Teaching Archaeology as Anthropology

Susan D. Gillespie
University of Florida

One of the growing wedges dividing American archaeology from its home in anthropology departments is the enormous increase in employment of archaeologists outside of academia, mostly in response to legislation mandating the active stewardship of some cultural resources. The practice of professional archaeology has experienced a pronounced shift from what was once primarily an academic endeavor to what is now primarily an applied enterprise. Clark and Anderson (this volume) comment on the intellectual tensions that have long existed between academic and nonacademic archaeologies (the latter usually lumped together as cultural resource management), with CRM archaeology continuing to be stigmatized as good in methods but poor in theory and publication record. These tensions have exacerbated the stresses felt between archaeology and the rest of anthropology.

The transformation in archaeological job placement is also impacting academia in terms of the teaching of archaeology. In recent years there has been a growing movement to revise the curriculum so that what we teach students will better prepare them for a world in which most archaeological work is accomplished outside of purely academic interests. As part of this movement, there have been some calls to separate archaeology from anthropology on the premise that the housing of archaeology students in anthropology departments has been impeding their preparation for these jobs. Nevertheless, just as there are compelling reasons why the practice of non-academic archaeology benefits from its ties to the other subdisciplines of anthropology (Doelle, Ferguson, this volume), there are equally valid reasons why the teaching of archaeology, including for those students destined to become CRM archaeologists, should involve anthropology as a whole (see also Majewski, Anderson, this volume; Kelly 2002). In fact, responding effectively to this extra-academic reality should serve as an impetus for further interaction among faculty members representing the different subfields of anthropology, rather than as a rationale for institutional separation.

A Crisis in Archaeological Education

The typical archaeology curriculum in American colleges and universities—at both the undergraduate and graduate levels—has not kept up with the substantial change in the employment of archaeologists, despite early warning signs of a looming problem (e.g., Geier 1981; Gumerman and Phillips 1978). Most graduate students are still being prepared for teaching and research, even though this type of employment is diminishing rather than increasing. They are also not being equipped with the knowledge and skills they need to fill the growing number of nonacademic archaeology jobs in CRM, historic preservation, and other aspects of public archaeology. This situation has reached a critical stage: good jobs are going unfilled for the lack of well-trained persons to take them, to the detriment of the preservation and interpretation of cultural heritage. Graduate-degree students often end up reluctantly taking jobs in public archaeology when they cannot find the positions they seek in academic archaeology that they have been taught to value more highly. They are typically poorly prepared academically for this employment, although many of them have expressed satisfaction in these careers (Zeder 1997).

However, there is far more involved in this situation than a simple lack of fit between career preparation and employment opportunities, which could be corrected by training a subset of archaeology students for the nonacademic jobs. The boundary that once seemingly separated academic from public archaeology is itself disappearing. It is becoming very clear that all archaeology is in the public interest and must respond to issues of public concern (e.g., Downum and Price 1999:227; McGimsey and Davis 2000:5; Watkins et al. 2000:73).[1] These issues include long-standing challenges to the future of archaeology, namely, site destruction at an unprecedented scale and the unabated global market in antiquities, now exacerbated by the ease of e-commerce.

These conclusions are shared by public archaeologists, including cultural resource managers and museum

professionals, the government officials with whom they work, and teaching archaeologists, many of whom have been sufficiently motivated by this crisis to act on it (Bender and Smith 1998, 2000; Fagan 1999; Schuldenrein 1998a, 1998b; Wiseman 1998). Following upon some earlier meetings and symposia, including a major forum in 1997 in New York City, the Society for American Archaeology's Public Education Committee organized the "Workshop on Teaching Archaeology in the Twenty-First Century" in February 1998 at Wakulla Springs, Florida.[2] Its first significant product, *Teaching Archaeology in the Twenty-First Century* (Bender and Smith 2000), is a blueprint for action.[3] Among its recommendations, this document proposes that seven major principles be incorporated into the archaeology curricula at both the undergraduate and graduate levels in order to better prepare students for the realities of archaeology as it is practiced. The SAA Task Force on Curriculum is following up on this blueprint, planning additional workshops and pilot courses and soliciting input from those who teach and do archaeology.

A question that has arisen from this discussion, and that requires further consideration, is the continuing position of archaeology as a subfield of anthropology. In these workshops various participants commented on the difficulties of gearing the training of archaeology students toward an applied—even vocational—focus considering that the great majority of archaeology students in this country are housed in anthropology departments or programs. The well-known subdisciplinary factionalism within the larger departments that provide graduate education was considered a hindrance. For example, one frank opinion was that department heads are more likely to be sociocultural anthropologists, who therefore may be disinclined to support major curricular reforms in archaeology, especially if they require additional resources from shrinking academic budgets (reported in Schuldenrein 1998a:31, 1998b:27).

However, larger issues were raised regarding the perceived lack of fit between archaeology and the rest of anthropology. Another expressed concern, which I have also heard elsewhere, was that an overemphasis on some kind of job-training program would be considered out of place in the traditional liberal arts and sciences framework of academic anthropology.[4] Along these lines, it has also been argued that the continued placement of archaeology within an academic or research-oriented discipline is precisely what is impeding instruction in the technical skills needed for the majority of the available archaeological positions (Bender 2000b:3; see also Krass 2000). Wood and Powell (1993) note that even

the scientific "ethos" within which academic archaeologists are enculturated raises many problems, because others involved in the practice of archaeology, such as government officials and interested communities with whom archaeologists must interact, often do not share that ethos.

Finally, a more troubling view voiced by a minority of individuals, including those not participating in these workshops, is that archaeology cannot succeed in this curricular reform unless it separates itself from anthropology (or other) departments (Wiseman 1998). Anderson (2000:141) reported on this attitude, which he does not share, among some of the Wakulla Springs workshop participants:

> The relevance of the traditional four-field (i.e., archaeology, cultural anthropology, linguistics, and physical anthropology) approach to the training of archaeologists has been questioned, particularly for archaeologists heading for nonacademic positions....The core of this argument appears to revolve around the perception that teaching courses in linguistics, cultural anthropology, and physical anthropology takes up valuable time that would be better spent imparting more useful information and skills to our [i.e., archaeology] students.

Despite these many concerns, curricular reform to prepare students for the real-world practice of archaeology can be enhanced, rather than impeded, in integrated anthropology programs. This chapter speaks specifically to this topic, while recognizing that there are many other salient intellectual reasons archaeology benefits from its continued association with the other subfields of anthropology. I emphasize the split between archaeology and sociocultural anthropology because this is where I see the greatest division, whereas in my experience biological anthropology is often grouped with archaeology in terms of teaching substance and methods and linguistics with sociocultural anthropology. For the record, I have taught university archaeology and cultural anthropology courses since 1983, including in two research universities with large graduate programs. Two of the departments in which I taught had attached CRM programs, one of which I briefly directed.

Does Curricular Reform Encourage Autonomy?

Given that the SAA, whose membership includes many nonacademic professional archaeologists, has taken the lead in curricular reform, one might assume that the recommendations of its task force would have played down the historic ties to anthropology. However, the

seven principles that underlie the proposed curriculum and the careful thought that went into their creation demonstrate that anthropology remains the preferred academic framework for this education for intellectual reasons. Although this issue was not explicitly highlighted by the SAA workshop, it was the focus of a later symposium that asked point-blank whether training in CRM archaeology should continue to operate within anthropology.[5] The consensus of the academic, nonacademic, and government archaeologists, as well as of the graduate students who attended the symposium, was that education in anthropology is of value to all archaeologists.

The seven principles enunciated by the SAA workshop are encapsulated in the following titles: stewardship, diverse interests, social relevance, professional ethics and values, communication, basic archaeological skills, and real-world problem solving (Bender 2000a; Bender and Smith 1998; Davis et al. 1999). They involve such important topics as preservation of the archaeological record, respecting different views of the past, learning lessons from the past for the present, ethical and legal issues, writing and speaking competencies, archaeological field and laboratory skills, the politics of archaeology, and professional accountability.

These principles can be incorporated within many existing courses in anthropology curricula (Bender 2000a:table 1, 42–43; Davis et al. 1999:table 1). Indeed, by making reference to them in as many courses as possible, the revised undergraduate curriculum would expose the many nonmajors and anthropology students interested in other subfields who take these classes, as well as those destined to go on in archaeology, to these important topics. A significant goal is to create a better-educated public that will be making decisions about archaeological and preservation issues. Additional courses should be added for graduate training that speak more directly to these principles and provide specific information especially needed in nonacademic careers, such as "Ethics, Law, and Professionalism" and "Cultural Resource Management and Preservation" (Lynott et al. 1999).

Furthermore, the workshop participants emphasized the need for keeping archaeology students within the umbrella of anthropology for reasons other than the obvious practicality of fitting them within an existing academic structure. The participants recognized that undergraduates who have developed a "well-rounded background in anthropology with course work in archaeology, cultural anthropology, and biological anthropology" (Lynott et al. 1999:21) will be much better prepared for graduate training. The 1997 New York City forum agreed that "the anthropological perspective still

constituted the foundation for archaeological specialists and that the traditional 'four field' approach, with core courses in linguistics, archaeology, and cultural and physical anthropology, should remain largely intact" (Schuldenrein 1998b:26). Anderson (2000:141), a Wakulla Springs workshop participant, extolled the holistic view of human behavior provided by anthropology (following Flannery 1982) as a necessary intellectual framework for archaeology.

By the same token, curricular reform need not entail a shift away from liberal arts and sciences—on the contrary, the seven principles were formulated with the idea that many of these competencies "were clearly imbedded in the traditions of liberal arts education (e.g., written and oral education and values clarification)" (Bender and Smith 1998:12). Indeed, the New York City forum highlighted the two most important skills needed by practicing archaeologists, namely, the ability to think critically and to write effectively, skills that are essential components of all liberal arts programs (Schuldenrein 1998a:32, 1998b:26–27, 29, 2000:135).

Nevertheless, some—most visibly Wiseman (1998, 2002)—have used the call for curricular reform to further support the removal of archaeology from anthropology (and other) departments and the nationwide establishment of autonomous departments of archaeology, like the one he helped found at Boston University. Wiseman (2002:8–9) asserted that the need to establish their own academic curriculum and professional standards was a major impetus for the archaeologists to create a separate department, on the assumption that it would be difficult to offer an adequate archaeological curriculum "in a department devoted to another discipline."

The idea of autonomy actually first gained prominence in this country some 20 years ago with a small movement to establish interdisciplinary archaeology departments. At that time the principal argument was to better facilitate the multidisciplinary research of *academic* archaeologists, as well as to respond to the development of large-scale contract archaeology projects that began in the 1970s (e.g., Gumerman and Phillips 1978; Watson 1983; Wiseman 1980a, 1980b). The initial proposal for separation by Wiseman, a Classical archaeologist, reflected his long-standing attitude that archaeology will never get the respect and visibility it deserves while it continues to be housed in departments with other names and therefore ostensibly other missions, such as Anthropology, Classics, Art History, and History. Archaeology seems thereby doomed to be nothing but a subfield of something else (Wiseman 1980a, 1980b, 1998).

But the problem goes much deeper than a mere "subfield" status. Within departments of anthropology, the desire of archaeologists to secede stems primarily from the feeling that archaeology does not have much in common with the rest of anthropology any more. The opinion famously expressed by Phillips (1955), repeated by Willey and Phillips (1958), and echoed by Strong (1952) that "archaeology...is a vital part of anthropology, the study of man and culture in time and space" (Strong 1952:320) was being refuted by archaeologists only a generation later. In 1978 Gumerman and Phillips (1978:188–189) declared "the traditional four-field anthropology department that requires grounding in linguistics, physical and cultural anthropology as well as archaeology" to be "inappropriate for most contemporary archaeological training." Twenty years later, by which time another generation was still being taught in four-field anthropology departments, the same attitude was expressed by some of the Wakulla Springs workshop participants, namely, that "much of the subject matter that is taught in many anthropology courses today is perceived as trivial, arcane, or otherwise irrelevant to many practicing archaeologists" (reported by Anderson 2000:141).

However, this condemnation of the rest of anthropology as irrelevant to practicing archaeology is not being fueled simply by the phenomenal growth of CRM, which in some ways is used more as an excuse for us not to confront some of our deeper and thornier problems (see Fox, this volume). This opinion resonates as well with many academic archaeologists, although nonacademic archaeologists, most of whom are not institutionally housed with other anthropologists, may have greater freedom to publicly express it. In his introduction to the 2001 SAA symposium that argued for, as it was titled, "Archaeology as Archaeology," T. Douglas Price asserted that a "four-field" academic discipline no longer exists. He attributed its demise to the fragmentation and fractious atmosphere of anthropology departments as a result of overspecialization within each of the subfields (reported in Wiseman 2001:11, 2002:9).

Connect and Disconnect

Despite these commonsense explanations for why archaeology should now finally seek autonomy for itself—that we are so overspecialized we have little in common and that there is this large nonacademic component for which we need to prepare our own students— the feeling of disconnect between archaeology and the rest of anthropology has an even longer history and can-

not be blamed on recent developments in our discipline or in public archaeology. It was already apparent at the start of academic archaeology in America when there was uncertainty as to whether archaeology belonged in nascent anthropology departments (e.g., Strong 1936; Taylor 1948). The perceived alternative in American universities at that time was history; departments of prehistory or archaeology were not under serious consideration. Even in the mid-1950s this alternative was still being debated and became the focus of Phillips's (1955) mandate that American archaeology should be explicitly "anthropological" (read "social" and "generalizing"), rather than continue its fascination with historical particularities.

A century-long history of American academic archaeology reveals repeated occurrences of perceptions of frustrating disconnect that were ultimately overcome by the long-term reality of continued connection. In the past the root cause for this on-again, off-again partnership was often explicitly attributed to changing theoretical currents, because of which archaeology and anthropology were sometimes at odds with one another and other times exhibited common objectives. Significantly, changes in theory seemed to appear first in sociocultural (and/or linguistic) anthropology. As the continued citation of Phillips's (1955) article makes clear, for a long time archaeologists felt they had a dependent relationship on ethnology for theory. However, archaeologists were slow to keep up with their fellow anthropologists, exhibiting chronic "paradigm lag" (Leone 1972) that often resulted in a period of disconnect and the accompanying perception that archaeologists were always behind the curve.

The reality, of course, is that the theoretical shifts in anthropology derived from changes in larger social science paradigms, as well as changes in the social and political contexts within which academics operate (Trigger 1989). Ethnographers usually did not have to undertake as much "translation" in order to utilize the latest social science theories in their investigations of living peoples, whereas archaeologists had to develop methods so as to apply them to interpreting patterns in the material evidence of past lives. It takes time and ingenuity to do so. In some cases it was believed that archaeologists would not be able to use currently fashionable theories, and not all of them that have been used have served archaeology well. Archaeologists also have long availed themselves of theories that did not come first through sociocultural anthropology (e.g., Clarke 1972:7; Gumerman and Phillips 1978:185).

An example of this sense of theoretical disconnect is manifest in the research of Julian Steward. Steward

contributed significantly to the intellectual growth of American archaeology in terms of both culture historical interpretations (Steward 1929, 1942) and later ecological and evolutionary theory (Steward 1949, 1953). He exemplified (perhaps because he was exceptional) earlier archaeologists' shared vision of how their work would ultimately contribute to the anthropological study of regularities in the human condition across space and time (e.g., Phillips 1955; Strong 1952). Nevertheless, Steward also complained in 1938 that ethnology and archaeology were growing apart—only two years after Strong (1936) had made a definitive argument for their integration in academia. The problem? Steward observed that ethnologists were emphasizing functional studies, but archaeologists were ignoring this useful approach (Steward and Setzler 1938:4). Yet a few years later archaeology saw the shift toward functional concerns that ultimately led to the "new archaeology" of the 1960s and an explicit (re)commitment to an anthropological archaeology, as seen in the intellectual trajectory represented by Bennett (1943), Taylor (1948), Willey and Phillips (1958), and Binford (1962).

Hoebel's (1949:436) notorious remark that "[a]rchaeology...is doomed always to be the lesser part of anthropology" referred specifically to the psychological turn in American cultural anthropology at that time and the accompanying presumption that artifacts alone would never reveal the human psychology that produced them (Meggers 1955:128). This attitude was reflected in Binford's (1965:204) later "paleo-psychologist" caricature, but by then some in cultural anthropology had already turned toward adaptational and evolutionary frameworks to which archaeology continues to contribute significantly.

There were also expressions of disconnect between archaeology and the cultural anthropology of the 1980s (e.g., Watson 1983:xiii; Wolf 1984), although symbolic, structuralist archaeology was already starting to make its appearance (e.g., Hodder 1982), and poststructural, phenomenological, and other more contemporary approaches have now become an integral part of postprocessual archaeologies. Archaeology has been impacted by the same postmodernism that permeates much of sociocultural anthropology, including an unfortunate extreme relativism by a minority of archaeologists despite an early warning to archaeologists not to let this happen (Kohl 1985). The presumed separation between an antiscience postmodern sociocultural anthropology and a scientific archaeology is as much an oversimplification of what is dividing archaeology from anthropology as the presumed nonacademic-academic split.

Indeed, in terms of certain theoretical concerns, postprocessual archaeology and sociocultural anthropology are approaching a real convergence—and this is the opinion of a British archaeologist operating in a tradition that has not historically included anthropology in the American sense (Gosden 1999). Interestingly, the theoretical and intellectual convergence (anticipated by Willey and Phillips 1958; see also Terrell, this volume) has the potential for more of a two-way interaction than the presumed unidirectional influence of the past. This is especially visible in some of sociocultural anthropology's rediscovery of historical change and material culture, topics that had once helped unite anthropology before much of sociocultural anthropology abandoned them (Cunningham 2000; see also Majewski's commentary on historical archaeology, this volume). As Gosden (1999:7) observed, "Post-processual archaeology has embraced a social theory essentially the same as that of any anthropologists. Anthropology (or parts of it) has moved...towards material culture, the body, art, technology and landscape." One could add to his list the contemporary concerns in both subfields for agency, gender, ethnicity and other constructs of social identity, history, and the constructivist approach to culture. Archaeologists have also long recognized their opportunity to contribute to social theory in ways not amenable to the temporal and social frameworks of sociocultural anthropology (e.g., Bailey 1983; Binford 1981).

It remains to be seen whether archaeologists and sociocultural anthropologists will endeavor to move beyond the intellectual divisiveness that has plagued the discipline and to actually fulfill this potential for scholarly interaction. But it also turns out that we share pragmatic as well as theoretical concerns that could move us closer together.

Applied Archaeology as Applied Anthropology—As Anthropology

As I noted in my introduction, the growing practice of archaeology outside of academia has been a source of contention within the academy. The recent "crisis," which has been developing for over a score of years, is being portrayed by some in terms of the disconnect between public archaeology and contemporary anthropology. Furthermore, the contentious factionalism among the anthropological subfields is purported to contribute to the inability of academic archaeologists to develop curricula to meet the needs of future practicing archaeologists (e.g., Wiseman 2001:12, 2002:9). However, it has been my own experience in both large and small anthro-

pology departments that the only forum in which we all agree to work cooperatively may be in the development of coordinated undergraduate and graduate curricula. As Lees (2002:11) noted in her response to Wiseman's proposal for autonomy, "Sharing students is one of the most important avenues of academic communication." In fact, the proposed solutions to the problem of educating archaeology students to meet present and future challenges call for closer collaboration within the discipline of anthropology, and it is important to examine the reasons why.

All archaeology, whether it is done for academic research or for legal compliance, is conducted in the present, and it must take into account present concerns for the past. Archaeologists are increasingly caught up in local or national political disputes that can endanger the success of their projects or even their own safety (e.g., Hoopes 1997; Smith 1997). For example, the huge global debate over the disposition of archaeological human remains, which reaches far beyond NAGPRA in this country, calls into question the different ways "personhood" is defined and how identities are created or maintained between the past and present through persons, places, and things. "Interpretation" or "(re)construction" of the prehistoric past is no longer the exclusive monopoly of archaeologists, who must respond in intelligent ways to the claims of various stakeholders without simply relinquishing our own interests or denying theirs. More than ever before, archaeologists realize the need to be "sensitive to cultural constructions of the world and the past, areas traditionally the domain of [sociocultural] anthropologists" (Gosden 1999:11). Even beyond sensitivity, archaeologists today should be trained in ethnography in order to better conduct archaeology in community settings (Watkins et al. 2000; see also Kelly 2002:14).

Archaeologists also need to direct our analytical skills and anthropological knowledge to ourselves to understand how the transformation in archaeological practice is part of national and global changes (e.g., Kohl and Fawcett 1995; Patterson 1999). There are indisputable pragmatic reasons for training students for nonacademic jobs and for helping to ensure that all archaeology is carried out in a professional manner with the support of an educated public. But it also behooves us to comprehend how archaeology itself is being shaped by extra-academic factors, including the allocation of financial resources to archaeological concerns and access to the information that is gained from excavations. I have rarely heard any frank discussion of how the pecuniary aspects of CRM archaeology and especially of CRM programs at-

tached to academic departments might contribute to subdisciplinary tensions (e.g., giving priority in teaching assistantships to students in other subdisciplines on the assumption that the archaeology students can pick up part-time CRM jobs on their own). We should recognize that even the language of CRM (e.g., the special meanings attached to terms such as *significance, management, mitigation, cultural resources*) and other aspects of its institutional culture have influenced the conduct and mind-set of archaeology today. In other words, closer ties to the research methods and knowledge provided by other subdisciplines of anthropology, including a penchant for reflection and greater self-awareness, are needed to meet the diverse challenges facing archaeology.

Furthermore, archaeology is hardly unique among the anthropological subfields in experiencing the shift away from being a mostly academic endeavor. At the same time that contract archaeology was first motivating calls for the practical training of archaeologists, sociocultural anthropologists also began to recognize the challenges of preparing their students for nonacademic careers[6] and "applied anthropology" began to assume its "fifth subfield" status. Because all archaeologists should be cognizant of the varying impacts their work has on local and larger communities, Pyburn and Wilk (1995:73, 75) proposed that we take advantage of the knowledge accumulated by applied anthropologists to help promote positive changes and avoid negative impacts.

Downum and Price (1999:226) closely examined the impact of an "applied archaeology" in seven important areas: resource claims, cultural identity and representation, technology, public education, CRM, cultural tourism, and environment and ecosystem projects. Note that CRM is only a small part of what constitutes applied archaeology as applied anthropology, defined as "using anthropological methods, concepts, or knowledge to solve nonacademic problems" (Downum and Price 1999:227). Downum and Price further explained how archaeology students can benefit from existing training programs in applied anthropology and public policy, including emphases on methods, local contexts, social groups and networks, macro- and micro-perspectives, the roles of culture brokers, qualitative program evaluation, and ethical considerations (Downum and Price 1999:232–234).

Significantly, not only is archaeology not the only subfield of anthropology concerned with educating students for practicing professional opportunities, but also archaeologists are not alone in being reproached for their failures in this respect. Sociocultural anthropologists have

also been chided for ignoring the "widening mis-match" between the training offered to graduate students and that needed for the growing majority of anthropology Ph.D.s who will be taking nonacademic jobs or academic jobs outside of anthropology (Price 2001:5). Applied anthropology has also been stigmatized as somehow inferior to academic anthropology, the same perception that still persists among some academic archaeologists toward public-sponsored archaeology. So there is more in common between these two subfields in terms of pedagogy and practice than their respective members might have realized.

In this regard, it is important to note that the whole notion of applied anthropology as a fifth subfield has been called into question, in that it reinforces a divide between research and practice that is increasingly unwarranted and unrealistic. Chambers (1997:263) has suggested instead that applied issues and topics be integrated into the entire anthropology curriculum to introduce all students to "real-world" decision making, the "correspondence between practice and theory," and "the relationship between the generation of knowledge and its uses." Indeed, as part of the Wakulla Springs workshop, McGimsey and Davis (2000:7) similarly called for a complete reworking of anthropology, not just archaeology, courses. All anthropology students need exposure to ethics, public responsibility, real-world problems, methods for interacting with different communities, and communications skills—and these can be learned in courses taught by anthropologists other than archaeologists.

In other words, we should all as anthropologists be working together to create integrated curricula, acknowledging the expertise of the other subfields in our collaboration in the construction of educational programs that prepare all of our students, majors and nonmajors, for the real world. Such discussions could constitute the basis for the revival of an integrated, multifield anthropology. In the opinion of Chrisman (2002:5), only when there is a "synergy of theory and practice" will anthropology become a "mature discipline."

Real-World Barriers

Despite what look like promising avenues for the reconnection of archaeology and sociocultural anthropology in terms of converging theoretical, pedagogical, and practical concerns, it would be naive to think that institutional mandates and our own conventional ways of thinking and acting can easily be transformed. What is being proposed is the difficult task of breaking down various barriers: the intellectual barricade erected between the academic and practicing aspects of our discipline, the institutional settings that have contributed to subdisciplinary separation, and the technical innovations that continue to split us into ever-smaller specializations. Just getting archaeologists and the other anthropologists together to coordinate the teaching of their respective courses goes against the "peaceful co-existence" model that is the de facto or de jure modus vivendi of many larger anthropology departments.

Furthermore, in terms of anthropological education there are additional barriers between us as teachers and those we teach that also have to be breached. It is not enough for us to create or modify courses that integrate ethics, public responsibility, real-world problem solving, and recognition of cultural differences into a syllabus. The difficulty comes when we realize that students bring the "real world" with them into the classroom. The ethnic/racial/identity politics that we confront in contemporary anthropology, including archaeology, typically loom even larger and much more personally among college students. My experience at Midwestern public universities was that (mostly white) students were either uncomfortable discussing issues such as NAGPRA and the rights of descendant communities—not believing they had the right to speak for or against the wishes of "others"—or they immediately embraced the political aspects of these topics without considering their intellectual merits. Convincing students that looting and interacting with antiquities dealers are unethical actions may be a hard sell in a climate where downloading pirated music and videos is part of everyday life. These phenomena are also part of the "real world" in which we live, and we can better comprehend them by becoming ethnographers of our own institutional cultures.

Furthermore, in breaching this last barrier we should expand the notion of "students" to include fellow professionals, which will also impact how and what we teach. Continuing education and professional development are part of the SAA proposal for curricular reform in order to keep practicing archaeologists, especially, abreast of both specific knowledge and the sociopolitics of archaeology (Messenger et al. 1999). Greater educational interaction between academic and nonacademic professionals would help to jettison the notion that the former make theoretical contributions while the latter are limited to methodological advances. Such two-way interaction should also allow those who teach archaeology students to become better aware of the "real-world" settings in which archaeology is conducted and to appropriately work this knowledge into their other courses.

The barriers are there, but recognizing them is the first step to knocking them down, if that is the shared objective. I hope to have demonstrated that now is not the time for archaeology to secede but rather the time for us to realize, for the first time in a long time, how much the subfields of anthropology have in common regarding both research-oriented theoretical issues and practical educational concerns. There are sufficient intellectual grounds for intradisciplinary communication and, equally important, imperative educational grounds for cooperation in the reshaping of our curricula and our practices. Phillips's (1955:246–247) mantra coined almost 50 years ago has been much repeated, too often mindlessly, and sometimes misunderstood, but its essential message—*archaeology is anthropology*—remains meaningful today, though in a more expanded sense than he originally intended.

Acknowledgments

This essay is a much expanded revision of a presentation entitled "Teaching Archaeology: Preaching What We Practice," presented at the Society for Anthropology in Community College's Invited Session, "Current Issues in Anthropology: Five Fields Update," at the 99th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association in San Francisco, California, November 2000. That presentation was published by the American Anthropological Association in the newsletter *SACC Notes: Teaching Anthropology* (7[2, Fall-Winter 2000-2001]:14–17, 41). I gratefully acknowledge the helpful suggestions of David C. Grove, Deborah L. Nichols, David G. Anderson, and the volume reviewers for this revised version.

Notes

1. From the SAA's Principles of Archaeological Ethics (SAA 1996:451): "Principle No. 2: Accountability—Responsible archaeological research, including all levels of professional activity, requires an acknowledgment of public accountability and a commitment to make every reasonable effort, in good faith, to consult actively with affected group(s), with the goal of establishing a working relationship that can be beneficial to all parties involved."

2. These earlier meetings include various SAA working conferences and a symposium at the 1995 Chacmool Conference in Calgary, Alberta. The 1997 conference was sponsored by the Professional Archaeologists of New York City (Bender and Smith 1998:11;

Schuldenrein 1998a, 1998b). The Wakulla Springs workshop was sponsored by the National Park Service, Bureau of Reclamation, and the National Association of State Archaeologists, and coordinated with the American Anthropological Association, the Archaeological Institute of America, the Canadian Archaeological Association, and the Society for Historical Archaeology (Bender and Smith 1998:11).

3. Preliminary descriptions of the proposals from this workshop in Bender and Smith (1998), Davis et al. (1999), Lynott et al. (1999), and Messenger et al. (1999) are summarized in Bender (2000a). See also Smith and Bender (2000).

4. "The time-worn argument that a university's mission is to teach archaeologists to think and not to serve as vocational training grounds begs the issue sorely and bespeaks elitist arrogance, at a time when the cost, effort, and duration of Ph.D. programs is greater than it ever has been and offerings for traditional jobs have never been as meager" (Schuldenrein 2000:136). See also Bender (2000b:3).

5. Joseph Schuldenrein and I organized "Teaching Archaeology at the Dawn of the Millennium: Is Anthropology Really Necessary?" a session presented in 2001 at the 100th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Washington, D.C.

6. As just one example, see the nearly 20-year-old exchange between Kershaw (1983) and Kent (1983) on the need for anthropology departments to create courses and programs to prepare students for the "real world of work" beyond academia.

References

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

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

Bender, Susan J.
   2000a A Proposal to Guide Curricular Reform for the Twenty-First Century. In *Teaching Archaeology in the Twenty-First Century*. S. J. Bender and G. S. Smith, eds. Pp. 31–48. Washington, DC: Society for American Archaeology.

2000b Historical Background: Thinking about How We Teach Archaeology. In *Teaching Archaeology in the Twenty-First Century*. S. J. Bender and G. S. Smith, eds. Pp. 3–4. Washington, DC: Society for American Archaeology.

Bender, Susan J., and George S. Smith
1998 SAA's Workshop on Teaching Archaeology in the Twenty-First Century: Promoting a National Dialogue on Curricula Reform. *SAA Bulletin* 16(5):11–13.
2000 [Editors] *Teaching Archaeology in the Twenty-First Century*. Washington, DC: Society for American Archaeology.

Bennett, John W.
1943 Recent Developments in the Functional Interpretation of Archaeological Data. *American Antiquity* 9:208–219.

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.
1981 Behavioural Archaeology and the "Pompeii Premise." *Journal of Anthropological Research* 37:195–208.

Chambers, Erve
1997 Contested Territories: Teaching the Uses of Anthropology. In *The Teaching of Anthropology: Problems, Issues, and Decisions*. C. P. Kottak, J. J. White, R. H. Furlow, and P. C. Rice, eds. Pp. 260–265. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.

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

Clarke, David L.
1972 Models and Paradigms in Contemporary Archaeology. In *Models in Archaeology*. D. L. Clarke, ed. Pp. 1–60. London: Methuen.

Cunningham, Clark E.
2000 Foreword. In *Beyond Kinship: Social and Material Reproduction in House Societies*. R. A. Joyce and S. D. Gillespie, eds. Pp. vii–ix. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Davis, Hester A., Jeffrey H. Altschul, Judith Bense, Elizabeth M. Brumfiel, Shereen Lerner, James J. Miller, Vincas P. Steponaitis, and Joe Watkins
1999 Teaching Archaeology in the Twenty-First Century: Thoughts on Undergraduate Education. *SAA Bulletin* 17(1):18–20, 22.

Downum, Christian E., and Laurie J. Price
1999 Applied Archaeology. *Human Organization* 58:226–239.

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

Flannery, Kent V.
1982 The Golden Marshalltown: A Parable for the Archeology of the 1980s. *American Anthropologist* 84:265–278.

Geier, Clarence R.
1981 *Archeological Training, Theory, and Technique: Problems in the Professional Base of Contract Archeology*. Occasional Publication No. 5. Arlington, VA: Popular Archaeology.

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

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

Hodder, Ian, ed.
1982 *Symbolic and Structural Archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Hoopes, John W.
1997 Ordeal in Chiapas: Archaeologists Survive Attack during Attempt to Rescue Maya Altar from Looters. *SAA Bulletin* 15(4):20–21, 33.

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

Kent, Susan
    1983 Academic Courses for Nonacademic Anthropologists? [reply to Kershaw]. *American Anthropologist* 85:120–122.

Kershaw, Greet
    1983 A Breath of Fresh Air. *American Anthropologist* 85:119–120.

Kohl, Philip L.
    1985 Symbolic, Cognitive Archaeology: A New Loss of Innocence. *Dialectical Anthropology* 9: 105–117.

Kohl, Philip L., and Clare Fawcett, eds.
    1995 *Nationalism, Politics, and the Practice of Archaeology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Krass, Dorothy Schlotthauer
    2000 What *Is* the Archaeology Curriculum? In *Teaching Archaeology in the Twenty-First Century.* S. J. Bender and G. S. Smith, eds. Pp. 9–15. Washington, DC: Society for American Archaeology.

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

Leone, Mark P.
    1972 Issues in Anthropological Archaeology. In *Contemporary Archaeology: A Guide to Theory and Contributions.* M. P. Leone, ed. Pp. 14–27. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Lynott, Mark J., David G. Anderson, Glen H. Doran, Ricardo J. Elia, Maria Franklin, K. Anne Pyburn, Joseph Schuldenrein, and Dean R. Snow
    1999 Teaching Archaeology in the Twenty-First Century: Thoughts on Graduate Education. *SAA Bulletin* 17(1):21–22.

McGimsey, Charles R., III, and Hester A. Davis
    2000 The Old Order Changeth, or, Now That Archaeology Is in the Deep End of the Pool, Let's Not Just Tread Water. In *Teaching Archaeology in the Twenty-First Century.* S. J. Bender and G. S. Smith, eds. Pp. 5–8. Washington, DC: Society for American Archaeology.

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.

Messenger, Phyllis E., Dennis B. Blanton, Tobi A. Brimsek, Noel Broadbent, Pamela Cressey, Nancy DeGrummond, John E. Ehrenhard, Dorothy S. Krass, Charles R. McGimsey III, and Nancy M. White
    1999 Teaching Archaeology in the Twenty-First Century: Thoughts on Postgraduate Educational/Professional Development. *SAA Bulletin* 17(2):13–14.

Patterson, Thomas C.
    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.

Price, Laurie J.
    2001 How Good Is Graduate Training in Anthropology? *Anthropology News* 42(5):5–6.

Pyburn, K. Anne, and Richard R. Wilk
    1995 Responsible Archaeology Is Applied Anthropology. In *Ethics in American Archaeology: Challenges for the 1990s.* M. J. Lynott and A. Wylie, eds. Pp. 71–76. Special Report. Washington, DC: Society for American Archaeology.

Schuldenrein, Joseph
    1998a Changing Career Paths and the Training of Professional Archaeologists: Observations from the Barnard College Forum, Part I. *SAA Bulletin* 16(1):31–33.
    1998b Changing Career Paths and the Training of Professional Archaeologists: Observations from the Barnard College Forum, Part II. *SAA Bulletin* 16(3):26–29.
    2000 Refashioning Our Profession: Practical Skills, Preservation, and Cultural Resource Management. In *Teaching Archaeology in the Twenty-First Century.* S. J. Bender and G. S. Smith, eds. Pp. 133–139. Washington, DC: Society for American Archaeology.

Smith, George S., and Susan J. Bender
   2000 AAA Co-Sponsors Teaching Archaeology Workshop. *Anthropology News* 41(1):42.

Smith, Michael E.
   1997 Archaeology in the Middle of Political Conflict in Yautepec, Mexico. *SAA Bulletin* 15(4): 12–14.

Society for American Archaeology
   1996 Society for American Archaeology Principles of Archaeological Ethics. *American Antiquity* 61:451–452.

Steward, Julian
   1929 Diffusion and Independent Invention: A Critique of Logic. *American Anthropologist* 31:491–495.
   1942 The Direct Historical Approach to Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 7:337–343.
   1949 Cultural Causality and Law: A Trial Formulation of the Development of Early Civilizations. *American Anthropologist* 51:1–27.
   1953 Evolution and Process. In *Anthropology Today*. A. L. Kroeber, ed. Pp. 313–326. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

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

Strong, William Duncan
   1936 Anthropological Theory and Archaeological Fact. In *Essays in Anthropology (Presented to A. L. Kroeber in Celebration of His Sixtieth Birthday)*. R. H. Lowie, ed. Pp. 359–370. Berkeley: University of California Press.
   1952 The Value of Archeology in the Training of Professional Anthropologists. *American Anthropologist* 54:318–321.

Taylor, Walter W., Jr.
   1948 *A Study of Archaeology*. American Anthropological Association Memoir 69, pp. 5–263. Menasha, WS.

Trigger, Bruce G.
   1989 *A History of Archaeological Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Watkins, Joe, K. Anne Pyburn, and Pam Cressey
   2000 Community Relations: What the Practicing Archaeologist Needs to Know to Work Effectively with Local and/or Descendant Communities. In *Teaching Archaeology in the Twenty-First Century*. S. J. Bender and G. S. Smith, eds. Pp. 73–81. Washington, DC: Society for American Archaeology.

Watson, Patty Jo
   1983 Foreword to the 1983 Edition. In *A Study of Archeology* [*sic*], by Walter W. Taylor. Pp. ix–xiii. Center for Archaeological Investigations. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University.

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

Wiseman, James
   1980a Archaeology as Archaeology. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 7:149–151.
   1980b Archaeology in the Future: An Evolving Discipline. *American Journal of Archaeology* 84:279–285.
   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.

Wolf, Eric R.
   1984 Culture: Panacea or Problem? *American Antiquity* 49:393–400.

Wood, John J., and Shirley Powell
   1993 An Ethos for Archaeological Practice. *Human Organization* 52:405–413.

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