Is Archaeology Anthropology?

Deborah L. Nichols, Dartmouth College
Rosemary A. Joyce, University of California, Berkeley
Susan D. Gillespie, University of Florida

Archeology is anthropology...save that the people archeology studies happen to be dead.
—Braidwood (1959:79)

In a famous phrase, Philip Phillips (1955:246–247) stated that "New World archaeology is anthropology or it is nothing." A few years later, Robert Braidwood made a similar characterization for the Old World (see epigraph). That these well-established archaeologists were motivated to make such pronouncements indicates a sense of uncertainty even then of the relationship between archaeology and anthropology. This uncertainty has not abated, and nearly 50 years later the relationship has become more strained. Archaeology in the United States, as in many other countries, is viable outside of anthropology. Academically it is housed in nonanthropology departments, institutes, and interdisciplinary programs at a number of universities. Most professional archaeologists are employed outside the academy where their identity as anthropologists (if it exists) is often muted (see Bender and Smith 2000; Zeder 1997:46). The notion that American departments of anthropology should necessarily include archaeology as a major subfield of the discipline and that all anthropology students should be required to take classes in archaeology (e.g., Strong 1952) is being questioned. Within anthropology departments, formal or informal divisions separating archaeology, biological anthropology, and sociocultural/ linguistic anthropology are becoming more common.

Now, however, there are increasingly strident calls for archaeology to be recognized as a discrete intellectual discipline in autonomous academic departments, leaving many archaeology professionals and students pondering the future of their identity as anthropologists and the enormous changes in the discipline that this move would portend. While there have been previous attempts by a few archaeologists to organize separate departments of archaeology, some of them quite successful (notably at Boston University and Calgary University; Ferrie 2001; Wiseman 1980, 1983), recent events have brought this issue greater attention and garnered more broad-based support for separation. They have also provoked equally passionate arguments from the other side.

Most visible among the recent proposals for an autonomous archaeology was the forum "Archaeology Is Archaeology" organized by T. Douglas Price at the 2001 Society for American Archaeology meeting (reported in Wiseman 2001, 2002). It motivated a Point-Counterpoint exchange among James Wiseman (2002), Robert Kelly (2002), and Susan Lees (2002) in the *SAA Archaeological Record*, with Kelly (SAA President) and Lees (co-editor of *American Anthropologist*) arguing against separation from anthropology. The 2001 symposium was organized partly in response to one presented at the 2000 SAA meeting entitled "Archaeology Is Anthropology" sponsored by the Archeology Division of the American Anthropological Association, the impetus for this volume. Other recent sessions that have considered the relationship between archaeology and anthropology include one organized by Heather VanWormer and sponsored by the SAA Student Affairs Committee at the 2001 SAA meeting entitled "Archaeology as Anthropology: Perspectives at the Start of the New Millennium" and an AAA-AD symposium at the 2001 AAA meeting organized by Joseph Schuldenrein and Susan Gillespie entitled "Teaching Archaeology at the Dawn of the Millennium: Is Anthropology Really Necessary?" At that same AAA meeting William Longacre gave the AD Distinguished Lecture entitled "Archaeology as Anthropology Revisited."

Perhaps millennial fever together with the 2002 centennial celebration of the AAA has contributed to a reassessment of the value of maintaining our nineteenth-century legacy of "four-field" anthropology departments. However, we now have to contend with Robert Borofsky's (2002) assertion—in the flagship journal *American Anthropologist*—that "four-field" integration was always a "myth" and never a reality, a conclusion opposite to that reached by Longacre in his Distinguished Lecture.

Archaeology and anthropology have come a long way in the past half-century, and the 1950s thinking concerning the relationship between the two is increasingly considered irrelevant. However, the placement of archaeology within the discipline of anthropology has always been uneasy—and was just as much a half-century and more ago as it is now. Is archaeology only now on the brink of "divorce" after decades of pleas for mutual respect and cooperation have finally proven inadequate (Watson 1995)? Is separation the only alternative left to sustain and further archaeology and to finally shake off a second-class status to sociocultural anthropology that archaeologists have long contested (Willey and Sabloff 1993:152)? In what sense can we profess that archaeology is still anthropology?

This volume, based on the original 2000 SAA symposium and with additional contributions,[1] evaluates the reasons proffered for separation against those in favor of maintaining the identity and practice of archaeologists as anthropologists. Arguments for the separation of archaeology from the discipline of which it has been a part for over a century take several different forms, weighing various intellectual factors: historical, methodological, and theoretical. Recent changes in the practice of archaeology and in the organization of professional societies must also be considered. We summarize each of these factors in turn as a way of introducing the complex problems archaeologists face and that our contributors address in the chapters herein.

Intellectual Factors

Phillips's quotation, now often abbreviated to "archaeology is anthropology," provokes different readers to interpret it in distinct ways. For many, even shortened, it still carries the implied second clause—"or it is nothing"—and that clause in turn is treated as relegating archaeology to a position derivative of anthropology. This is indeed part of the original sense Phillips intended (Phillips 1955:246; see also Willey and Phillips 1958:1; Terrell, this volume)—archaeology should look to anthropology for the theoretical frameworks necessary for social interpretations of archaeological remains. This implication would not pose a problem if "anthropology" was reserved as the term for the larger field to which archaeology, ethnography, linguistics, human biology, and the other subfields contribute, as originally envisioned in the nineteenth century. R. B. Dixon (1913:558) characterized archaeology as "prehistoric ethnology and ethnography," as if only time (and hence corresponding methodological differences) separated the two subfields. Walter Taylor (1983 [1948]) vociferously argued for archaeology as an equal contributor to a larger theoretical enterprise known as anthropology. Interestingly, this position has recently been reiterated by British archaeologist Christopher Gosden (1999:2) and social anthropologist Tim Ingold (1992:694), outside of the Americanist anthropological tradition.

In practice, however, "anthropology" is too often used as a synonym for ethnography or sociocultural anthropology, whereas "archaeology" is a marked term referring more precisely to methods and techniques that may or may not reference anthropological theory or interpretation, although many archaeologists study society and culture. This common practice often results in the interpretation of Phillips's shorthand phrase as a statement that archaeology is a subordinate and lesser form of intellectual engagement in relation to sociocultural anthropology—and it was precisely to counter this perception that Phillips (1955:246) wrote his essay. Given that archaeologists of his day still aspired to approximate the same social and cultural units as ethnographers—that is, to actually do prehistoric ethnography and ethnology, something they could never do so well as ethnographers—it was inevitable that archaeology would be considered "highly marginal" within anthropology (Watson 1995:686). The proclamation of cultural anthropologist E. Adamson Hoebel (1949:436) that archaeology "is doomed always to be the lesser part of anthropology" hung heavy over American archaeology (Willey and Sabloff 1993:152), even though it was occasionally hotly contested (e.g., Binford 1962; Flannery 1983; Meggers 1955).

Archaeologists are still having to "borrow" from social science theory, as Phillips (1955:246) concluded was inevitable, but somehow with less legitimacy than that automatically granted to our fellow social scientists, namely, ethnographers, who observe living peoples and who more typically call themselves "anthropologists." Thus it is argued that archaeology will continue to be relegated to a second-class status as long as it remains a "subfield" of another discipline/department. Creating separate departments of archaeology

is considered a pragmatic means for archaeology to get the respect it deserves (e.g., Meltzer 1979; Wiseman 1980, 1998).

The Historical Argument: Our Unique Past Is Insufficient Justification for Present Circumstances

The separation of archaeology from anthropology is often taken to be a quite logical step given that in many other countries archaeology is not housed in anthropology departments but instead is found in free-standing departments of archaeology or prehistory or is allied with history, art history, or classics. James Wiseman (e.g., 2001), among others, has therefore urged anthropological archaeologists to move away from a relationship based on what is widely believed to be a singular and now obsolete historical foundation (see discussions in Barfield, Earle, this volume; see also Pinsky 1992:163; Taylor 1983 [1948]; Trigger 1989; Willey and Sabloff 1993). Over 20 years ago, George Gumerman and David Phillips (1978:187) plainly expressed what was already likely a widespread opinion when they questioned "whether given the historical development of the discipline since 1958 [Willey and Phillips's declaration of archaeology as anthropology], the automatic association of archaeology with anthropology is currently philosophically justified, and not merely *the institutionalization of historical accident*" (emphasis added).

The special circumstances of North American Boasian anthropology in the early twentieth century include the holistic engagement with Native American cultures, which were seen as "vanishing" and thus in need of multiple forms of "salvage," a view rooted in assumptions of shallow time depth and relative stability from the past to the ethnographic present (e.g., Trigger 1989). The emphasis of Euro-American archaeologists on the study of ancient Native America—"the Other"—unlike the nationalist focus of European archaeologists, cemented the tie of (prehistoric) archaeology to anthropology rather than to history (see Earle, this volume). In contrast, the much later development of North American historical archaeology—the study of "Us"—has much more tenuous ties with anthropology (see Majewski, this volume). These historical circumstances are cited not only as reasons to abandon the anthropological synthesis, but as forms of corruption in its origin, especially given the colonial contexts within which both archaeology and anthropology arose and which generated an especially troublesome attitude toward native peoples as if they were on the verge of extinction (e.g., Gosden 1999; Trigger 1980).

Moreover, subfield methodological differences strained the relationship of archaeology to anthropology from the beginning. Practitioners of both failed to engage in what should have been common goals, such as understanding cultural change, and as Julian Steward complained in 1942, even among early ethnographers and archaeologists "techniques and procedures have loomed as ultimate goals. Ethnology tends to ignore the results of archaeology, while archaeology, concentrating on its techniques for excavation and its methods for description and classification of the physical properties of artifacts, comes to consider itself a 'natural,' a 'biological,' or an 'earth-science' rather than a cultural science" (Steward 1942:339). Since that time, increasing specialization within all of the subfields of anthropology has become a serious threat to its cohesiveness and even to the unity of archaeology itself (e.g., Borofsky 2002:471–472; Schiffer 2000:2; T. Douglas Price in Wiseman 2001:11).

A major difficulty that leads to such divisiveness is that in its ambitious attempt to investigate the entirety of human experience, archaeology encompasses enormous diversity. There are vast differences in time scales at which various archaeologists work. Research questions, methods, and theoretical orientations of those who deal with early human populations in the distant past (Clark, this volume) may seem to have little in common with those of archaeologists who study historically documented peoples (see also Crumley 1994:2–3). Similarly, anthropology that examines large swaths of time on a global scale from an evolutionary perspective—for instance, research dealing with questions of disease and demographic patterns (Armelagos, this volume)—will look very different from the contextual analyses confined to narrow frames of time and space. Paleoanthropologists researching the deep past and bioarchaeologists often have much in common with another sister discipline, biological anthropology (Armelagos, Clark, this volume), while those who work in the more recent past tend to deal with questions that ally them with ethnographers and social historians (Majewski, this volume).

This diversity of topics and the new interdisciplinary alliances that are being formed and strengthened because of them may motivate the splitting of anthropology in novel ways to match the present realities. Some have found the disciplinary ties to anthropology "restrictive," in that anthropology is "not broad enough" for the research undertaken by archaeologists, especially those examining environmental/ecological issues and long-term or evolutionary processes (Gumerman 2002). These new alliances need not correspond to the traditional subfield boundaries that are a legacy of our discipline's his-

tory but could focus on specific topics and techniques, such as paleoanthropology, bioanthropology, historical anthropology, and ecological anthropology. Archaeology could legitimately contribute to many of these new disciplines (e.g., van der Leeuw and Redman 2002)—or it could strike out on its own.

The Methodological Argument: What We Do Is More Important Than Why We Do It

This discussion brings us to a second line of argument that has become increasingly heard in calls for separate departments and programs in archaeology: our specific methods and techniques are what provide our unique identity as archaeologists, and they implicate a corpus of research interests that is at odds with those of other anthropologists. Field and laboratory methods provide a common foundation for archaeologists trained in diverse traditions that span the sciences and humanities. Thus it seems easy to conceive archaeology as a unitary discipline grounded in a shared methodology. Conceiving archaeology as "technique" not only would provide disciplinary independence but also "permits the archaeologist to test more freely the theories and models that have emanated from many disciplines [besides sociocultural anthropology] while not denying we can develop our own body of theory" (Gumerman and Phillips 1978:188). As new technologies, such as materials analysis, geographic information systems, and bioarchaeological methods, become more accessible, archaeologists of all disciplinary backgrounds share greater interests in their application, reinforcing their methodological links.

Thus, some archaeologists have argued that archaeological methods are sufficiently different from those of ethnology and other social sciences to warrant treating "archaeology as itself" (see Trigger 1989:357ff; also Ferrie's [2001] interview with MacNeish; Wiseman 1980). This is especially possible in large departments whose faculty teach courses only within their narrow specializations and delegate most undergraduate instruction to graduate students and non–tenure line faculty. Furthermore, given that method is integrated with theory, the increasing importance of methodological differences among and within the subfields of anthropology also implicates inevitable theoretical differences.

The Theoretical Argument: Is There Still a Tie That Binds?

Phillips's original argument for the alignment of New World archaeology with anthropology, which has been echoed many times since then, emphasized the theoretical linkage: "American archaeology stands in a particularly close, and, *so far as theory is concerned*, dependent relationship to general anthropology" (Phillips 1955:246, emphasis added). In terms of theoretical interests, archaeologists and their sociocultural colleagues have experienced an uneven history, with periods of convergence and divergence (Gosden 1999). Already by the 1930s there seemed to be a lack of common intellectual objectives (Steward and Setzler 1938). This was also the period when "salvage" archaeology demanded more attention from archaeologists, seeming to further detach them from the academic pursuits of ethnographers (see below). Such centrifugal forces diminished in the middle decades of the twentieth century when functionalism encouraged a closer relationship between archaeology and sociocultural anthropology. Phillips (1955) together with his colleague Gordon R. Willey (Willey and Phillips 1958) attempted to engage archaeologists in the social implications of their typological units, an effort that could be said to have culminated in Lewis R. Binford's (1962) path-breaking article "Archaeology as Anthropology."

Furthermore, by the 1960s a renewed theoretical interest in comparative and evolutionary studies of human societies crosscut the anthropological subdisciplines and contributed to an explosive growth of archaeological knowledge (Pinsky 1992:176; Trigger 1998b:696; Willey and Sabloff 1993). However, the research of sociocultural anthropologists engaged with culture as symbols, meanings, and "texts" diverged from the focus of the processual archaeology of the 1960s and 1970s with its presumption that archaeologists could not be "paleopsychologists" (Binford 1965:204), although not all archaeologists eschewed these approaches. Symbolic and structuralist theory was followed by Gramscian hegemony, Foucauldian discourse, and other postmodern, postpositive, poststructural, and postcolonial approaches (collectively referred to as "afterology" [Sahlins 1999:404]) that strongly appealed to later twentieth-century sociocultural anthropology (Ortner 1984). However, they seemed to have far less to offer archaeology (J. Kelly 2002) and contributed to a further drop in cross-subdisciplinary communication, although, again, some archaeologists have found value in these theories.

At the same time, archaeologists had been questioning the need to follow research agendas established within sociocultural anthropology, contesting the implication of Steward's (1942:341) earlier characterization of archaeology as relegated to "the position of the tail on an ethnological kite." That is, they wanted to be "more than

the bastard stepchildren of anthropology" (Lyman et al. 1997:213). By the 1970s there were a number of calls for archaeology to develop its own theory, one that better matched the analysis and interpretation of the archaeological record (e.g., Binford 1977:6–7; Meltzer 1979:654), especially given the very different time frames of archaeological and ethnographic research (e.g., Bailey 1983:182; Binford 1981:197–198). Rather than attempt to operationalize the empirical units of ethnographers—which we could never do as well—it was considered better to develop our own (e.g., Deetz 1972:114; Renfrew 1978:94). Archaeologists should no longer depend on theories first filtered through anthropology; they should have unlimited access to theories from the social and the other sciences (e.g., Gumerman and Phillips 1978; Trigger 1989:372–373). Indeed, the dependence on anthropology and the concomitant absence of archaeological theory was said to have contributed to archaeology's failure to become a full-fledged science (Dunnell 1982:1; Meltzer 1979:654).[2]

This growing theoretical divergence is a major factor motivating archaeologists and biological anthropologists, but also some sociocultural anthropologists, to break away from an increasingly meaningless four-field academic structure (see Barfield, this volume, for the perspective of the latter group). The recent separation of the Anthropology Department at Stanford University into a Department of Anthropological Sciences and a Department of Cultural and Social Anthropology has become characterized as a split of positivist archaeologists and biological anthropologists from antipositivist sociocultural anthropologists. This development is used to support the argument that archaeology, which is necessarily a materialist enterprise, is fundamentally opposed to antimaterialist sociocultural studies.[3]

Postmodernism often emerges as a focal point in the arguments for divorce—as a principal reason we no longer get along—although it may also serve as a strawman or distraction to avoid dealing with more pressing challenges to the practice of archaeology (Fox, this volume). For example, Robert Kelly (2002) sees the rejection of scientific, evolutionary, and materialist approaches by the more "critical" postmodernists (following Knapp 1996:130) as the most important factor underlying the current calls for archaeologists to leave anthropology. Within the broad and inchoate umbrella of positions labeled "postmodern" there are the "critical" nihilist and hyper-relativist strains (Knapp 1996:135) that leave little place for a holistic anthropology encompassing an explication of the entirety and diversity of the human experience, especially the evolutionary and

scientific approaches more often employed by archaeologists (Trigger 1998a:245). Bernard Knapp (1996:144) has argued that the rejection of material culture theory, long-term change, and human agency in the past espoused by some extremist positions would render archaeology virtually irrelevant if not impossible. On the other hand, the social and interpretive approaches that derive from "moderate" postmodernism (Knapp 1996:131) have advanced archaeological knowledge and provide an opportunity for archaeology to "lead the way" in developing these theoretical perspectives (Knapp 1996:152).

Thus, this schism does not fall strictly along subdisciplinary lines within anthropology. Furthermore, criticisms of "critical" or "radical" postmodernism have been made by sociocultural anthropologists and other social scientists, most of whom take more moderate positions (Knapp 1996:136). There is now a "post-mortem on postmodernism" (J. Kelly 2002) and a resurgence of concern for science among many sociocultural anthropologists (e.g., the recently formed Society for Anthropological Sciences; http://anthrosciences.org). However, what is often construed as a split between science and antiscience associated with postmodernism is not confined to the academy, given that postmodernism itself has been characterized as a societal "condition" (Lyotard 1984). Geoffrey Clark (this volume) argues that in the United States the varied political agendas of anti-intellectual, antiscience, and antievolutionism groups exacerbate theoretical schisms in the academy. Thus, we need to consider the impact of extra-academic factors on the relationship of archaeology to anthropology.

Practical Factors

Our discipline is defined not only by its intellectual concerns, having to do with the substantive content, theories, and methods, but also by its specific institutional structure—the organization of university and college departments, the training of students, professional associations and journals, and archaeological practice outside the academy (Gosden 1999:33). These factors have also been raised in the arguments for or against autonomy. Centrifugal forces of subdisciplinary specialization that are as old as the discipline of anthropology are exemplified—and increasingly intensified—by the proliferation of specialist professional societies and interest groups, changes within academic institutions that have fostered factionalism, the explosive growth in nonacademic employment, and the increasing realization that all archaeologists must take "real-world" factors into account, both inside and outside of academia.

Professional Societies and Disciplinary Identities

Physical anthropologists and linguists each formed separate professional organizations and journals in the early decades of the twentieth century (Pinsky 1992: 164–165; Stocking 1976:23–30). The Society for American Archaeology was not established until 1934, significantly, in response to the rapid growth of "amateur archaeology" projects carried out under government auspices and in recognition of the growing gap therefore between anthropological objectives and most archaeological practice (Pinsky 1992:166). The establishment of the SAA has also been characterized "both as a symptom of intensified subdisciplinary specialization, and as an aggravating factor in that process" (Pinsky 1992:167).

Thomas Patterson (1999:162) observed that a 1946 reorganization of the American Anthropological Association (founded 1902) reasserted and also redefined the four-field structure of anthropology, which was only later mirrored in academic departments. A number of the larger subdisciplinary organizations were affiliated with the AAA, which managed certain business affairs for them such as membership billing and publications. However, a 1982 Internal Revenue Service ruling impacted the association's ability to provide such services. Several organizations, including the SAA and the American Association of Physical Anthropologists, opted to manage their own association business rather than face dissolution under the proposed AAA reorganization plan (Green and Fowler 1983:1). The AAA established a new section to represent the interests of archaeologists within the association—the Archeology Division (publisher of this volume)—and created the Biological Anthropology Division to represent the interests of biological anthropologists. Nevertheless, that decision likely affected the identity of many SAA members in terms of the intellectual alliance of archaeology with anthropology.[4]

The resulting co-presence of two professional associations dedicated to archaeology is now believed by some to represent a major division within archaeology itself. Bruce Smith (2001:215) recently asserted that archaeologists who participate in the AAA, publish in *American Anthropologist*, and are proponents of four-field anthropology are "intellectual theoreticians" engaged with big-picture questions of culture change. They contrast in his opinion with "scientist" archaeologists who are "particularists concerned with discovering and documenting the scatter of hard facts." Smith considers that it is the latter group that recognizes the "reality of the decline in interaction between sociocultural anthropol-

ogy and archaeology" and are more likely to belong to the SAA (but see below).

The SAA, which at this writing has almost 7,000 members, has created a distinctive identity as a professional organization. It has been active in shaping public and legal policies in the United States, in recognizing the growth of practicing or cultural resource management archaeology, in public outreach, and in promoting archaeological education. Many professional and student archaeologists, faced with the increasing costs of membership in either organization (SAA or AAA-AD), have chosen to join the one that is devoted solely to archaeology, further reinforcing their identities as "archaeologists" more so than as "anthropologists."

The Archeology Division of the AAA, which at this writing has over 1,400 members, is a minority member of the much larger association, although it is one of the larger sections. The great majority of AAA members identify themselves as sociocultural anthropologists (Borofsky 2002:471). Despite the recent reorganization of the AAA that sought to reduce subdisciplinary factionalism, Borofsky (2002:471) suggests that, as the largest percentage of members, sociocultural anthropologists—who, he presumes, have more in common with one another than with members in the other subfields—should dictate the future directions of the AAA. He blames the stultifying bureaucracy of the AAA and academic anthropology departments for not being able to respond to what he sees as a mandate for change away from the "myth" of the four fields.

Changing Educational Structures

Institutional academic constraints have also been faulted for subfield fragmentation. Post-war anthropology was influenced by the expanded opportunities in North American higher education for the working and middle classes (mostly men) made possible by the GI bill and the overall growth of colleges and universities to accommodate the baby-boom generation. Free-standing departments of anthropology became more common in the 1960s (usually splitting off from joint sociology-anthropology departments), and their faculties increasingly represented all four subfields (Patterson 1999:163). Subdisciplinary specialization intensified in the early 1970s as the expansion of universities and the growth of anthropology departments generally came to an end, and funding constraints furthered compartmentalization (Patterson 1995:106–113, 1999:161–162). Competition for resources for faculty lines and graduate admissions tended to exacerbate subdisciplinary factions.

As for students, both undergraduate and graduate education operate within a limited time framework established by academic conventions in North America and further promulgated by resource constraints. The various impulses pulling students away from a general grounding in anthropology are strong, including narrow specializations coupled with the increasing intersections of archaeology with other disciplines ranging from art history to zoology, the need for special professional training, and an appearance of lack of common interests, if not outright tensions, among the subdisciplines.

Graduate students were therefore encouraged to specialize even more, and to compensate for this factor, other anthropology requirements began to be curtailed or dropped altogether in some departments. Over time, as new faculty and graduate teaching assistants lacking a comprehensive anthropology background joined departments in increasing numbers, the inability or unwillingness to communicate across the subdisciplines and to pass on a holistic view of anthropology—one that examines the entirety of human biological, cultural, and historical experience—to the next generation of students intensified. Scalar stress in very large departments probably necessitates some form of organizational subdivision that usually follows subdisciplinary lines (Cowgill 2002). These changes have contributed to the feeling by many archaeologists, who are usually outnumbered by sociocultural anthropologists in U.S. academic departments, that the sociocultural majority has little understanding of or concern for archaeology (Cowgill 2002).

The Growth of Nonacademic Archaeology

Both the SAA's founding and its later split from the AAA occurred in periods when salvage or CRM archaeology was growing rapidly. Indeed, in the 1930s it was "the mounting demands of survey and salvage work...which in fact relegated archaeology to a 'backwater' within the Boasian domain [Cole 1976:121], and which preserved its subdisciplinary marginality for quite some time" (Pinsky 1992:177). By the 1970s CRM had become a significant force restructuring the practice of archaeology in the United States, prompting calls for establishment of an autonomous discipline of archaeology even at that time (e.g., Gumerman and Phillips 1978).

The enormous shift in funding and employment for archaeology to the government and private sectors has produced tensions within archaeology itself—between archaeology as "science," archaeology as an academic discipline, and archaeology as "business" (see Anderson, Clark, Doelle, this volume)—even as it has also continued to fuel the divisiveness between archaeology and sociocultural anthropology. It has long been questioned whether CRM-bound students would be better served by training in separate departments of archaeology, especially now given the huge demand for practicing archaeologists (e.g., Gumerman and Phillips 1978; Wiseman 1980, 1983, 1998; see Anderson, Gillespie, this volume). Because the majority of archaeology graduates today will likely obtain nonacademic jobs, and the special professional training needed for these jobs is not typically provided in research-oriented anthropology departments (Fagan 1999; Zeder 1997), this dramatic employment change has again been cited as reason enough for creating separate departments of archaeology (e.g., Wiseman 1998).

In sum, the arguments for rethinking the traditional placement of archaeology within anthropology are complex and multifaceted. They require serious consideration from a variety of perspectives responding to both the substantive and practical issues that have been raised.

Organization and Scope of the Volume

In the chapters that follow, the contributors consider these factors as they discuss from their own experience the interfacing of archaeology and anthropology in theory and practice. The chapters are grouped to form two parts that address these different but overlapping issues in the relationship between archaeology and anthropology. Part II considers intellectual and theoretical factors with papers by Timothy Earle, George Armelagos, Thomas Barfield, Geoffrey Clark, John Terrell, and Teresita Majewski. Practical and institutional factors are explored in Part III in papers by Susan Gillespie, Rosemary Joyce, David Anderson, William Doelle, and T. J. Ferguson. Commentaries are offered by Jane Hill and Richard Fox in Part IV. In the concluding chapter we return to the intersection of these various factors in the calls for both separation and continued unity and examine future directions that archaeology might take.

The archaeology contributors represent the gamut of the profession, from research to teaching to museum curation and interpretation to CRM and public outreach. They include archaeologists who advocate for archaeology as science and others who emphasize historical and humanist approaches. We also sought the perspectives of biological and sociocultural anthropologists. George Armelagos's research in skeletal biology from a biosocial and evolutionary framework bridges anthropology's subdisciplines. Ethnographer Thomas Barfield chairs the Anthropology Department at Boston University, one of

the rare institutions at which the anthropological archaeologists are in a separate Department of Archaeology with other archaeologists. The volume's commentators, Jane Hill, a linguist and former president of the American Anthropological Association, and Richard Fox, an ethnographer and current president of the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, Inc., and past editor of *Current Anthropology*, bring a broader perspective to bear on the current state of archaeology's relations with the rest of anthropology.

No contributor list can fully represent the totality of American archaeology. There is certainly a great diversity of experience and perspective among archaeologists today, but attempts to characterize their differences are not as clearcut as is often portrayed. For example, there is a strong perception that the aims of academic and CRM archaeology are at odds with one another, but this view is often contested (e.g., Clark, Anderson, Doelle, this volume). Archaeologists might also seem to be divisible along a "science-humanities" dichotomy, but many actually span that presumed gap (e.g., Renfrew and Zubrow 1994), and departments of archaeology such as that at Boston University are an indication that such differences need not preclude collegial collaboration and coordination.

Bruce Smith's characterization (above) of a separation between AAA-affiliated four-field-advocating "intellectual theoreticians" and SAA-affiliated autonomy-advocating "scientist archaeologists" also does not withstand close scrutiny. Archaeologists arguing both for and against separation from anthropology include individuals along the full range of the science-history-humanist continuum. In fact, there is substantial overlap in the leadership of the AAA-Archeology Division and the SAA. For example, Robert Kelly, the current SAA president, served on the AAA-AD Executive Committee, as have two other current SAA board members, Patricia McAnany and William Doelle. All the members of the current AAA-AD Executive Committee have also served either on the SAA Executive Board or on SAA committees, and most members of the AAA-AD also belong to SAA. We agree with Smith that the historical decline in participation in the annual meeting of the AAA by archaeologists and the decline in archaeologists publishing in *American Anthropologist* (even though there has been some reversal of those trends [Nichols and Gillespie 2000]) reflect a separation between archaeology and sociocultural anthropology. The expense of belonging to both organizations and attending the annual meeting of both is also a factor. Our point is that the archaeological contributors to this AAA-AD–sponsored volume express many of the same concerns about the relationship of ar-

chaeology to anthropology as our colleagues who advocate for separation, but we differ in our perspectives as to what kind of change is needed and how to accomplish it.

The editors asked for and received from the authors a frank discussion; no aspect of this issue was off-limits. The intensification of calls by archaeologists to separate from anthropology after the original symposium has sharpened the focus of the contributors' comments and has added a sense of urgency to the debate. They present strongly, even passionately, held views, many based on personal experiences and varied research perspectives. The authors do not agree with one another as to how or why anthropology and archaeology should be related, which is itself a reflection of the enormous diversity encompassed by anthropological archaeology. Neither we nor the other authors are satisfied with the status quo, and a variety of recommendations for change are offered, although they are not easy solutions.

The contributors generally take the position that archaeology indeed still is, and should continue to be, anthropological, but they come to this conclusion from a broad range of viewpoints based on their research perspectives and experiences both within and outside the academy. This position is not meant to be a panacea for current intellectual, practical, and interpersonal difficulties that promote divisiveness, nor is it a dogmatic model for all academic departments to follow. The authors, however, do provide compelling counterarguments against the calls for separation and for archaeology as anthropology.

Acknowledgments

Notes

1. All of the SAA 2000 participants are represented here. Papers by Anderson, Clark, Fox, Gillespie, and

Joyce were solicited following the symposium. Rosemary Joyce also collaborated in planning the symposium.

2. Notably, however, this growing split was not uniformly felt even in North America (Earle, this volume), and south of the Rio Grande archaeology is a vital part of anthropology, which Bernal (1980) has called the national discipline of Mexico.

3. See the concluding chapter: this departmental division has been misrepresented, as there are archaeologists and sociocultural anthropologists in both daughter departments.

4. This is the opinion of Barbara Stark (personal communication) from her experience as the first (transitional) chair of the Archeology Division.

References

Bailey, G. N.
    1983 Concepts of Time in Quaternary Prehistory. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 12:165–192.

Bender, Susan J., and George S. Smith, eds.
    2000 *Teaching Archaeology in the Twenty-First Century.* Washington, DC: Society for American Archaeology.

Bernal, Ignacio
    1980 *A History of Mexican Archaeology: The Vanished Civilizations of Middle America.* New York: Thames and Hudson.

Binford, Lewis R.
    1962 Archaeology as Anthropology. *American Antiquity* 28:217–225.
    1965 Archaeological Systematics and the Study of Culture Process. *American Antiquity* 31:203–210.
    1977 General Introduction. In *For Theory Building in Archaeology.* L. R. Binford, ed. Pp. 1–10. New York: Academic.
    1981 Behavioural Archaeology and the "Pompeii Premise." *Journal of Anthropological Research* 37:195–208.

Borofsky, Robert
    2002 The Four Subfields: Anthropologists as Mythmakers. *American Anthropologist* 104:463–480.

Braidwood, Robert J.
    1959 Archeology and the Evolutionary Theory. In *Evolution and Anthropology: A Centennial Appraisal.*

B. J. Meggers, ed. Pp. 76–89. Washington, DC: Anthropological Society of Washington.

Cole, John R.
    1976 Nineteenth Century Fieldwork, Archaeology, and Museum Studies: Their Role in the Four-Field Definition of American Anthropology. In *American Anthropology: The Early Years.* J. V. Murra, ed. Pp. 111–125. St. Paul: West Publishing.

Cowgill, George L.
    2002 Archaeology Loses If It Doesn't Pay Attention to Other Social Scientists and Historians. Paper presented at the 67th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Denver.

Crumley, Carole L.
    1994 Historical Ecology: A Multidimensional Ecological Orientation. In *Historical Ecology: Cultural Knowledge and Changing Landscapes.* C. L. Crumley, ed. Pp. 1–16. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Deetz, James F.
    1972 Archaeology as a Social Science. In *Contemporary Archaeology: A Guide to Theory and Contributions.* M. P. Leone, ed. Pp. 108–117. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Dixon, R. B.
    1913 Some Aspects of North American Archaeology. *American Anthropologist* 15:549–577.

Dunnell, Robert C.
    1982 Science, Social Science, and Common Sense: The Agonizing Dilemma of Modern Archaeology. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 38:1–25.

Fagan, Brian
    1999 An Academic Time Warp: New Archaeologists Don't Fit the Job Market. *Discovering Archaeology* 1(July–Aug.):8–11.

Ferrie, Helke
    2001 An Interview with Richard S. MacNeish. *Current Anthropology* 42:715–735.

Flannery, Kent V.
    1983 Archaeology and Ethnology in the Context of Divergent Evolution. In *The Cloud People: Diver-*

gent Evolution of the Zapotec and Mixtec Civilizations. K. V. Flannery and J. Marcus, eds. Pp. 361–362. New York: Academic.

Gosden, Chris
1999 *Anthropology and Archaeology: A Changing Relationship.* London: Routledge.

Green, Dee F., and Don F. Fowler
1983 Change in SAA Management Announced. *SAA Bulletin* 1(4):1–2.

Gumerman, George J.
2002 Letter to the Editor. *The SAA Archaeological Record* 2(4):3.

Gumerman, George J., and David A. Phillips, Jr.
1978 Archaeology Beyond Anthropology. *American Antiquity* 43:184–191.

Hoebel, E. Adamson
1949 *Man in the Primitive World.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ingold, Tim
1992 Editorial. *Man* 27:693–696.

Kelly, John D.
2002 Hegemony in Anthropological Theory. Paper presented at the 67th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Denver.

Kelly, Robert L.
2002 Counterpoint: Archaeology *Is* Anthropology. *The SAA Archaeological Record* 2(3):13–14.

Knapp, A. Bernard
1996 Archaeology Without Gravity: Postmodernism and the Past. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 3:127–158.

Lees, Susan
2002 Counterpoint: Separation versus a Larger Vision. *The SAA Archaeological Record* 2(3):11–12.

Lyman, R. Lee, Michael J. O'Brien, and Robert C. Dunnell
1997 *The Rise and Fall of Culture History.* New York: Plenum Press.

Lyotard, Jean-François
1984 *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowl-*

edge. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi, trans. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Meggers, Betty J.
1955 The Coming of Age of American Archaeology. In *New Interpretations of Aboriginal American Culture History.* B. J. Meggers and C. Evans, eds. Pp. 116–129. Washington, DC: Anthropological Society of Washington.

Meltzer, David J.
1979 Paradigms and the Nature of Change in American Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 44:644–657.

Nichols, Deborah L., and Susan D. Gillespie
2000 Willey Prize Clarification. *Anthropology News* 41(6):3.

Ortner, Sherry B.
1984 Theory in Anthropology since the Sixties. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 26:126–166.

Patterson, Thomas C.
1995 *Toward a Social History of Archaeology in the United States.* Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publications.
1999 The Political Economy of Archaeology in the United States. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 28:155–174.

Phillips, Philip
1955 American Archaeology and General Anthropological Theory. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 11:246–250.

Pinsky, Valerie
1992 Archaeology, Politics, and Boundary-Formation: The Boas Censure (1991) and the Development of American Archaeology during the Inter-War Years. In *Rediscovering Our Past: Essays on the History of American Archaeology.* J. E. Reyman, ed. Pp. 161–190. Aldershot: Avebury.

Renfrew, Colin
1978 Space, Time and Polity. In *The Evolution of Social Systems.* J. Friedman and M. J. Rowlands, eds. Pp. 89–112. London: Duckworth.

Renfrew, Colin, and Ezra B. W. Zubrow, eds.
1994 *The Ancient Mind: Elements of Cognitive Archaeology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sahlins, Marshall
  1999 Two or Three Things That I Know about Culture. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute,* n.s., 5:399–421.

Schiffer, Michael Brian
  2000 Social Theory in Archaeology: Building Bridges. In *Social Theory in Archaeology.* M. B. Schiffer, ed. Pp. 1–13. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

Smith, Bruce D.
  2001 The Transition to Food Production. In *Archaeology at the Millennium: A Sourcebook.* G. M. Feinman and T. D. Price, eds. Pp. 199–230. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.

Steward, Julian
  1942 The Direct Historical Approach to Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 7:337–343.

Steward, Julian, and F. M. Setzler
  1938 Function and Configuration in Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 4:4–10.

Stocking, George W., Jr.
  1976 Ideas and Institutions in American Anthropology: Thoughts Toward a History of the Interwar Years. In *Selected Papers from the American Anthropologist, 1921–1945.* G. W. Stocking, Jr., ed. Pp. 1–53. Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.

Strong, William Duncan
  1952 The Value of Archaeology in the Training of Professional Anthropologists. *American Anthropologist* 54:318–321.

Taylor, Walter W., Jr.
  1983 [1948] *A Study of Archeology* [*sic*]. Center for Archaeological Investigations. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University.

Trigger, Bruce G.
  1980 Archaeology and the Image of the American Indian. *American Antiquity* 45:662–676.
  1989 *A History of Archaeological Thought.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
  1998a *Sociocultural Evolution: Calculation and Contingency.* Oxford: Blackwell.
  1998b "The Loss of Innocence" in Historical Perspective. *Antiquity* 72:694–698.

van der Leeuw, Sander E., and Charles L. Redman
  2002 Placing Archaeology at the Center of Socio-Natural Studies. *American Antiquity* 67:597–605.

Watson, Patty Jo
  1995 Archaeology, Anthropology, and the Culture Concept. *American Anthropologist* 97:683–694.

Willey, Gordon R., and Philip Phillips
  1958 *Method and Theory in American Archaeology.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Willey, Gordon R., and Jeremy A. Sabloff
  1993 *A History of American Archaeology.* 3rd ed. New York: W. H. Freeman.

Wiseman, James
  1980 Archaeology as Archaeology. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 7:149–151.
  1983 Conflicts in Archaeology: Education and Practice. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 10:1–9.
  1998 Reforming Academia. *Archaeology* 51(5):27–30.
  2001 Declaration of Independence. *Archaeology* 54(4):10–12.
  2002 Point: Archaeology as an Academic Discipline. *The SAA Archaeological Record* 2(3):8–10.

Zeder, Melinda A.
  1997 *The American Archaeologist: A Profile.* Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.