, despite a historical trajectory of collaboration, today only a small percentage of cultural anthropologists and archaeologists collaborate at the regional level. In their chapter, the authors seek to explain why levels of collaboration have decreased in these two specific regions. LaMotta and Monaghan conclude that, especially in the case of Mesoamerican studies, there are extremely long temporal gaps in research and focus that become academically categorized under the realm of "history," which result in the loss of between one and three centuries of research potential for cultural anthropologists and archaeologists. Therefore, the authors propose that differences in levels of subdisciplinary collaboration are not a recent development but also have specific historic trajectories that extend beyond theoretical differences or variable historical disciplinary relationships.

In the second chapter, Paul Shankman assesses the history of cultural evolution, a theoretical concept that has experienced decades of use, misapplication, and rediscovery in cultural anthropology and archaeology in the Americanist tradition. Shankman's chapter begins with a question: Does cultural evolution carry so much intellectual baggage that nowadays it can be referred to only indirectly? Indeed, the majority of students studying in graduate programs in the United States have been exposed to the concept of cultural evolution in core or history of anthropology courses. However, the concept is widely considered antiquated, and is presented as something of a cautionary tale in the history of the discipline. Shankman states that many currently practicing anthropologists, especially those who are the "newer" generations of researchers, think cultural evolution is outdated as a concept, but are unsure why. Shankman approaches this paradox by thoroughly reviewing the contributions of major historic figures in cultural evolutionary studies in order to make a case for why ethnography and comparison are not mutually exclusive. Shankman proposes, using case studies based in his own research in the South Pacific, that work currently being done by cultural evolutionists in areas of shared thematic interest with archaeologists, when based in materialist and scientific approaches, could in fact contribute to mutual understandings of specific topics of broader anthropological

interest, such as chiefdoms. It bears note that Shankman's chapter does not blindly defend what some may consider an antiquated and distasteful conceptual para- digm—as suggested by the chapter's title. Rather, he examines the reasons for which cultural evolution—once fertile ground for intradisciplinary dialogue—has been relegated to the trash heap of anthropological discourse.

In his chapter, Fredrik Fahlander—an archaeologist trained in Europe—explores the idea of the "absent subject" in archaeology, and how this concept makes the relationship between archaeology and anthropology writ large an "uneven affair." Another cause for unevenness in the relationship between archaeology and anthro- pology, specifically cultural anthropology, stems from a time lag in the development and application of major theoretical paradigms, where theories tend to make their way first to cultural anthropology before they filter into archaeological practice. Furthermore, Fahlander cautions that the unregulated use of ethnographic analogies in archaeology can be somewhat dangerous. However, theories that extend under- standings of the archaeological record to include social actors and acting objects— aspects often addressed in ethnographic practice—can be beneficial for the subdis- cipline of archaeology as a whole. Fahlander envisions a "posthuman" archaeology, one that emphasizes materialism and an evolution beyond dichotomous distinc- tions between "people" and "things." He proposes that archaeology could serve broader anthropological ends from its increased attachment to meaning and agency in interpreting archeological contexts. Although Fahlander's chapter at first glance may be regarded as antithetical to the goals of this volume, we felt it important to give voice to an outside perspective, insofar as archaeologists of the European school often view cultural anthropology and archaeology as wholly separate—and often unrelated—disciplines. Nonetheless, a careful reading reveals many suggestions for finding common ground and sparking dialogue between cultural anthropology and archaeology in both Europe and the Americas—a significant conclusion given the intellectual and academic contexts of Fahlander's own research.

Ivy A. Rieger presents an analysis of what a cultural anthropologist with archae- ological field training, personal experiences, and four-field academic training could practically look like. Rieger begins her chapter with a reflexive analysis of the influences of two different graduate programs on her development as a cul- tural anthropologist. Rieger states that there exists a marked potential for graduate students in anthropology, no matter the subdiscipline, to experience an identity crisis, especially if they have more than a basic interest in exploring subdisciplines other than their own more profoundly. To address this issue, Rieger proposes that graduate training in cultural anthropology could specifically benefit from the integration and practical application of archaeological research experiences. Through a recapitulation of her personal research experiences in Oaxaca, Mexico,

Rieger provides a case study of what conclusions can result through collaboration between the cultural anthropologist, as a subject position, and archaeology, as a discipline. Rieger concludes that, if more cultural anthropologists worked in the field with archaeologists and in archaeological research contexts, and shared theory, method, and practice on a recurring level, both subdisciplines could mutually inform each other and their relations with local populations, as well as provide valuable nuances to theoretical perspectives and research conducted in anthropology at large.

Joshua Englehardt shifts perspectives regarding theoretical issues in archaeology and anthropology by comparing the practice of anthropology and archaeology in Mexico and the United States. To begin, Englehardt observes that those scholars, graduate students, and university faculty members who are anthropologists in the Americanist tradition who call for a "trial separation" or "divorce" often fail to sketch a realistic vision of what archaeology without anthropology, and anthropology without archaeology, would actually look like. Through a reflexive analysis of his experiences studying, teaching, and practicing archaeology in both the United States and Mexico, Englehardt outlines his support of the continuation of the four-field model of anthropology, discusses debates surrounding the concept of "science" in archaeology, and addresses the current boundaries and frontiers shaping the discipline of archaeology and anthropology as a whole today. Englehardt notes that archaeology is "undeniably multifaceted" and, as such a broad discipline, embodies many applications of various theories and methods associated with diverse schools of thought, regional traditions, and historical foundations. However, Englehardt contends that archaeology lacks what can truly be considered its own body of theory, and that postmodern critique, largely borrowed from cultural anthropology when applied in archaeological practice, is not objectionable but should not be the "end goal" of anthropological investigation. Englehardt makes the argument that archaeologists and other anthropologists should never lose the human element that makes up the heart of our shared discipline, and that forcing a divide or allowing fragmentation between our subdisciplines could hinder the development of new ideas and theoretical perspectives.

Joseph Hellweg's chapter explores the chameleonic nature of the concept of "tribe" in cultural anthropology and archaeology. Hellweg argues that archaeologists who have attempted to redefine and appropriate the term *tribe* for revitalized use in archaeology may be, in fact, misconstruing the dynamics of kinship, alliance, and gender that inform the term ethnographically. Through a thorough review of the use of *tribe* in ethnography—specifically focusing on the Nuer, Evans-Pritchard's legacy, Hellweg's own work, and beyond—Hellweg notes that the traditional tribal model, as applied in archaeology, relies on an individualistic notion of personhood, an

assumption of social equality, and a belief that ethnographic insights can exclusively pertain to short-term timespans. However, patterns of social life do leave traces in the material record, and Hellweg proposes that many archaeologists who are not familiar with ethnographic literature are not trained to see these traces. Therefore, Hellweg concludes that occupying the term *tribal*, while emphasizing collaborative exchange between cultural anthropologists and archaeologists, can result in productive conversations that, in turn, amplify interpretations of the archaeological and ethnographic records. Hellweg's chapter itself directly engages the work of one of his former departmental colleagues—archaeologist Bill Parkinson—offering a tangible example of the shapes that productive engagement and dialogue between archaeologists and cultural anthropologists may take.

Archaeologist Lilia Fernández Souza offers an ethnographic approach to the study of foodways in Yucatán that also has practical applications for archaeological purposes. In her chapter, Fernández demonstrates the value of intradisciplinary cooperation through an analysis of culinary practices in contemporary communities as well as the importance of food as a sociocultural concept over time and space. She proposes that food, as an archaeological and ethnographic topic of interest for anthropologists, should be considered from ethnic, gender, age, class, religious, and locational perspectives. Fernández contends that an agency approach in archaeology is useful in the analysis of how certain sociocultural groups take specific actions related to the production, consumption, and distribution of food. As a case study, Fernández analyzes the history of Mexican cuisine, and the influence of colonialist, nationalist, and indigenous traditions in culinary traditions present in Yucatán, Mexico. She concludes that, although "translating" ethnographic analysis into archaeological terms can be challenging, interpreting specific anthropological and archaeological questions using every possible data source available can offer more nuanced explanations in diverse research contexts. Like Rieger, Fernández uses an example from her own research experiences to tangibly demonstrate the practical benefits and positive impact of collaboration between archaeologists and cultural anthropologists.

Similarly, Ashley Kistler addresses the potential contribution that collaboration with an archaeologist could make to her own ethnographic research—and the local community—in San Juan Chamelco, Guatemala. Kistler argues that collaborative anthropology, involving complementary research and cooperation between cultural anthropologists, archaeologists, and local communities, provides an opportunity to bridge the growing subdisciplinary gap. Kistler details her own work on the Aj Pop B'atz' Project, an offshoot of her ethnographic research in the region. This project sought to illuminate local perceptions of Aj Pop B'atz', a revered and ancestral Q'eqchi' Maya leader of the sixteenth century. Although ethnographic work to discover Aj Pop B'atz' were successful, Kistler contends, throughout her research

new questions arose that could not be answered ethnographically. Kistler suggests that supplementing her ethnographic work through collaboration with an archaeologist could expand understanding of this indigenous leader—particularly aspects concerning the details of his life and accomplishments—as well as provide access to the empirical data and historical information that the local community fervently seeks. Thus, Kistler concludes, collaboration between cultural anthropologists and archaeologists may have not only a reflexive positive impact on our subdisciplines, but may also provide tangible benefits for the general public of the communities in which we conduct our research.

The contribution by David Small, a classical archaeologist, is another perspective that we felt a special need to include in this collection, given the historical and structural divides between classical and anthropological archaeologists (and cultural anthropologists). Classical and anthropological archaeologists are almost always housed in distinct academic units and the former often adopt a more interpretivist stance than the latter. Small discusses the interaction—or lack thereof— between anthropology and classical archaeology in Greece, arguing that there is a pedagogical disconnect between how classicists and other archaeologists, especially those working in the Americanist tradition, are trained. Specifically, classicists are trained using a philological approach that applies history, not anthropology, as the primary theoretical paradigm. Therefore, the ways in which classicists working in the Greek context approach archaeology includes an explicit division between "prehistory" and "history," one that emphasizes the appearance of the written record, a dichotomy that anthropological archaeologists do not typically construct in their analyses of the archaeological record. Small posits that classical archaeology, and, conversely, anthropological archaeology and ethnography, can mutually benefit from each other via a cross-pollination of theoretical and methodological ideas that can bear fruitful collaborative comparisons between cultures, places, and time periods. In his chapter, Small provides poignant examples of what this hybrid species of analysis could look like, with a comparison between Classic Maya and Classical Greek societies.

The final chapter of the volume, coauthored by the archaeologist Kent Fowler and the cultural anthropologist Derek Johnson, analyzes the concepts of choice and wellbeing in archaeology and cultural anthropology. The authors review the theorization of the two concepts in both subdisciplines in relation to the idea of "resources." Through comparative case studies of fishing in Gujarat, India, and ceramic production in South Africa, Fowler and Johnson emphasize the utility of the concept of "modes of production" as having potential to cross the divide regarding collaboration between archaeologists and cultural anthropologists. Modes of production, they argue, can also be of use in an ethnoarchaeological context as well.

In conclusion, Fowler and Johnson propose that cultural anthropology, and cultural anthropologists, may find it "refreshing" that archaeologists are motivated to seriously consider the immaterial underpinnings of materiality, and that cultural anthropologists may also be inspired to reconsider the importance of material considerations in ethnographic studies of human lifeways.

To close the diverse arguments and perspectives presented by the authors of this volume, we have included two conclusions, one from a cultural anthropologist and another from an archaeologist. The first conclusion, by Donna M. Goldstein, reflects on the contemporary characteristics and possible futures of the discipline of anthropology approximately ten years after the publication of Segal and Yanagisako's (2005) *Unwrapping the Sacred Bundle: Reflections on the Disciplining of Anthropology*. Citing the chapters in the present volume, Goldstein proposes that anthropology appears poised for a shared future, one where archaeology and cultural anthropology can practically and theoretically mutually nourish one another. However, Goldstein points out that any "creative alliances" between the subdisciplines must grow organically and freely, born of individual choice, instead of being forced to do so (or to not do so) due to departmental or disciplinary politics, which can and do continue to produce unnecessary tensions between us.

William A. Parkinson's conclusion reflects upon the anthropological nature of archaeology and, conversely, the archaeological nature of anthropology's historically Boasian (split?) personality. Parkinson argues that even if archaeologists and anthropologists attempt to speak the same language, they have always practiced, and will continue to practice, their fields in different ways. However, this should not be cause for despair. Holism, Parkinson suggests, should not be seen as a theoretical ideal where we "share" everything even if it isn't a good fit, but instead be identified as our unique ability, and shared goal, to "examine the human condition from a variety of different perspectives" using a diverse range of theoretical standpoints.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Returning to a point made above, we recognize that archaeology and cultural anthropology have critiqued each other throughout their existence as academic disciplines, and that there is a great deal of variability in this historical relationship. No one collection of essays on the topic can possibly provide a definitive resolution to the issues that currently affect our subfields and have the potential to divide us as a discipline. We do not suggest that the contributions collected here address or represent all possible perspectives on the issues. Although we accept that the relationship between anthropological subdisciplines may not be as dire as some may think—or as we have suggested—we do maintain that both subfields could benefit

from employing a "common language" to move beyond mutual misunderstandings on theoretical and practical levels. To us, it is clear that only by coming together as a discipline can anthropologists meaningfully contribute to intradisciplinary dialogue and research, and only by presenting a unified front can we engage the wider public to underline the contemporary value and relevance of both anthropological research and the discipline itself.

We further recognize that the use of social theory and ethnographic analogies represent difficult mediums for archaeologists. Highly abstract yet potentially fruitful theories and models derived from cultural anthropological research are often difficult to translate for functional archaeological use, and are too often met with snide dismissal. Likewise, cultural anthropologists also face challenging dilemmas when conducting ethnographic analysis, and are sometimes reluctant to employ potentially productive diachronic methods to contextualize data that result from archaeological research. Nonetheless, we hold that a greater exchange of data, results, and ideas between subfields would positively benefit both ethnographic and archaeological research, in both intellectual and practical terms. In highlighting linkages between subfields in the research of our colleagues, this volume offers tangible evidence that transparent communication regarding the ways in which social theory and emerging technologies are used in anthropological research is, in fact, occurring, and that progress can be made in reconciling intradisciplinary differences.

We thus conclude that the dialogue we have started here must continue if the subdisciplines of American anthropology are to scale the barriers that currently threaten it. It is only through such productive dialogue resulting in (and demonstrating) tangible intradisciplinary benefits that we can begin to repair the divide. To paraphrase Fox (2003:152–153), nothing good will come to anthropology by ignoring these sociological, organizational, and intellectual challenges, or by displacing dismay, displeasure, or frustration onto perceived adversaries, either internal or external. We do not suggest that archaeologists should collaborate *solely* with cultural anthropologists, or that cultural anthropologists must *necessarily* employ archaeological data. Rather, we echo Fox's (2003:153) call for anthropologists to pursue significant research questions and to integrate scholarship across fields and subdisciplines as those research questions require. We hope that this volume contributes to such integration, encouraging both further inquiry and an appreciation of the richly productive relationship between anthropological subfields. In the end, we believe that all anthropologists should actively work toward creating and maintaining active and productive subdisciplinary discourse. This volume contributes to such discourse by offering tangible examples of the benefits of collaborative research and exchange, as well as illustrating the myriad shapes that such intradisciplinary exchange may take.

NOTES

1. Or, for that matter, whether any of the four traditional subdisciplines are related in any meaningful way, given the immense diversity that exists between them (Smith 2011; Wallerstein 2003).

2. See the AAA definition of cultural anthropology (http://www.aaanet.org/about /whatisanthropology.cfm, accessed October 10, 2014) and the SAA definition of archaeology (http://www.saa.org/publicftp/PUBLIC/educators/03_whatis.html, accessed October 10, 2014). Rather than viewing these definitions as prescriptive, we prefer to envision them as a baseline against which the conceptions and definitions of our discipline (and subdisciplines) offered by the chapters in this volume may be compared and contrasted.

3. Both the SAA and the AAA do have webpages dedicated to the general public (e.g., "archaeology for the public," http://www.saa.org/publicftp/PUBLIC/home/home.html; "archaeology for educators," http://www.saa.org/publicftp/PUBLIC/educators/03_whatis .html; "RACE: Are We So Different?," http://www.aaanet.org/resources/a-public-education -program.cfm). However, there is little direct interaction with public-media forums, including conferences, television, radio, and internet, that are outside of the academic sphere.

4. See, for example, the recent controversy surrounding the inclusion of the word *science* in the mission statement of the AAA (AAA Long–Range Plan, http://www.aaanet.org /about/Governance/Long_range_plan.cfm, accessed June 11, 2013); cf. Dreger 2010.

5. See http://www.nytimes.com/2010/12/10/science/10anthropology.html?_r=0, accessed May 23, 2013.

6. For example, one of the coeditors of this volume has received research funding from both the National Science Foundation and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

7. The National Research Council's data-based assessment of research doctorate programs (Ostriker et al. 2011) offers a particularly data-rich vision of the wide variety of departmental and administrative classifications of anthropology (and its subdisciplines) at 82 US research universities. In fairness, however, it should be noted that the majority of these programs remain within the contexts of four-field departments of anthropology.

8. At the risk of accusations of creating a "strawman" argument, we prefer not to "name names" or call out particular scholars directly. We feel that such an approach would merely serve to reinforce the very acrimony and division we seek to avoid. Of course, such sentiments are not universally shared. Indeed, there are voices on both sides of the debate that favor continued association (e.g., Anderson 2003; Barfield 2003; Earle 2003; Gosden 1999; Kuper and Marks 2011; Longacre 2010; Sugandhi 2009).

9. See http://uff-fsu.org/oldsite/art/UFFLayoffArbitrationBrief.pdf, accessed October 7, 2014. It is revealing that among the possibilities considered by the university administration was "farming out certain anthropology professors to biology and other departments" (http://chronicle.com/article/Anthropologists-Look-for/125464/, accessed July 12, 2013).

10. See http://politics.heraldtribune.com/2011/10/10/rick-scott-wants-to-shift-univer sity-funding-away-from-some-majors/, accessed October 7, 2014; http://chronicle.com /article/Disappearing-Disciplines-/64850/; and http://chronicle.com/blogs/brainstorm /why-i-am-weeping-for-florida-state-university/19493, accessed October 7, 2014. Since then, Governor Scott has proposed differential tuition rates for STEM (science, technology, engineering, and math) and non-STEM majors. The Governor has thus made it clear that he sees anthropology as a whole as an "unscientific" discipline, and intends to make those who wish to study it pay more for their educations. Ironically, his own daughter has an undergraduate degree in anthropology.

11. Full disclosure: the FSU department of anthropology ceased to be a truly four-field department when its only linguistic anthropologist passed away in 2006.

12. As one commenter put it: "anthropology reminds me of one of those furniture stores that is always going out of business. Cries of alarm at its imminent breakup, as well as heartfelt pleas to keep the four fields together, have been a staple of anthropological discourse for at least a generation. After a while, you start to think that maybe this isn't a crisis, it's a business model" (http://chronicle.com/article/Anthropologists-Look-for/125 464/, accessed July 12, 2013).

REFERENCES

Anderson, David G. 2000. "Archaeologists as Anthropologists: The Question of Training." In *Teaching Archaeology in the Twenty-First Century*, ed. Susan J. Bender and George S. Smith, 141–146. Washington, DC: Society for American Archaeology.

Anderson, David G. 2003. "Archaeology and Anthropology in the Twenty-First Century: Strategies for Working Together." *Archeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association: Special Issue: Archeology Is Anthropology* 13(1):111–127. http://dx.doi.org/10 .1525/ap3a.2003.13.1.111.

Barfield, Thomas. 2003. "Archaeology as Anthropology of the Long Term." *Archeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association: Special Issue: Archeology Is Anthropology* 13(1):41–49. http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/ap3a.2003.13.1.41.

Borofsky, Robert. 2002. "The Four Sub-fields: Anthropologists as Mythmakers." *American Anthropologist* 104(2):463–480. http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/aa.2002.104.2.463.

Brenneis, Don, and Peter Ellison. 2009. "Holism and Anthropology." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 38(1):v–vi. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.an.38.091009.100001.

Chrisman, Noel J. 2002. "Toward a Mature Anthropology." *Anthropology News* 43(4):4–5.

Clark, Geoffrey A. 2003. "American Archaeology's Uncertain Future." *Archeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association: Special Issue: Archeology Is Anthropology* 13(1):51–67. http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/ap3a.2003.13.1.51.

Clarke, David L. 1973. "Archaeology: The Loss of Innocence." *Antiquity* 47(185):6–18. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0003598X0003461X.

Clifford, James. 2005. "Rearticulating Anthropology." In *Unwrapping the Sacred Bundle: Reflections on the Disciplining of Anthropology*, ed. Daniel A. Segal and Sylvia J. Yanagisako, 24–48. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Dreger, Alice. 2010. "No Science, Please. We're Anthropologists." *Pychology Today*. Accessed July 17, 2013. http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/fetishes-i-dont-get/201011/no-science-please-were-anthropologists.

Earle, Timothy. 2003. "Anthropology Must Have Archaeology." *Archeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association: Special Issue: Archeology Is Anthropology* 13(1):17–26. http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/ap3a.2003.13.1.17.

Flannery, Kent V. 1973. "Archaeology with a Capital 'S." In *Research and Theory in Current Archaeology*, ed. Charles L. Redman, 47–53. New York: John Wiley.

Flannery, Kent V. 1982. "The Golden Marshalltown: A Parable for the Archaeology of the 1980s." *American Anthropologist* 84(2):265–278. http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/aa.1982.84.2.02a00010.

Fox, Richard G. 2003. "Let Archaeology Be." *Archeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association: Special Issue: Archeology Is Anthropology* 13(1):151–153. http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/ap3a.2003.13.1.151.

Gillespie, Susan D. 2003. "Teaching Archaeology as Anthropology." *Archeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association: Special Issue: Archeology Is Anthropology* 13(1):87–97. http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/ap3a.2003.13.1.87.

Gillespie, Susan D. 2004. "Training the Next Generation of Academic Archaeologists: The Impact of Disciplinary Fragmentation on Students." *SAA Archaeological Record* 4(2):13–17.

Gillespie, Susan D., Rosemary A. Joyce, and Deborah L. Nichols. 2003. "Archaeology Is Anthropology." *Archeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association: Special Issue: Archeology Is Anthropology* 13(1):155–169. http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/ap3a.2003.13.1.155.

Gosden, Christopher. 1999. *Anthropology and Archaeology: A Changing Relationship*. New York: Routledge.

Hepp, Ivy R., and Joshua D. Englehardt. 2011. "Speaking the Same Language: Bridging the Ever–Growing Disciplinary Divide between Sociocultural Anthropology and Archaeology." *Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers* 100(1):26–37.

Kuper, Adam, and Jonathan Marks. 2011. "Anthropologists Unite!" *Nature* 470(7333):166–168. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/470166a.

Longacre, William. 2010. "Archaeology as Anthropology Revisited." *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 17(2):81–100. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10816-010-9080-1.

Morgan, Colleen. 2011. "Archaeology, Anthropology, and Multi-Sited Ethnography." *Anthropologies* 3. Accessed June 11, 2013. http://www.anthropologiesproject.org/2011/05/archaeology-anthropology-and-multi.html.

Nader, Laura. 2001. "Anthropology!" *American Anthropologist* 103(3):609–620. http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/aa.2001.103.3.609.

Nichols, Deborah L., Rosemary A. Joyce, and Susan D. Gillespie. 2003. "Is Archaeology Anthropology?" *Archeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association: Special Issue: Archeology Is Anthropology* 13(1):3–13. http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/ap3a.2003.13.1.3.

Ostriker, Jeremiah P., Charlotte V. Kuh, and James A. Voytuk, eds. 2011. *A Data-Based Assessment of Research Doctorate Programs in the United States*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

Peirano, Mariza. 1998. "When Anthropology Is at Home: The Different Contexts of a Single Discipline." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 27(1):105–218. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.27.1.105.

Phillips, Philip. 1955. "American Archaeology and General Anthropological Theory." *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 11(3):246–250. http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/soutjanth.11.3.3629023.

Segal, Daniel A., and Sylvia J. Yanagisako. 2005. "Introduction." In *Unwrapping the Sacred Bundle: Reflections on the Disciplining of Anthropology*, ed. Daniel A. Segal and Sylvia J. Yanagisako, 1–23. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1215/9780822388641-001.

Smith, Michael E. 2010. "Archaeology is Archaeology." *Anthropology News* 51(1):35.

Smith, Michael E. 2011. "Why Anthropology Is Too Narrow an Intellectual Context for Archaeology." *Anthropologies* 3. Accessed June 11, 2013. http://www.anthropologiesproject.org/2011/05/why-anthropology-is-too-narrow.html.

Smith, Michael E., Gary M. Feinman, Robert D. Drennan, Timothy Earle, and Ian Morris. 2012. "Archaeology as a Social Science." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 109(20):7617–7621. http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1201714109.

Sugandhi, Namita. 2009. "Archaeology as Anthropology." *Anthropology News* 50(9):34–35.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2003. "Anthropology, Sociology, and Other Dubious Disciplines." *Current Anthropology* 44(4):453–465. http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/375868.

Watson, Patty Jo. 1995. "Archaeology, Anthropology, and the Culture Concept." *American Anthropologist* 97(4):683–694. http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/aa.1995.97.4.02a00110.

Wiseman, James. 1980a. "Archaeology in the Future: An Evolving Discipline." *American Journal of Archaeology* 84(3):279–285. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/504702.

Wiseman, James. 1980b. "Archaeology as Archaeology." *Journal of Field Archaeology* 7:149–51.

Wiseman, James. 2001. "Declaration of Independence." *Archaeology* 54 (4): 10–2.

Wiseman, James. 2002. "Point: Archaeology as an Academic Discipline." *SAA Archaeological Record* 2(3):8–10.