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Welcome to AN 59.5, the “Hominin” issue. From Homo naledi to Nyanzapithecus alesi, evolutionary essentialism to symbolic thinking, five authors discuss recent discoveries and present a range of perspectives on our understanding of human evolution.
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GOING NATIVE

By Bernard Perley © 2018

A YOUNG ANTHROPOLOGIST VISITS THE RESERVATION.

...AND I WOULD LIKE TO DO MY FIELDWORK IN YOUR COMMUNITY.

I AM SURE WE CAN FIND SOMETHING FOR YOU TO DO.

A WHILE LATER...AT THE RESERVATION FARM.

CHIEF? ARE WE EXPLOITING ANTHRO STUDENTS AGAIN?

NEVER! HE SAID HE WANTED TO DO FIELDWORK.

YOU KNOW THAT'S NOT WHAT THEY MEAN BY "FIELDWORK."

FINE. LET'S CALL IT PARTICIPANT-OBSERVATION...

FROM THE NATIVE POINT OF VIEW!
In a tweet from 2013, Roseanne Barr called former United States National Security Advisor Susan Rice a “big man with swinging ape balls.” This year, Barr was at it again, tweeting “If Muslim brotherhood & planet of the apes had a baby =vj.” VJ was a reference to Valerie Jarett, a former senior advisor to President Barak Obama. In 26 characters, she let the genie of racism out, and this time it erupted all over Twitter. Comparing of black people to apes was once standard practice in anthropology textbooks (e.g., Nott and Gliddon 1854). We know that early scholars of anthropology pushed the notion that Africans are the missing link with the apes and that this was used to justify slavery. For many of us, fighting this deception provided purpose and a calling. Yet, despite anthropologists’ repeated, widely disseminated assertions that race is a cultural construct, the belief of closer biological affinity between apes and black people is alive and well. How do we counter it now? Still the genie hides, only to burst forth from collective unconscious in unguarded moments, once again on public display. This article is for all anthropologists, a revisiting of the stakes at the core of the work we do.
I am hypervigilant about any tendency among anthropologists to abandon skepticism and assert that we—humans and our cousins the apes—are all kin, before the evidence is in. And I view as code, as some sign of conceding to popular opinion, the statement that we arose at different times from different places. Too often, we can expect a subtext claiming that we are not even remotely African. The need to understand the nature of human differences and our relationship to extant apes and other living beings is great. Barr’s racist sentiments offer a clue as to just how prominently apes figure in Americans’ thinking about what it means to be human, a thinking that could certainly benefit from what we actually now know about ape-human evolution. We do ourselves a great disservice by diminishing interest in the race-related problems that people of color grapple with daily.

Having spent my entire adult life studying and teaching ape evolution, I hold these four major lessons to be necessary for the proper understanding and interpretation of modern human differences and human-ape kinship:

1. Humans may not see themselves as apes today, but we most certainly are from apes.
2. Humans are one of many in a once surprisingly diverse lineage. Humans, like chimpanzees, gorillas, and gibbons are the few survivors of a severely pruned, not the end product of some stairway to heaven. Humans and our cousins the apes—are all kin, before the evidence is in. And I view as code, as some sign of conceding to popular opinion, the statement that we arose at different times from different places. Too often, we can expect a subtext claiming that we are not even remotely African. The need to understand the nature of human differences and our relationship to extant apes and other living beings is great. Barr’s racist sentiments offer a clue as to just how prominently apes figure in Americans’ thinking about what it means to be human, a thinking that could certainly benefit from what we actually now know about ape-human evolution. We do ourselves a great disservice by diminishing interest in the race-related problems that people of color grapple with daily.

Having spent my entire adult life studying and teaching ape evolution, I hold these four major lessons to be necessary for the proper understanding and interpretation of modern human differences and human-ape kinship:

1. Humans may not see themselves as apes today, but we most certainly are from apes.
2. Humans are one of many in a once surprisingly diverse lineage. Humans, like chimpanzees, gorillas, and gibbons are the few survivors of a severely pruned, not the end product of some stairway to heaven. Humans, like chimpanzees, gorillas, and gibbons are the few survivors of a surprisingly diverse lineage.
3. Humans do not represent the final apotheosis of an evolutionary march of progress.
4. The empire of the planet of the apes was in Africa.

We do well to revisit and rehearse them everywhere. Here I will reprise the last point in light of a recent discovery of a new ape species in Africa.

In *The Descent of Man*, Charles Darwin hypothesized that progenitors of apes (including humans) most likely evolved in Africa. Over the last five decades, paleoanthropologists have done a remarkable job of finding fossils that help us to reconstruct our extinct cousins and ancestors and flesh out key events and the general pattern of hominoid (humans and apes) evolution. Although the evidence is clear that the origin and diversification of the hominin lineage occurred in Africa, fossils of the ancestors we share with the extant apes are still elusive—yet these are most likely to have evolved in Africa as well.

**The discovery of Alesi is an indication that we are yet to reach the asymptote of new ape species discoveries, although the general topology of hominoid evolution is beginning to emerge.**

The case for the origin of the common ancestor of hominoids in Africa is now reinforced by the recent discovery of the infant cranium KNM-NP 59050, nicknamed Alesi (Turkana for ancestor). It was spotted at the Middle Miocene site of Napudet in the Turkana Basin, Kenya, during a cigarette break at the end of a fruitless search on the evening of September 4, 2014. John Ekusi, one of a super talented handful of Turkana and Dassanetch field technicians on my field research team made the find (Nengo et al. 2017). Alesi is the only infant and most complete cranium of an ape known in the fossil record. After preparation of the specimen. It was scanned using synchrotron X-ray tomography in Grenoble, France, in 2015, generating almost two terabytes of digital data and revealing in high resolution both its external and internal morphology.

Currently, there are just over a dozen reasonably complete juvenile to adult cranial specimens of fossil apes from the Miocene (circa 23 to 5 million years ago) fossil record, in spite of the fact that there are over 40 ape species recorded. In Eurasia, partial crania are known for *Pierolapithecus*, *Anoiapithecus*, *Ankarapithecus*, *Ouranopithecus*, *Rudapithecus*, *Hispanopithecus*, *Sivapithecus* and *Lufengpithecus* (see Begun 2002; Kelley 2002; Kelley and Gao, 2012; Ji et al. 2013; Moyà Solà et al. 2004; 2009). In Africa, partial ape crania are known for *Ekembo*, *Afropithecus*, and *Turkanapithecus* (see Harrison 2010). The *Ekembo* specimen is distorted throughout and lacks the cranial base. *Afropithecus* and *Turkanapithecus*, though not distorted, preserve only the face and parts of the neurocranium. Juvenile hominoid crania are particularly rare in the fossil record, with a total of three specimens. Two specimens, attributed to *Lufengpithecus*, preserve most of the facial skeleton and the frontal bone of a juvenile and an individual at the stage of the infant to juvenile transition. The specimen of *Nyanzapithecus alesi*, KNM-NP 59050, is the only infant and the most complete hominoid cranium in the fossil record so far.

KNM-NP 59050 is unique in that nearly all elements of external and internal morphology are preserved in a single extinct hominoid specimen. Aspects of the internal morphology available for study include the unerupted teeth, the inner ear bony labyrinth housing the organs of hearing and balance, the middle ear (including ossicles on both sides), the nasal cavity and paranasal sinuses, and the brain endocard preserving excellent surface detail. Using various analytical techniques, these elements of anatomy will allow us to explore aspects of diet, positional behavior, hearing, social behavior, growth and development, and life history, as well as systematics and phylogeny. Based on the morphology of the unerupted adult teeth inside the infant ape’s skull, we have
established that the specimen belonged to a new species, *Nyanzapithecus alesi*. A phylogenetic analysis revealed that *Nyanzapithecus alesi* belonged to a now extinct lineage, nyanzapithecines, which existed in Africa for over 10 million years, starting from about 25 million years ago and was very close to the origin of the common ancestor of humans and apes.

The discovery of Alesi is an indication that we are yet to reach the asymptote of new ape species discoveries, although the general topology of hominoid evolution is beginning to emerge. There was a tremendous diversity of ape species in Africa in the Early-to-Middle Miocene, these spreading to Eurasia in the Middle-to-Late Miocene. Nyanzapithecines were part of the early ape radiation. Dated to approximately seven million years ago, *Oreopithecus* from Italy could be a late surviving member of a nyanzapithecine group that migrated to Eurasia and that was derived from the earlier radiation centered in Africa (Harrison 1986, Nengo et al. 2017). Another major diversification of the hominin line that also centered in Africa in the Plio-Pleistocene was followed by migrations of species such as *Homo erectus* into Eurasia, and *Homo sapiens* everywhere. Modern chimpanzees, gorillas, gibbons, orangs, and humans are but mere twigs on the family tree after the end of this grand flowering over millions of years, first in Africa and with later immigrant branches outside of Africa.

What can we deduce from this pattern? A diversity of species in a lineage occurs when a landmass supports a corresponding variety of ecological possibilities. The story of our becoming human is of ape species thriving in Africa—a petri dish for evolutionary experiments on ape-human form, conjuring up variety after variety over millions of years. If anything, a better understanding of our ape origins and our relationship to our few surviving cousin species could inspire us to reflect on our true place in nature.

Isaiah Nengo is associate director of research and science at the Turkana Basin Institute, Stony Brook University. He was born in Nairobi, Kenya. He holds a BSc in zoology and botany from the University of Nairobi and a PhD in biological anthropology from Harvard University. He was Fulbright Scholar at the National Museums of Kenya and the University of Nairobi. His research focuses on the origins and evolution of apes.

The discovery of Alesi is an indication that we are yet to reach the asymptote of new ape species discoveries, although the general topology of hominoid evolution is beginning to emerge. There was a tremendous diversity of ape species in Africa in the Early-to-Middle Miocene, these spreading to Eurasia in the Middle-to-Late Miocene. Nyanzapithecines were part of the early ape radiation. Dated to approximately seven million years ago, *Oreopithecus* from Italy could be a late surviving member of a nyanzapithecine group that migrated to Eurasia and that was derived from the earlier radiation centered in Africa (Harrison 1986, Nengo et al. 2017). Another major diversification of the hominin line that also centered in Africa in the Plio-Pleistocene was followed by migrations of species such as *Homo erectus* into Eurasia, and *Homo sapiens* everywhere. Modern chimpanzees, gorillas, gibbons, orangs, and humans are but mere twigs on the family tree after the end of this grand flowering over millions of years, first in Africa and with later immigrant branches outside of Africa.

What can we deduce from this pattern? A diversity of species in a lineage occurs when a landmass supports a corresponding variety of ecological possibilities. The story of our becoming human is of ape species thriving in Africa—a petri dish for evolutionary experiments on ape-human form, conjuring up variety after variety over millions of years. If anything, a better understanding of our ape origins and our relationship to our few surviving cousin species could inspire us to reflect on our true place in nature.

Isaiah Nengo is associate director of research and science at the Turkana Basin Institute, Stony Brook University. He was born in Nairobi, Kenya. He holds a BSc in zoology and botany from the University of Nairobi and a PhD in biological anthropology from Harvard University. He was Fulbright Scholar at the National Museums of Kenya and the University of Nairobi. His research focuses on the origins and evolution of apes.
Frontal view of the Neo skull of *Homo naledi* from the Lesedi Chamber.
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A common teaching analogy in paleoanthropology is that of the drunk looking for her keys in the light of a streetlamp. When a passerby asks if she dropped something, the drunk responds, “actually I dropped my keys on the other side of the road, but it is too dark for me to see over there.” The correspondence in paleoanthropology is clear; we can only be certain of what we know in relation to where we look. Our understanding of modern human origins has historically been biased toward a narrative of hominin evolution in Europe. Our appreciation of the African hominin record is likely skewed toward the East African Rift Valley. The discovery, analysis, and interpretation of more than fifteen hundred hominin fossil remains from the Rising Star Cave system in South Africa—given the taxonomic name of Homo naledi—open up an altogether more exciting and challenging perspective on this analogy (Berger et al. 2015). Maybe there are holes, conceptual as well as epistemological, even within the known areas of paleoanthropological vision?

The Southern African fossil record over the past 300,000 years—the H. naledi material has been provisionally dated to between 236,000 and 335,000 years old (Dirks et al. 2017)—is not devoid of hominin or archaeological representation. Fossils such as the Kabwe (Zambia) and Florisbad (South Africa) crania, both believed to date from a similar time range, have been part of the hominin fossil record for more than 80 years. South Africa has long been a center for research on the appearance and diversification of Middle Stone Age technologies dating back 500,000 years. Despite this, the materials recovered to date from the Dinaledi and Lesedi chambers of the cave system are striking and altogether surprising.

Part of what makes H. naledi remarkable is its clear distinction from these previous discoveries and the asymmetry of its distinctiveness. As one example, consider the reconstructed endocasts of the H. naledi material (Holloway et al. 2018). These specimens are uniform in their diminutive size, particularly in relation to the contemporary Southern African fossil record, but they also possess a number of features that are comparable to recent humans. The endocranial volume of the Kabwe cranium is more than double that observed in the H. naledi specimens. When it comes to the specimens’ geological age, only the remains identified as a unique species, Homo floriensis, from the cave of Liang Bua on the island of Flores, Indonesia, present a smaller endocranial volume this late in the hominin evolutionary record. And yet, analyses of the endocranial morphology highlight a number of features that gesture toward modern neurocranial architecture, despite the size of the remains. Throughout the morphology of H. naledi, represented now by hundreds of fossil fragments, there are interesting combinations of putative-ly archaic and derived features. In other words, the H. naledi assemblage defies simple classification as “more modern” or “more primitive” than contemporary hominin material elsewhere.

While there has not, as yet, been any published archaeological assemblage asso-
associated with *H. naledi*, researchers argue the accumulation of fossil material is the result of intentional deposition. Such purposeful mortuary behavior would have required members of this small-brained human species to make an arduous journey, in the dark, through the Rising Star cave system, to deliberately deposit their dead. Paleoanthropologists also claim mediated disposal for the slightly earlier accumulation of the vast hominin assemblage at Sima de los Huesos, Atapuerca (Spain), although in that case, the imagined hominin role in the process of accumulation was much less intense, and seemingly more passive. It is the intentionality and difficulty of the disposal in the Dinaledi chamber as well as the small brain size of *H. naledi* that raises significant questions about the link between cognitive, emotional, and symbolic capabilities in the Rising Star hominins. The *H. naledi* assemblage represents a stark challenge to simplistic, linear narratives of the origin of modernity in the hominin fossil record. And it is a challenge right in the middle of a long-studied, seemingly well-understood time and place in the hominin fossil record. Paleoanthropology has "known" the Middle–Late Pleistocene is a time period in our evolutionary framework of modern human origins. As one research group recently put it, "It is likely that gene flow occurred between many, or even most, hominin groups in the Late Pleistocene, and that more such events will be detected as more ancient genomes of high quality become available" (Prüfer et al. 2017, 657).

**Such purposeful mortuary behavior would have required members of this small-brained human species to make an arduous journey, in the dark, through the Rising Star cave system, to deliberately deposit their dead.**

While the cave of Denisova, in the foothills of the Altai mountains in southern Siberia, is a long way from the Rising Star Cave system in South Africa, I would argue the two are linked in our understanding of later Pleistocene human evolution. The challenge to a linear narrative of human evolution presented by the *H. naledi* material as well as the increasing ancient DNA record, is not a question of species names and phylogenetic trees. Instead, it sits in the murky middle ground of biology between populations distributed across a landscape and species distinguished throughout the fossil record. The history of paleoanthropology has often acted as a conversation across two languages. On one side, we have an understanding of human evolution based on the distribution of variation across living people today. On the other side, is the tangible evidence of our evolutionary past, scattered across time and space, localized at particular fossil and archaeological sites and within specific assemblages. Translations between these two languages present challenges. Variation in living humans is, in many ways, instantaneous in nature, either lacking a temporal depth altogether or more influenced by events in our recent past than is ideal for comparisons with the Pleistocene. Meanwhile, variation in the fossil record lends itself, probably too readily, to interpretations based on discontinuity.

The increasingly mosaic nature of the Late Pleistocene hominin evolutionary record attests to a complex array of evolutionary lineages—populations dispersed across time and space—both unique and reticulate with the broader pattern of human evolution. It is a testament to the growing body of amazing fieldwork over the past several decades that such complexities have become a tangible part of our scientific discourse in human evolution. But it is likely that the limited geographic expanse of historical work in archaeology and paleoanthropology means that much of the diversity of our past, particularly within Africa, remains unsampled (Scerri et al. 2018).

*H. naledi* is remarkable. It is, in the classic anthropological sense, both strange and familiar. Well within the historical lamplight of paleoanthropology in Southern Africa, yet not at all what we, as a discipline, were expecting to find. A decade ago, neither Denisovans nor *H. naledi* existed in our understanding of human evolution. What surprises might the next decade hold? I expect similar discoveries will be made in different areas of our paleoanthropological lamplight in the years to come—but perhaps with less surprise—as the basic evolutionary narr-
It is likely that the limited geographic expanse of historical work in archaeology and paleoanthropology means that much of the diversity of our past, particularly within Africa, remains unsampled.

tive surrounding human evolution in the Pleistocene continues to shift.

It should not go unsaid that one unparalleled aspect of the *H. naledi* story is the extent to which the findings are accessible to both the lay and professional public. Most of the *H. naledi* primary research reports are open access. The research group has made an effort to make as much of the primary fossil material as possible available for examination by uploading high-quality and downloadable 3D images to MorphoSource, an open access digital hub of 3D fossil data. In addition to the open access efforts surrounding the *H. naledi* material, the work itself has been extensively documented for a public audience, often in real time and with a particular emphasis on education. For those of us who feel that human evolution and its understanding are important for how we understand the world around us today, such work offers the potential to not just reveal new insights in our evolutionary history, but also to shine a brighter light outward, illuminating more questions to study and areas to explore.

Adam Van Arsdale is an associate professor and chair of the Department of Anthropology at Wellesley College. Email him at avanarsd@wellesley.edu. Find him on Twitter at @APV2600)
By Sheela Athreya

In the past year, at least four fossil finds have been billed as overturning the story of human evolution. The 300,000-year-old *Homo sapiens* specimen from Jebel Irhoud, Morocco, is hailed as pushing back the age of our species by nearly 100,000 years. Similarly, discoveries in Israel (a fossilized jawbone), Saudi Arabia (a fossilized finger bone), and Siberia (several bone fragments) were each declared to be the oldest *H. sapiens* in their respective regions of the world. With each new find, researchers and news headlines announced that the fossils significantly altered our understanding of human evolution and dispersal from Africa. But if we have to rewrite the story of *H. sapiens* evolution so frequently, we might ask whether the plot we’re using is wrong to begin with.

The dominant, almost axiomatic paleoanthropological narrative holds that anatomically modern humans evolved in sub-Saharan Africa 200,000 years ago, and considers any fossil find relative to that framework. So, the Jebel Irhoud cranium from Morocco was reported as pushing back the origin of our species and making it a pan-African phenomenon (Hublin et al. 2017); the Israeli and Saudi specimens were said to push back the timing of the dispersal out of Africa (Hershkovitz et al. 2018; Groucutt et al. 2018); and the Siberian fossils were called the oldest modern humans outside of the Middle East and Africa (*Siberian Times* 2018), despite older findings (and similar headlines) from China, Laos, and Indonesia in the last 10 years. In essence, the data are subservient to the narrative that an entity known as anatomically modern humans exists and has a singular origin. Yet, this story ignores the complex fossil records of Asia and Australia and perpetuates a distinctly Eurocentric vision of our past.

MODERN MISCONCEPTIONS
The phrase “anatomically modern *Homo sapiens*” was first used in the 1970s to distinguish between Neanderthals and the
European hominins who looked more like us. It wasn’t meant to establish a formal species boundary. But, in 1987, when Cann, Stoneking, and Wilson published their mitochondrial DNA study tracing all living humans back to a single ancestral population that lived in Africa around 200,000 years ago, molecular anthropology took on a new significance in the story of human evolution. After that, all non-African Middle and Late Pleistocene populations—including European Neanderthals as well as *Homo erectus* in Asia—were considered evolutionary dead ends. Despite the lack of consensus on this model among fossil experts and population geneticists, it has become the prevailing wisdom in a generation of anthropology textbooks and introductory lectures.

Within this framework, paleoanthropologists have aimed to locate where the first so-called “modern” humans evolved during the Late Pleistocene and to trace their subsequent path across the globe. This presumes two things: First, that there is a “first.” And second, that there is such a thing as a “modern human.” Based on these presumptions, paleoanthropologists, Paleolithic archaeologists, and anthropological geneticists have sought out the earliest signs of biological or behavioral “modernity.” Each subfield defines this differently. Biological anthropologists focus on anatomical modernity—high foreheads, reduced browridges, and globular heads with small faces. Paleolithic archaeologists have emphasized evidence of complex or abstract thinking in the form of art, burials, toolkits, or social/organizational complexity. Geneticists have honed in on genomic signatures that separate us from Neanderthals and unite us with living populations.

The problem is that these criteria are not nearly as universally recognized or scientifically repeatable as we’d like them to be. First, there is ample evidence that the evolution of our species was not a singular event with a “first” member. Biologically, there is no consensus definition of what constitutes anatomical modernity, just as there was never any agreement on what criteria should be used to define “races.” Behaviorally, evidence of complex or abstract thinking reveals itself in ways that we either overlook or can’t know because we are restricted to how these appear in present-day contexts. For example, stone tools from the Batadomba Lena rock shelter in Sri Lanka (Perera et al. 2011) and pelagic fish remains from the Jerimelai rock shelter in East Timor (O’Connor, Ono, and Clarkson 2011) show that humans successfully exploited rainforest and deep-seawater.
resources in Australasia 40,000 years ago, meaning these populations clearly had an understanding of astronomy, oceanography, or rainforest ecology that required abstract knowledge of a different form than we see in Europe. Since stone tool technology is a response to local environmental vicissitudes, constraints, and needs, it shouldn’t be expected to follow a linear pattern of development for all humans. So, to reduce *H. sapiens* evolution and behavior to the binary of “archaic” and “modern” and then search for the first appearance of the latter in our biology or artifacts is an exercise in essentialism. Membership in each is based on Eurocentric notions of what constitutes humanness, not on criteria that have been objectively defined and can be empirically uncovered exclusively through the scientific method. The entire narrative of *H. sapiens* evolution requires revision every time there is a new find not just because science is self-correcting, but because the current scientific model is fundamentally flawed.

**A MORE INCLUSIVE APPROACH TO HUMAN EVOLUTION**

The site I work at in India provides a chance to reconfigure how we study *H. sapiens* evolution and address the inherent biases that have been baked into this topic from the beginning. The Bhimbetka rock shelters are situated in the Vindhyan Hills of Madhya Pradesh, Central India, and preserve paintings and burials that appear to be early Holocene, based on the images depicted and preliminary radiocarbon dates taken in the 1970s. The late V. S. Wakankar excavated the shelters at that time. I have always known about the site but didn’t think much could be done there because the skeletal remains were too fragmentary to give any clues about morphology. Plus, most of the stone tools were microliths which, based on the European/Near Eastern model, are associated with the proto-agricultural Mesolithic period and between 12,000 and 8,000 years old. This is fairly young in terms of *H. sapiens* evolution.

A few years ago, I started delving into the details of these materials for a new collaboration I was forming with Mattias Jakobsson, an ancient DNA specialist at Uppsala University. The morphology I read about intrigued me. The most complete skeleton had a few features that we’d consider “archaic” in the binary model including thick cranial bones, a low, sloping forehead, and a huge jaw with large teeth. It wasn’t directly dated, but some of the stone tools associated with it were, in the European model, typical of Neanderthals and usually found in contexts older than 40,000 years. Another thing that struck me was that in the past ten years, the microliths used to date the site to the Mesolithic had been found in several sites in India dating to between 40,000 and 70,000 years ago. Microliths aren’t seen in Europe or the Near East until the dawn of agriculture and have always been assumed to be a technology that developed in conjunction with that subsistence pattern. But with the new data from India, their presence at Bhimb-
etka didn’t necessarily mean that the site was Mesolithic; I realized it could be older.

Our research at Bhimbetka now centers on filling in some gaps in the paleoanthropological record in a way that doesn’t start with the assumptions of the Out of Africa model. We aren’t seeking to find a “first” or to overturn the story of human evolution; we’re seeking to make the evolutionary narrative more inclusive. The question in South Asia has typically been, Where did microlithic technology come from? Was it brought into India by dispersing modern humans from Africa, or did it develop indigenously? But this very question is Eurocentric—it assumes that Indians in this scenario are “archaic” humans and were not likely to have developed microlithic technology themselves. It also misses the more informative question regarding these stone tools, which are also found in Southern Africa and Australia before the Holocene and are clearly not uniquely associated with the advent of agriculture: How did this technology mediate human adaptation to different environments at different times?

Similarly, the craniofacial anatomy at Bhimbetka tells us that there is no such singular entity as an “anatomically modern” human. Although the individuals there are robust, and possess sloping foreheads as well as brows that are more prominent and skulls that are less globular than your average Eurasian, there is no reason, based on age or morphology, to classify them as anything other than Homo sapiens. To examine their features exclusively within an archaic/modern binary is a typological and essentialist question focused on classification, not evolutionary history. Instead, in our project we are looking at the mechanisms that shape the human body, namely habitual behaviors combined with evolutionary forces such as gene flow (which can make two populations look more alike) and adaptation. We are interested in how these early populations share genetic markers with present-day Indians but also with other prehistoric groups from the neighboring regions of East Africa, the Near East, and East/Southeast Asia. These can help us trace paths of gene flow or migration.

The most exciting part of this project for me is the chance to study the Bhimbetka data relative to a different set of questions that aren’t driven by the Out of Africa narrative created by western scholars. We have the rare opportunity to definitively associate stone tool types with biological remains of humans in India and provide a direct date for them. By doing this, we are shifting the questions away from the essentialist associations that have historically been made between “modernity,” stone tool types, and morphology, and toward a more inclusive inquiry into the varied ways that morphological traits, genomes, and stone tools co-occurred in different regional populations of early Homo sapiens.

We are interested in how these early populations share genetic markers with present-day Indians but also with other prehistoric groups from the neighboring regions of East Africa, the Near East, and East/Southeast Asia.

Our analysis of the Bhimbetka material is preliminary, but we are aware that not all South Asians want to know when Africans first peopled their subcontinent, in part because they haven’t dismissed the data that reflect a strong level of regional continuity in occupation and evolution in South Asia throughout the Pleistocene. Instead, we will focus on questions of relatedness between present-day Indians and these past populations, and will also explore population movements into and out of the subcontinent—events that have shaped it for millennia.

One reason for our reframing of the dominant model and questions is that my co-principal investigator, Ravi Korisettar, and I are South Asian. Reviewers and colleagues tell me that our perspective exhibits an Indian ethnocentrism, but do western scholars recognize the ways in which their own ethnocentric biases continue to shape the discipline? We believe that the act of bringing this alternative perspective into paleoanthropology is necessary for the healthy development of the science. The National Science Foundation and Wenner-Gren Foundation realize this, and are supporting research such as ours. Rather than dismiss our Asian colleagues as ethnocentric, we can integrate their perspectives, explore different patterns of H. sapiens evolution in different regions, and acknowledge different modalities of ascertaining paleoanthropological facts.

Paleoanthropological models have historically been constructed in something of an echo chamber; we need to include more diverse voices in the development of our scientific research to improve the quality of our outcomes. My wish is that we do more for non-western communities than treat them as passive recipients of our “broader impacts” (doing the science and then going back and lecturing people on what we found out about them). We should include them as participants in study design and question formulation, and as contributors to our background/theoretical framework. Ultimately, inclusiveness means yielding space for other voices, forms of knowledge construction, and ways of performing science, and integrating this into the study so that multiple world views are represented at all levels of a project. Only by doing so can we truly excel at our goal of understanding our species’ evolutionary past.

Sheela Atreyea is an associate professor of anthropology at Texas A&M University. Her research focuses on Middle and Late Pleistocene human evolution, particularly in eastern Asia. Her publications include empirical analyses of hominin fossil data as well as reflexive analyses of the effects of colonialism on present-day paleoanthropological models.
Non-Modern Humans Were More Complex—and Artistic—Than We Thought

FOSSIL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE SUGGESTS THAT OUR ANCIENT RELATIVES FOUND INNOVATIVE WAYS TO MAKE AND SHARE MEANING.

The three-million-year-old Makapansgat pebble—also known as the stone of many faces—is made of jasperite, a stone not present at the site where it was discovered.
A recent exhibit at the Nasher Sculpture Center in Dallas, Texas, asked visitors to view stone tools not as artifacts but as works of art. The curators—artist Tony Berlant and anthropologist Thomas Wynn—displayed hand axes without context, which encouraged patrons to see the lithics as aesthetic objects rather than tools. Even more provocatively, the exhibit presented stones that resemble human faces as “figure stones.” Such interpretations are often ignored or downplayed by scholars interested in modern human behavior; art tends to be viewed as a rather recent human invention, a practice that dates to well after the emergence of *Homo sapiens*. The delineation of such artifacts as art is dismissed as the result of wishful thinking on the part of biased collectors rather than aesthetic creations by non-modern humans capable of complex thought. Skepticism of extraordinary claims is important, after all.

However, we may be too quick to disregard this approach. For much of the intellectual history of archaeology and paleoanthropology, the material and fossil records were viewed through a Eurocentric mindset that assumed linear progression with Western civilization as the apex of human evolution (see Kuljian 2016 for more on this). As our knowledge of the human fossil record expanded in the twentieth century, it became clear that the origins of *H. sapiens* date to at least 200,000 years ago (with recent evidence from Jebel Irhoud in Morocco placing this closer to 300,000 years ago). By the 1990s, archaeologists noticed an apparent disconnect in the data: while the fossil record suggested our species was old, the archaeological evidence did not show humans acting in a “modern” way, producing art and complex technologies, until much more recently.

The assertion that anatomical modernity preceded behavioral modernity has been the subject of much research over the last few decades. At its heart, this evolutionary approach is predicated on the idea that there is a clear and archaeologically visible dividing line between humans who act in a modern way and those who do not. This change, sometimes argued to be due to a single genetic mutation, is seen as driving the evolutionary success of our species, with humans thinking in new, cognitively complex ways able to outcompete other populations or species. Yet, it is also based on a specific way of looking at the record and, occasionally, a distinctly Western definition of what constitutes early art.

This reticence to accept the idea that non-modern humans could create works of art is part of the larger claim that only *H. sapiens* are capable of symbolic thought. Scholars have tried to use the archaeological record to pinpoint when humans evolved the ability to link a sign to the object it stands for simply because everyone agrees the connection exists. In other words, this link is not because it resembles the object (an example of iconic thinking, like a photograph of a car) or because it is directly linked to the object (indexical thinking, such as smoke being an index of fire), but because of an agreed upon convention (symbolic thinking, such as knowing a red light means stop). The use of symbols requires a sophisticated mind able to conceptualize beyond the literal world. Many studies contend that among the living primates, only humans possess this creative mental ability. But how far back in time can we trace our capacity for symbolic thought?

Not surprisingly, claims of symbolic artifacts made by non-modern humans have been met with intense scrutiny. Part of this is due to the fragmentary nature of the early archaeological record, but there is also a deeply held assumption that only *H. sapiens* could produce such artifacts.

Rather than fetishizing the ability to make symbols, we should instead concentrate on how our ancestors found novel and innovate ways to create and share meaning. My colleague, Agustín Fuentes, and I recently published an open access database of the current evidence of human symbolic expression, concentrating on examples of the creation of beads, engraved objects, and the use of ochre. Using these data, we argue that by at least 300,000 years ago, members of the genus *Homo* were engaging in complex, creative thought and producing artifacts laden with meanings. To be clear, the examples that date prior to 200,000 years ago are far from definitive examples of symbolic thought. Yet, they demonstrate that the human cultural niche was changing. Below are just some of the artifacts that suggest a more nuanced approach to the paleoanthropological record is necessary.

When humans began to actively use and control fire is hotly debated (see Chazan 2017). Discerning anthropogenic versus natural fires involves understanding the differences between quick-moving grass fires and those that...
were tended to. Research by Sarah Hlubik and colleagues (2017) suggests fire use at a 1.5-million-year-old site in Kenya. Evidence of the presence of burned seeds, wood, and flint fragments from Gesher Benot Ya'aqov in Israel indicates that non-modern humans were using fire by approximately 800,000 years ago (Goren-Inbar et al. 2004), although it may not be until 500,000 years later that widespread fire use appears in the archaeological record. While most scholars focus on the technical utilitarian reasons for fire use (for cooking, protection, and warmth), there may be a more nuanced and important aspect—conversation and storytelling. Polly Wiessner’s (2014) study of evening campfire conversations by the Ju/'hoansi of Namibia and Botswana implies that it was during talks over firelight that humans engaged in non-subsistence related conversations that aroused the imagination; spreading rumors and spinning tales.

As with fire, the origins of intentional burial are contested and debated. One of the earliest claims is the AL 333 fossil assemblage of *Australopithecus afarensis*, which dates to 3.2 million years ago, but there appears to be no direct evidence in support of this. The Sima de los Huesos assemblage (probably older than 300,000 years ago, although the exact date is disputed) may also represent an intentional burial, or at least the purposeful movement of bodies postmortem. Recent support for burial activity before (or in addition to) that of contemporary humans comes from the recent work on Homo naledi (Berger et al. 2017) at between 236,000 and 335,000 years ago. The remains found in the Rising Star cave system in South Africa may have been deliberately deposited by other members of their species. This sort of mortuary behavior does not necessarily imply symbolic thought, but it does suggest that something distinctively human is occurring earlier than once thought.

For many archaeologists, the production of shell and stone beads is a critical step in the evolution of human thought. Beads are seen as markers of group identity and may indicate the desire to let someone else know who you are (e.g., “I’m from the group down by the river who wear blue-tinted shells”). Modern examples suggest that beads send multiple signals (Wilkie 2014). Of course, it is difficult to assess this in the past, yet the very act of creating these objects indicates awareness of the importance of social networks. The oldest shell beads come from the United Kingdom and may be 300,000 years old (Bednarik 1995), but these are around 200,000 years older than better-accepted examples from North Africa, Southwest Asia, and South Africa (Kissel and Fuentes 2016). At Blombos Cave in South Africa, archaeologists have identified a change in the way beadwork was created over time and interpreted this as a reflection of changes in the social norms shared by members of a Middle Stone Age community (Vanhaeren et al. 2013).

The three-million-year-old Makapansgat Pebble may have been selected and carried to a home site by an australopithecine who recognized in the naturally occurring markings something resembling a face (Bednarik 1998). Most scholars reject its status as symbolic. Yet, if we think of modern human origins as a process, rather than a single event, behaviors such as the curation of rocks and other items of embedded social meaning are important. Recent work in Indonesia has uncovered examples of *Homo erectus* engraving lines on mussel shells (Joordens et al. 2015). This artifact dates to between 540,000 and 430,000 years ago and was engraved with a sharp object in a zigzag pattern. Were our human ancestors capable of producing abstract design? We will likely never know what this engraved mussel shell meant to its maker, but we are finding more evidence for what could be considered symbolic objects far earlier than previously acknowledged.

Perhaps these earlier examples, which date to periods before *H. sapiens* flourished, are glimmerings of the capacity to
engage in complex meaning making. Of course, it is hard to say what the function of these scratch marks was and whether fire and burial truly represented something novel. Archaeologists tend to divide objects and behaviors into two classes: utilitarian and nonutilitarian. Much effort has been expended in trying to find the functional significance of these objects and behaviors, partly to negate the hypothesis that they had symbolic meaning. Nevertheless, we must remember that the objects we use today can function in multiple ways. Toothbrushes are functional, but the fact that one can buy a $4,000 toothbrush suggests that modern humans can input meaning into many objects.

Much of anthropology’s early history as a discipline is linked with narratives delineating who is human and who is not. Our intellectual forbears often assumed that it made sense not only to put people into groups, but to rank them in a hierarchical manner. We then defined human behavior by what we think is unique and distinctive to humans. However, time and again we have seen that this assumed exclusivity is mistaken. Tellingly, as soon as we define a shared, derived trait for humans, another study comes along and shows that feature or behavior exists in non-modern humans. We thus get stuck in a sort of feedback loop asking, Do we redefine what it means to be human, or do we add more “types” to the human species?

Today, anthropologists are working to reframe the questions we ask to be more inclusive. Definitions of what make us human can be based more on our shared evolutionary history rather than a specific cranial capacity. To be fair, the possible examples of meaning making in *Homo* groups prior to around 200,000 years ago are few and far apart. These are glimmerings, rare and potentially isolated occurrences that point to the complex nature of behavior in early non-modern humans.

But these glimmers matter. By taking a more nuanced approach to human evolutionary history and questions scholars can better model the complex processes that lead to the emergence of modern humans.

If we think of modern human origins as a process, rather than a single event, behaviors such as the curation of rocks and other items of embedded social meaning are important.

Recent work shows that hybridization may have played a key role in the origin of our species (Ackermann, Mackay, and Arnold 2015). To me, the claims that Neandertals painted cave art, carved images, and created structures are evidence in support of a more human definition of humanity, one that is informed by both evolution and anthropology. The ability to navigate complex social networks, to trade and exchange not just genes but ideas and objects, has its roots farther back than previously recognized. Humans today send countless nonverbal messages via our clothing, hairstyle, tattoos, and jewelry. Why adorn your body with shell beads (used by at least 100,000 years ago and possibly as far back as 300,000 years ago) unless you want to signal something about who you are?

Reframing the question removes the need to delineate who is human and who is not, a question that can have invidious social implications. When Jane Goodall reported chimps using tools, Louis Leakey allegedly replied, “Now we must redefine ‘tool’, redefine ‘man’, or accept chimpanzees as humans.” If what makes us human is our shared evolutionary history, it is a much longer and more complex history than we previously recognized.

Marc Kissel is a lecturer in anthropology at Appalachian State University. His research includes the study of modern human origins, semiotics, Neandertals, and the evolutionary arc of human warfare. His first book, written with Nam Kim, *Emergent Warfare in Our Evolutionary Past*, was published in March, 2018.
Where Do We Come From?

IN FOCUS

THE IDEA THAT A SINGLE POPULATION WAS THE ANCESTOR OF ALL LIVING HUMANS IS NEAT AND CONVENIENT, BUT IT IS NOT CONSISTENT WITH THE DATA.

By Sang-Hee Lee

The origin of modern humans is one of the most popular and hotly debated topics in the history of human evolution research. Researchers have produced a thick literature, both scholarly and public. I want to take issue with the two statements contained within this dominant paleoanthropological narrative: first, the suggestion that there is an identifiable point in time and place to call an origin; second, the related implication that there exists a definable entity called “modern humans.” These two statements are taken as premises and remained largely unquestioned until recently. New research and a new generation of researchers are challenging these presuppositions at the heart of the discipline, and evidence is mounting to suggest that modern humans do not have an origin. Instead, we may be looking at fuzzy boundaries and messy origins. These terms are not as clean, but they are more likely to get us closer to true story of human evolution.

MODERN HUMANS DO NOT HAVE AN ORIGIN

We think of modern humans as a species, Homo sapiens. In modern biology, species is the only level in taxonomy and classification to be biologically real; all other levels, genus and above, subspecies and below, are understood as abstract concepts, produced by and residing in the minds of scientists. Species is empirically defined, with a clear boundary of reproductive isolation. Members of the same species can reproduce fertile offspring; members of different species cannot. See donkeys, horses, and mules.

Since we are a species called Homo sapiens, we must have a point of origin, the moment of speciation. This is when our lineage started on its own evolutionary trajectory, separate from others—H. sapiens as a new species protected by reproductive barriers.

Or so we thought.

This understanding of species and species boundaries may apply to textbook examples, but not to all species, and certainly not to modern humans.

That modern humans were descendants of previous “archaic” populations living all over the Old World, Neanderthals being one of them, was a common paleoanthropological position until the 1990s. This decade saw a shift in the prevailing narrative, with geneticists lending support to the alternative view that modern humans arose as a new species as recently as 150,000 years ago in Africa. Time and time again, genetic research showed that Africans have the greatest genetic diversity, and the level of genetic diversity was directly linked with the depth of time. Africans, being the most diverse, were taken to be the oldest; and Africa, the place of origin of modern humans. Efforts were made to pinpoint the first modern humans somewhere on the continent. Strong candidates included Jebel Irhoud, Herto, and Omo, all sites in Africa (see Stringer 2016).

New research has been accumulating at lightning speed. Extracting usable ancient DNA from hominin fossils does not make headline news anymore, barely 20 years after the first successful research (Krings et al. 1997). Recent work on ancient DNA points toward a conclusion quite different from the first generation of ancient DNA research. A breakthrough publication in 2010 from Svante Pääbo and his research
team (Green et al. 2010) started a wave of new research showing an admixture of Neanderthals and modern humans. The field of paleoanthropology was quick to incorporate this “new” discovery (perhaps setting aside the substantial body of literature arguing the exact same point based on fossil data) using the concept of introgression. The discipline conceded that there was admixture between archaic populations such as Neanderthals and moderns, at a negligible and insignificant level.

In actual fact, genetics research confirms that the admixture between the archaic and the moderns was rather more significant, and the genes exchanged and introgressed were functional, not trivial. Neanderthals and Denisovans strengthened the immune system of the modern humans (Abi-Rached et al. 2011). Moderns interbred with Neanderthals, Denisovans, and yet another mystery population (McCoy et al. 2017); they all interbred with one another. Introgressed genes were important for surviving the tough and challenging environments that characterized the Pleistocene.

**A SPIRAL RATHER THAN A PENDULUM**

A cynic might observe the recent shift in thinking about modern humans and declare the pendulum swings yet once more, but what we are seeing now is something more akin to a spiralling than a pendulum’s stroke.

Modern humans arose at different times in different places, not as a separate species, but rather a continuation from the indigenous populations. Modern humans did not originate as a separate species and there was no single origin of a specific time and space; there were modern traits whose points of origin sprinkled throughout various times and spaces. There was no new species because of gene flow between populations across time and space. Asking where and when modern humans originat-ed at a global scale is not only a question without an answer—it can erase voices that need to be heard.

This idea, not a new argument, opens new ways of thinking and gives importance to new topics. Hybridization research is one such example. Given the near-sanctity of species boundaries, hybrid species has been considered a marginal theory: by definition, species do not hybridize. New research demands that we consider the possibility that hybrid species are more often found in nature than we previously thought (Ackermann et al. 2016)—and modern humans might just be one such example. Humans throughout history moved about the world. They had sex and babies. They exchanged ideas and culture. The admixture of archaic and modern traits is often observed in hominin fossils throughout the Pleistocene. Sometimes, they have been interpreted as “remnant” *Homo erectus*, implicitly driven to extinction by harsh climate or modern humans.
New research opens up the possibility that rather than being remnants, these were members of modern humans, interbreeding with various populations. In fact, instead of clarifying matters, the distinction between “modern” and “non-modern” could limit the argument and hamper our paleoanthropological progress.

**Fuzzy Boundaries, Messy Origins**

We have long known that speciation is a messy process. Genes in a species may have different histories than the species itself (Nichols 2001). Speciation is a gradual process of solidifying reproductive barriers. There will be exchange in genes between two populations that are on the trajectory of divergence and speciation, especially during the beginning stage of a speciation. This process is called incomplete lineage sorting.

What if this kind of gene exchange is not just a temporary process that only happens for populations undergoing speciation? What if gene exchange is itself a process that occurs throughout a history of a species? That is what the research seems to be pointing towards.

In the twentieth century, we were most interested in asking if Neanderthals were ancestors to modern humans. By the end of the twentieth century, the answer seemed obvious: modern humans arose as a separate species during the late Middle Pleistocene in Africa and dispersed all over the Old World. As they moved to new regions they encountered other hominin populations. The result of such encounters was replacement without interbreeding, because the two belong to two different species. At the turn of the twenty-first century, we were asking if the introgression from Neanderthals to modern humans was significant. Starting with the Neanderthal genome published in 2010, genetics research from the last decade draws conclusions that are in stark contrast to the previous generation. Research shows genetic interaction between archaic human populations; Neanderthals and modern humans did interbreed. In the twentieth century, fossil and archaeology data were messy and complicated, while genetic data were clean and consistent. Now it seems that genetics is complicated, too.

**A Brave New World**

We are now writing a new chapter in human evolution research and all data point toward diversity. The kind of big picture drawn with a broad brush was only possible with spotty data. Did Neanderthals go extinct? In some regions, surely; in other regions they did not. Instead, Neanderthals interbred with modern humans and left a genetic legacy. Asia was considered uninhabited after H. erectus left or went extinct. Denisovans and new discoveries show Asia was continuously populated with a new depth of antiquity (Zhu et al. 2018). The absence of data turned out not to be the data of absence.

Whether Neanderthals and modern humans are a same species or different may never be resolved.

New research reminds us to confront our own biases of racism and presentism. Much discussion about how to define modern humans implicitly includes modern Europeans and excludes Neanderthals. This definition, when applied to many extant humans, also excludes non-negligible proportions of indigenous populations. Furthermore, the diminutive hominins from Indonesia challenge us to expand what we accept as a normal range of variation for modern humans or to recognize another species of the genus Homo (see Aiello 2015).

Ancient humans lived in a different environment than us, with different trees and rivers, different landscapes, and different coastlines. There were no borders, only masses of land on which ancient humans moved. Some populations went extinct, taking their genetic signature with them. Some populations interacted with new incoming populations, exchanging genes and cultures.

The idea that a single population was the ancestor of all living humans is neat, but it is not compatible with the data. Gone are the days when a hypothesis could be tested with a few fossil specimens, a few genes, or a few stone tools. Gone are the days when a global model could be applied. In a recent article, Scerri and colleagues (2018) raise the point that modern humans did not originate from a single population in Africa, a point that has been made countless times before (for one early example, see Wolpoff et al. 1988).

Whether Neanderthals and modern humans are a same species or different may never be resolved. Neanderthal genes are found in modern humans because either they are same species (gene flow), or they are different species but genetically not yet separated completely (incomplete lineage sorting), or they are established different species that exchanges genes (introgression). Perhaps it is time to say goodbye to the idea of species as “the only entity with natural boundaries.” Perhaps it is time to be interested in new questions, questions that can be answered with new data. Perhaps, as Rosenberg and Wu (2018) suggest, it is time to move on from the imagery of trees with branches as a metaphor for human evolution and consider streams and rivers instead.

Sang-Hee Lee is a biological anthropologist specializing in human evolution. She was trained in Korea, the United States, and Japan, and is now a professor of anthropology at the University of California, Riverside. She has published numerous articles and her book about human evolution in Korean (인류의 기원) is now translated into several languages (English, Chinese, and Spanish).

Charlotte Hollands is an illustrator, artist, and ethnographer who is fascinated with the power of hand-drawn images to reveal and describe complex truths. She is developing new ways to use illustration within social science research and is currently working on her first graphic non-fiction book, written by Alisse Waterston.
BULLHEADED can be a compliment.

The Bull-Headed Lyre, Ur, ca. 2450 BCE
One of the earliest musical instruments in the world, and the only one like it on view in the United States. Featured among 1,200 outstanding objects and interactives that illuminate the human story.

NEW MIDDLE EAST GALLERIES

“One of the world’s most significant collections of ancient artifacts.”
— The Guardian

see ancient history in a modern light

The Penn Museum’s new Middle East Galleries are made possible with lead support from the Sela Foundation and the William B. Dietrich Foundation, and support from the National Endowment for the Humanities: Exploring the human endeavor, and the Coby Foundation.
FROM THE PRESIDENT

A Repository for the Common Good

Rates of academic and professional publishing continue to climb—each year some 1.3 million articles are published in scholarly titles. Yet despite that massive output, we know that the products of anthropological knowledge include more than what's captured in peer-reviewed journals.

To better preserve those other forms of knowledge production—and to make them more visible and available to others—we're developing a freely accessible repository for all kinds of anthropological knowledge, including article preprints (green open access), conference papers, technical monographs and gray literature reports, datasets, project metadata, or any other kind of information anthropologists of all kinds and from all areas deem appropriate. Yes, commercial platforms like Academia.edu and ResearchGate exist, but we can already see them shifting to "premium" features available only to those able to pay, and few who follow academic publishing will be surprised when one or both are acquired by the major commercial publishers. There is also precedent; AAA previously tried to develop such a repository in collaboration with the Social Science Research network (SSRN), until SSRN was acquired by Elsevier.

To ensure this is an anthropological resource advancing the discipline as a whole, we've invited peer organizations to join an advisory committee helping to guide and shape the repository's development and operation. Participating groups that have agreed to provide advisory input to date include the Royal Anthropological Institute, the American Association of Applied Linguistics, the American Association of Physical Anthropologists, the Society for American Archaeology, the Linguistic Society of America, and the Society for Applied Anthropology.

In July, I traveled to Brazil to brief the World Council of Anthropological Associations and the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (currently in the process of combining into a bicameral World Anthropological Union) on the initiative, and to invite them to appoint international representatives to the advisory committee.

Perhaps understandably there were questions: Why is AAA doing this? How do we as an association gain from the initiative? And, why is AAA developing a repository instead of transferring funds to other international entities so that they can create their own? There were concerns about the number of American entities included and whether international voices—especially those from the global south—will be adequately heard. There also were a range of concerns about how we will meet different national standards and expectations for data access, protection, and privacy. Meeting the disparate and often conflicting expectations of AAA members is daunting, fairly and forthrightly meeting those of dozens of other worldwide organizations much more so.

But that international perspective is critical; as anthropologists we appreciate better than anyone the importance of diverse viewpoints and perspectives, informed by the concerns and experiences of anthropologists living and working in different contexts across the globe. It's also critical because of the growing number and complexity of international guidelines regarding data privacy and access, and the ethical implications of making certain kinds of data accessible in these troubled times.

These concerns already impact each of us. As just one example, earlier this year AAA reviewed and revised all aspects of our internal processes and external partners to ensure compliance with the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation, which took effect in late May. Those changes—necessary because we serve members on both sides of the Atlantic—allow members greater control over their digital footprint, but also create new obligations and requirements we as an association must meet on an ongoing basis.

The repository poses technical, practical, and ethical challenges. Some are already apparent; others will become clearer and more pressing along the way. Meeting those challenges, and the responsibilities the repository will pose, is no small matter. Most of us have seen how digital platforms can be manipulated to spread misinformation, skew opinion, or spew hate. How do we limit intentional misuse, much less unintentional apophenia and pareidolia, without serving as intellectual gatekeepers or censors?

Those challenges are enough to give anyone pause, but in many ways they simply mirror the challenges we already face as a discipline. We'll meet them with your help and with the help of global partners. However, doing so will require all of us to work together toward common goals for the common good, with uncommon commitment and creativity.

The repository is intended to meet your needs and those of our colleagues around the world. Its success will depend in large part on you and how you use it to share anthropological insights, advance anthropological scholarship, and increase the discipline's global impact and reach.

I hope you’ll join us in making the promise of the repository a reality.
Dolores Huerta, co-founder of the United Farm Workers of America and president/founder of the Dolores Huerta Foundation, will present the opening keynote at the 2018 AAA Annual Meeting.

Huerta is a labor leader and community organizer who has worked for civil rights and social justice for over 50 years. In 1962, she and Cesar Chavez founded the United Farm Workers union where she served as vice president and played a critical role in many of the union’s accomplishments for four decades.

Huerta has received numerous awards including the Eleanor Roosevelt Human Rights Award from President Clinton in 1998 and the Presidential Medal of Freedom from President Obama in 2012. In 2002, she received the Puffin/Nation $100,000 prize for Creative Citizenship which she used to establish the Dolores Huerta Foundation (DHF). DHF is connecting groundbreaking community-based organizers and organizations to state and national movements so that they can register and educate voters, advocate for education reform, bring about infrastructure improvements in low-income communities, advocate for greater equality for the LGBT community, and create strong leadership development.

Join us at the Opening Ceremony on Wednesday, November 14, 2018 from 6:15 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. in Grand Ballroom A at the San José Convention Center. Reception to follow.

Emily Martin, feminist anthropologist and anthropologist of science and gender, will present the Distinguished Lecture at the 2018 AAA Annual Meeting.

Martin has combined feminist analysis with ethnographic investigation to explore technoscience, reproduction, the immune system, and psychology. She is the author of six books and more than 100 articles including The Woman in the Body: A Cultural Analysis of Reproduction (1987) and Bipolar Expeditions: Mania and Depression in American Culture (2007), which were honored with the Eileen Basker Memorial Prize and the Diana Forsythe Prize, respectively. She is the founding editor of the general interest publication Anthropology Now and her work has been translated into 12 languages.

In addition to serving on the Board of Directors of the Social Science Research Council and as president of the American Ethnological Society, Martin has taught anthropology at the University of California, Irvine, Yale University, Johns Hopkins University, Princeton University, and New York University. Her research has been supported by Fulbright awards, a Guggenheim fellowship, an American Council of Learned Societies Fellowship, and grants from the National Science Foundation, the Social Science Research Council, the Wenner-Gren Foundation, and the Spencer Foundation. In 2015, she received the Society for the Anthropology of North America Prize for Distinguished Achievement in the Critical Study of North America.

Join us for the AAA Distinguished Lecture on Saturday, November 17, 2018 from 6:15 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. in Grand Ballroom A at the San José Convention Center.
Podcasting the Smithsonian Folklife Festival

By Adam Gamwell and Leslie Walker

The day was hot. The lively sounds of the Smithsonian Folklife Festival surrounded us—speakers presenting on stage, a parade of Catalan giant puppets, passersby chatting about what to eat for lunch, and music from an Armenian avant-garde jazz band off in the distance.

The Folklife Festival takes place entirely outdoors, sprawling across the National Mall between the Washington Monument and Capitol Hill. There are no walls, no quiet rooms in which to hit record and conduct interviews. Instead, Adam carried a mini studio kit in his backpack, one part ethnographic fieldwork recording equipment (hand recorder, windscreen, and notebook), one part studio podcast equipment (quality microphones, XLR cables, and large headphones for monitoring).

We sought a quiet-enough place to record. Leslie found a small round table sitting behind one of the event tents and procured four folding chairs. We pulled out the recorder, plugged in the mics, and tested the sound. Our interviews would have some background ambience—an element of “being there” that we felt would be appropriate for the podcasts.

Our first guest, Armenian artist and calligrapher Ruben Mayalan, greeted us with a loaf of freshly baked Lavash bread in his hands. “This is the traditional bread of Armenia and it is meant to be shared,” he told us. We ate together while preparing for the conversation.

When he was 21, Ruben and his family left Armenia for Israel so his father could receive medical treatment. As an immigrant and artist, Ruben was struck by the way modern architecture and classical art in Tel Aviv coexisted in the same space, and this came to influence his style of mixing traditional Armenian calligraphy and bold block script. “Art is a mirror for society...you can tell the history of a culture by looking at its art,” Ruben told us, before explaining how his own work reflects his views of Armenia’s recent turn to democracy.

We knew we were in for a powerful 10 days.

This summer marks the third year the American Anthropological Association (AAA) has collaborated with the Smithsonian Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage to incorporate our public education initiative, World on the Move, into programming at the Folklife Festival. This year the AAA, the Festival’s migration program On the Move, and the podcast team behind This Anthro Life came together to interview participants and curators to create audio narratives on migration, diaspora, displacement, and creativity on the move that will take listeners behind the scenes at the Festival. The theme of the 2018 Folklife Festival was Heritage Enterprise.

For 10 days, presenters, curators, and members of the public engaged in cultural exchange by participating in a variety of workshops, listening to music, creating crafts, and eating traditional foods that celebrate this year’s featured nations, regions, and themes—Catalonia, Armenia, and Crafts of African Fashion.

To create narratives linking the diverse peoples, perspectives, and activities across the Festival, we set about conducting a series of micro ethnographies. We combined observations of sessions, workshops, and craft demonstrations with interviews with Festival participants and curators. We also looked at documents and research notes.
from Smithsonian staff who curated programs for the Festival. We were specifically interested in speakers who presented on topics of migration and heritage industries, and practitioners who are skilled at narrating and demonstrating their craft. We spoke with Soumana Saley, who shared stories of learning to become a master leather craftsman and how the tradition is grounded in the knowledge and skills of his local communities. Saley and other West African artisans at the Festival use these traditional practices in the African fashion industry. The cultural enterprise of handmade fashion plays an important role in sustaining their communities as they travel abroad to sell their merchandise, but it also provides buyers an opportunity to appreciate the labor and skill involved in creating the items. Adam moderated one of the On the Move narrative sessions in which master Armenian embroiderers shared their stories and experiences of displacement and migration across Armenia and Syria. Embroidery became a way of connecting with their grandmothers who fled to Syria during the Armenian genocide in the early twentieth century and also with their sense of home when they had to migrate back to Armenia in recent years.

In the spirit of This Anthro Life’s conversational podcasts, we used an open format interview style, which focused on themes such as art or music with few set questions. This allowed participants to define in their own words the relationships between their artisanship, musical ability, or experiences and the ways in which migration and movement shape their lives. Conversations with curators and other researchers supplemented the interviews with Festival participants, and helped us to identify the research involved in selecting participants and the presentation of cultural heritage for the Festival. This approach allows us to foreground a central or thematic conversation and to narrate events and activities at the Festival that listeners can paint in their minds as if they had been there to experience it.

The podcast series is currently in post-production; we are sorting through more than nine hours of audio material to produce a series of 15-minute episodes that cut across themes such as art as resistance, music and human connection, and defending immigration. We aim to release the series in the early fall, so listen up for announcements from the AAA, the Smithsonian, and This Anthro Life! We hope that listeners come away from the series understanding the resilience of immigrants as they adapt to and thrive in new environments—despite violent conflicts, environmental changes, and displacement—by drawing on their heritage and community support. The Folklife Festival showcases how support and cross-cultural understanding come in many forms—and they are needed now more than ever. 

Adam Gamwell is the co-host and executive producer of the This Anthro Life (TAL). TAL’s mission is to demonstrate the value of anthropological methods, thinking, and storytelling, and to generate dialogue, promote social consciousness, and foster wonder at our diverse worlds. Check out thisanthrolife.com for more information.

Leslie Walker is the project manager of the Public Education Initiative at the AAA. He served as a special guest host, collecting stories during the Folklife Festival for the forthcoming podcast series with This Anthro Life.

New AAA Staff

Palmyra Jackson first joined the AAA in July 2017 as a summer intern after completing her BA in both cultural anthropology and humanities for teaching at Seattle University. She is now the research assistant in the Professional Development, Education, and Research Department where she compiles and analyzes data for Anthropology Information Central, the AAA’s institutional research clearinghouse. Her primary areas of focus are employment trends for professional anthropologists, the availability of anthropology curricula at the pre-collegiate level, and the history of anthropology curriculum development projects. She particularly enjoys digging into the details of how curricula evolve and anthropology’s influence on present-day pedagogy.

When she’s not in the AAA office, Palmyra can be found cycling, playing board games, and petting neighborhood cats.

Nate Wambold joined the AAA staff in June 2018 as the director of meetings and conferences. He brings the AAA a wealth of experience gained over 10 years in managing meetings in the association world and the hotel industry. Nate has a BA in psychology from American University. Most recently, he was the director of meetings and events at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, where he built a team of professional staff and breathed new life into the Society’s annual meeting with 4,000 attendees. At the AAA, Nate is looking forward to pairing his professional skills with his experience working with scholars to enhance operations and bring innovative formats to the Association’s Annual Meeting and conferences.

Nate holds a Certified Meeting Professional designation and has been selected for the American Society of Association Executives’ NextGen Class of 2018, where he will be a leading voice for young professionals in event, meeting, and convention management.

When Nate isn’t working, he’s at the gym, traveling to visit friends and family, and spending as much time as he can outdoors on trails in the woods.
Procedure for Consideration of Resolutions and Motions at the Annual Business Meeting

The next Annual Business Meeting of the AAA will be held on Friday, November 16, 2018, in the San José Convention Center, Grand Ballroom A.

The meeting will begin Friday evening, at 6:15 p.m. and end at 7:30 p.m. The AAA bylaws require that a quorum of 250 members who are in good standing be present to transact official business at the Meeting.

The Business Meeting provides an opportunity for AAA members to present resolutions or make motions for consideration and potential adoption by the Association. Resolutions are written statements of position or action, typically dealing with matters of substance and/or complexity. Resolutions should follow the format as described in Roberts Rules of Order, Newly Revised.

AAA by-laws require that resolutions must be received 30 days in advance of the meeting to be placed on the Annual Business Meeting Agenda for consideration by the membership. Resolutions must arrive in the AAA offices, addressed to the AAA Secretary Susana Narotzky, no later than 5:00 p.m. (ET) October 15, 2018.

Resolutions that are properly submitted in advance of the Business Meeting will be placed on the agenda for consideration. If adopted by the Business Meeting, resolutions are automatically placed on the next electronic ballot for a vote by the AAA membership.

If there is no quorum at the Annual Business Meeting, members present may suspend the rules by a two thirds majority vote. If the rules are suspended, members present may convene as an informal gathering. Motions that are adopted are considered a recommendation to the Executive Board.

Resolutions submitted for consideration at the Annual Business Meeting should be accompanied by the following:

1. name, mailing address, phone number, and email address of each person submitting the resolution
2. necessary background information or description of the action being proposed
3. an estimate of the cost to the Association were the resolution to be enacted

Resolutions should be addressed to AAA Secretary Susana Narotzky. Please mark submissions “Attention Kim Baker, Organizational Governance Manager” and send them via mail to the American Anthropological Association, 2300 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1301, Arlington VA, 22201-3357; or by email to kbaker@americananthro.org.

Questions should be directed to Kim Baker, 703/528-1902, ext. 1170.

GUIDELINES FOR CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED PUBLIC STATEMENTS, TO INCLUDE MOTIONS FROM THE ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING

Adopted by AAA Executive Board, May 2004

1. The Board should be strategic in selecting matters on which to speak out (i.e., don’t waste your powder on matters on which the organization has little hope of making an impact).

2. Public statements should address matters of clear common professional interest and concern to the Association’s membership or public statements should be issued only on matters about which the Association’s members have special knowledge and or expertise.

3. The statement itself should include language that demonstrates such special knowledge. Thus, to the extent possible, the statement should present anthropological findings, conclusions or recommendations on the matter being addressed.

4. Public statements should make a contribution to better public understanding of the matter being addressed.

5. Public statements should specify their intended audience.

6. If the statement seeks action, it should specify upon whom such action is urged and detail the action being sought.
Executive Board Actions
May–July 2018

- Received the Annual Reports from the Resource Development Committee, Members Programmatic Advisory and Advocacy Committee, and Annual Meeting Program Committee.
- Received the Annual Reports of Sections, Interest Groups, and Journals.
- Received a report from the Section Assembly Convener.
- Reauthorized the AAA Nominations Committee and Association Operations Committee.
- Agreed to allow the Society for the Anthropology of Consciousness members to vote on a proposed name change.
- Reauthorized the Digital Anthropologies Interest Group, Music and Sound Interest Group, Polynesian Interest Group, and the Post-Communist Cultural Studies Interest Group for another 3-year term.
- Approved support for the Intern Endowment Fund with funds from the AAA reserves, which will be matched by Section funds over a 3-year period.
- Received the FY2017 Auditors Report and the Federal 990 tax form.
- Appointed Doug Henry as the new AAA Treasurer for a 4-year term.
- Approved clarifications to the guidelines, for Sections, about the creation and management of endowments and quasi-endowments.
- Approved the Society for Anthropology in Community Colleges’ creation of the Leonard Lieberman Memorial Teaching and Learning award, to be supported by a quasi-endowment.
- Accepted the recommendations from the Membership Dues working group report to advance discussion about changes in membership dues with the understanding discussion will require input from impacted parties, especially Sections. These recommendations are the foundation for ongoing planning and not proposed changes.
- Selected the 2018 AAA Award recipients for the Franz Boas Award for Exemplary Service to Anthropology, AAA/Oxford University Press Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching in Anthropology, the Anthropology in Media Award, and the Robert B. Textor and Family Prize for Excellence in Anticipatory Anthropology. Also jointly selected the Recipient of the AAA/SfAA Margaret Mead Award.
- Awarded the Minority Dissertation Fellowship to Saira Mehmood.
- Agreed to establish a fellows program for public education, it would be analogous to the Leadership Fellows program.
- Agreed to have the AAA Awards Committee chair review applications for proposed Section Awards and take appropriate action. Agreed to support and work with the Section Assembly to create new awards.
- Adopted the AAA Policy on Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault.
- Received a Report from the Executive Board Working Group on Border Walls.
- Approved the Charge for the AAA Anthropology and the Proliferation of Border and Security Walls Task Force.
- Approved a price increase for AnthoSource institutional subscribers.
- Approved a proposal from the National Association for Student Anthropologists for a peer-reviewed student journal.
- Approved a revision to the publishing permissions process, to understand who is using the materials and how they are being used.
- Agreed to partner with Atypon and begin development of an anthropology-specific repository.
- Agreed to annually review the state of the Association’s responses to requests of accessibility of the Annual Meeting.
- Approved a set of budget priorities for FY2019.
Language on the Move

AN OPEN MIC OPENS UP PUBLIC CONVERSATIONS ABOUT MIGRATION, MULTILINGUALISM, AND TRANSNATIONALISM.

By Amelia Tseng

We live our lives through language, and it’s often assumed to be a direct index of who we are. But identity is more complicated than that. As we move and adapt to new contexts, which languages we speak, and with whom, changes. For one thing, there’s usually immense pressure ( overtly or covertly enacted through official language policy and institutions such as schools) to “shift” to the majority language at the expense of home languages. This erases historical multilingualism and diversity in the United States, such as indigenous cultures, Spanish as the first European language in the Southwest, hundreds of immigrant languages, and the development of regional and ethnic American English dialects. A renewed historical perspective illustrates the tension between lived cultural diversity and the recurrent myth of the United States as an “English-only” country. Immigrants can internalize language discrimination and/or maintain a strong sense of pride, sometimes simultaneously. And, of course, their children and grandchildren develop unique identities combining old and new cultural practices in which new languages, as well as maintaining or regaining heritage languages, are important. A recent proliferation of language, story, and community memory initiatives is increasingly bringing this rich diversity to light in the public domain.

As language and identity are discussed in different channels—in the news, on social media, in traditional and contemporary arts—it’s important that we honor this conversation and recognize that it draws from daily life experiences common to our shared humanity.

Last year’s On the Move programming at the Smithsonian Folklife Festival incorporated new activities to foreground language as a dynamic part of (im)migration, identity, and intangible cultural heritage. I organized three open mic sessions that invited passersby to reflect on language in their own lives and family histories through art and conversation, opening up spaces for audience-driven conversation about what languages and their loss mean to people. The activities amplified ordinary voices, honored language and migration experiences, and provided opportunities for participation by young scholars from area universities.

Open mic participants spoke an impressive range of at least 35 languages and 5 dialects of American English. Conversation revealed language’s important role in family and heritage, and in cultural adaptation and maintenance. One family originally from Iran, shared the importance of language for opening doors and for family and cultural connections. The mother said,

I was raised in Iran so I speak Farsi, but I also speak English because I was raised bilingual, and I also speak French because Iran was very Francophile, and then now I’m studying Spanish once a week, because I find it to be a beautiful and useful language… [Being bilingual] opened a lot of doors, people are more hospitable when you visit their country and attempt their language.

From her daughter’s perspective, her family’s heritage language is important for maintaining family and cultural connections.

I speak Farsi and I’m learning French right now. Well, I like to talk to my grandparents, everyone in my family speaks Farsi when you go and visit them, they’re like, “I’m so happy you speak Farsi.” …They tell me all these stories in Farsi and I kind of know what their life is like in Iran.

Another visitor discussed the pressures of multilingual and multicultural expectations, noting that she shifts between Mexican and Salvadoran Spanish depending on whom she’s speaking to (which she symbolized through contrasting dialectal words for “dog”) and that she also feels pressure to be “American.”

Interns interviewed On the Move artists and performers about language in their lives and work. A Haitian dance ensemble spoke of language’s importance in cultural continuity and the ways in which they navigate language expectations. The troupe leader commented, “When I teach dance, I teach it with the language for them to understand what the dance is, how it’s done, and how it’s taught, or how did you perform it. So if I say something like nago or ibo, [dance names] they need to know how to perform it so that they can perform it correctly.” A dancer, when asked if she would like her future children to speak Kreyol, made it clear that language is an important part of cultural connection and maintenance, noting that some things are lost in translation.

Some expressions, you can only say in Kreyol and you can’t say in English, they wouldn’t understand it. Let’s say you’re kinda irritated and you’re just like, you say “mes amis,” like that. In English you can’t say that. Like, there’s no word for that. It’s just saying that I’m irritated. Yeah, all my Haitians, they understand it.

Members also discussed navigating language expectations and negative attitudes towards complex multilingual behavior. One dancer explained,
It’s very interesting because growing up, even when you’re small and a baby and your first language is the first one that your parents speak to you, ours was basically English, Kreyol and French all at the same time. So growing up, in schools your teacher would tell you, that is the incorrect saying of how you say that. … You would almost speak like you’re speaking Kreyol, French, and English all in one sentence. So you might say something in English but you might finish out the sentence in Kreyol.

The complexity of language, culture, identity, and attitudes extends to dialects. Michelle Banks, native Washingtonian, long-time educator, and foundational member of the Latinegro youth theater group, commented, “Language is a huge identifying trait. … a very, very, very important cultural marker. And regionalisms and dialects are also very important cultural markers as well.” She noted that the DC accent is a marker of local identity rooted in the African American community but now spoken by many Washingtonians, including immigrants (Tseng 2015). Christylez Bacon, a DC artist, said, “I tell people my first language is DC, my second language is English, you know, the vernacular’s very important, sometimes with vernacular, it could be like someone else knows that we have we have a similar life experience.” He drew a direct parallel between dialect diversity and language diversity to describe DC English.

When I think about English and how my folks being from the South speak English and how we speak English as DC people from the hoods, it’s like looking at Portugal Portuguese and Brazilian Portuguese. It’s like okay, this is the European one and then Brazilian Portuguese is where all the African influence comes in and then the reflexive verb changes to being in the front instead of in the back, and it just reminds me of that all the time in DC, you know certain words or the way in which we use these words, so they’re like English words but we just totally flipped them, this means something totally different.

The artists also emphasized multilingualism’s role in broader connection and communication. A young member of the Haitian dance troupe commented, Knowing more makes you more intelligent and aware and you have different cultures. You have a variety of things, like I can have a variety of dinners than most people would do if they don’t have a different culture and stuff like that.

Michelle Banks critiqued the monolingual or “English-only” orientation in the United States, raising the provocative question of fear in national identity.
I think that’s very important [that parents pass on their language and heritage to their children]. And the number of people that I talk to who say things like, I wish my mother or I wish my father had shared the language with me, and they didn’t, and I don’t [speak it]. I think it was during the 2008 election, a woman called in, or a woman had a question at one of the town halls. And she was, like, raging about, “And they come and they speak these other languages and da da da,” and he [the respondent] says, “Well, what are you afraid of?” And I was like yeah! What are you afraid of? And I think that as simple as that is, that was one of the most profound things, one of the most important things I’d heard in a long time. What are you afraid of?

The open mics and interviews opened up new spaces for conversation and reflection on language and heritage that otherwise might be lost in the day to day. Participants appreciated the opportunity for reflection.

It is nice talking about these things, because we don’t have a lot of opportunities to do this. And like maybe that’s part of it … where people get so uptight about language, maybe if they would spend more time having these discussions, maybe there would be some understanding.

The language activities were an etic and emic experience for student interns as they reflected on their own lives: “My mother was born in Hungary, and Hungarian is her first language. As a refugee, she eventually journeyed to America before learning to read or write Hungarian well, which ultimately affected her relationships with family members over time.” For some, the interview process contributed to their interest in language revitalization and heritage languages. For others, the experience of interviewing and relating to strangers from a range of backgrounds was an exhilarating experience.

The Festival language activities invited public participants to lead discussions of language in human migration from a personal and historical perspective, and to interrogate its impact on communities and individuals. Together, they raised public engagement and awareness around these issues—key aims of the Smithsonian Institution and World on the Move initiative. Conversations revealed a strong sense that language, culture, and identity are related to heritage but are also a creative embodiment of complex, dynamic social identities. The United States is not monolingual; it is a place of multiple, mobile, transnational linguistic connections. Languages, like people, are on the move. And, whether traditional or newly learned, they open doors to connection and understanding. Public intellectual projects can be a powerful tool in advancing the issues of our times and our understanding of our shared humanity.

Amelia Tseng is assistant professor in world languages and cultures at American University and research associate at the Smithsonian Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage. Her research addresses language and identity in multilingual immigrant communities, focusing on the Latinx diaspora and Washington, DC. In addition to her published work, she has been featured on National Public Radio and WUSA 9.

We’ve teamed up the AAA’s public education initiative, World on the Move: 100,000 Years of Human Migration™ to run an ongoing series of articles on migration and displacement. You can find them all on the Anthropology News website.
2018 Leadership Fellows

JENA BARCHAS-LICHTENSTEIN
Researcher
New Knowledge Organization, Ltd.
I lead media research at an interdisciplinary New York City-based think tank. I consider myself primarily a linguistic anthropologist, with a focus on various kinds of large-scale communication and theories of community and identity. I’m particularly interested in the role of mass media in inequality.

There is relatively little overlap between the communities of practicing anthropologists and linguistic anthropologists, at least at the AAA. As a Leadership Fellow, I hope to create more connections between these groups, advocate for the needs of practicing anthropologists, and support more mentorship opportunities for linguistic anthropologists. I did not have access to a lot of resources when I was looking at careers outside the academy, and I’d like to help change that.

My ongoing professional service has been in outreach and mentorship, both mostly informal. I’m excited to take on this kind of service in a more structured way and become more involved with the AAA.

CARLA PEZZIA
Assistant Professor
Human Sciences Center, University of Dallas
I am a medical anthropologist with particular interests in mental health care among medically underserved populations, both in the United States and Latin America.

I have previously served in leadership roles for the Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA) and the National Association for the Practice of Anthropology, which sparked my interest in serving in other capacities for both the SfAA and AAA.

As a Fellow, I would like to figure out where I may be of most service to AAA and its members. I would like to actively engage with leadership to address issues experienced by traditionally underrepresented groups in the profession and in the AAA membership.

I would also like to take the opportunity to learn more about the “business” of the Association to better understand my purpose in being a member as well as to better promote the Association and discipline to my students.

MATTHEW REILLY
Assistant Professor of Anthropology, Gender Studies, and International Studies
City College of New York
I am an anthropological archaeologist interested in race, class, colonialism, and capitalism in the Atlantic World. My two current research projects are based on the Caribbean island of Barbados and the West African nation of Liberia. My research interests also include the role that whiteness and white supremacy have played, and continue to play, in shaping archaeology.

Being a new faculty member at the City College of New York pushed me to apply for the program. The experience of coming to a public university with passionate and dedicated students and faculty and with limited resources, motivated me to seek opportunities to more effectively engage with a wider student base in underserved communities.

I am thrilled to be part of the Leadership Fellows Program. The past plays a crucial role in understanding our present and shaping our future, and it is my intention to work with the AAA to facilitate more substantive dialogue between archaeologists and cultural anthropologists with the shared goal of striving for social justice. I will work hard to encourage student involvement and participation in the AAA and strive to build an inclusive, public-facing association that affects change at all levels of society.

Call for Nominations for AAA Leadership Positions

The AAA Nominations Committee is seeking nominations for the following positions in the 2019 elections:

AAA President-Elect/Vice President (2-year term)
AAA Executive Board (3-year terms)
- Practicing/Professional Seat
- Minority Seat
Nominations Committee (3-year terms)
- Cultural Seat
- Archaeology Seat
- Undesignated Seat #2
Members’ Programmatic Advisory and Advocacy Committee (3-year terms)
- Practicing/Professional Seat
- Human Rights Seat
- Public Policy Seat

The deadline for the close of nominations is October 3. For more information visit the AAA website: http://americananthro.org
AAA 2018 Election Results

AAA Executive Board
AAA Secretary (3-year term)
Elizabeth K. Briody
AAA Executive Board
Cultural (3-year term)
Corinne A. Kratz
AAA Executive Board
Student Seat (3-year term)
Judith Williams
AAA Executive Board
Undesignated Seat #1 (3-year term)
Sarah Strauss
AAA Executive Board
Undesignated Seat #2 (3-year term)
Carla Guerrón Montero
Executive Board/Section
Assembly Executive Committee
Large Section Seat (3-year term)
Petrá Kupping
AAA Nominations Committee
Nominations Committee
Minority Seat (3-year term)
Ashanté Reese
Nominations Committee
Practicing Professional
Seat (3-year term)
Kevin Newton
AAA Members’ Programmatic Advisory and Advocacy Committee
Labor Seat (3-year term)
Jessica Mason
Gender Equity Seat (3-year term)
Stevie Merino
Student Seat #2 (3-year term)
Krista Billingsley

SECTIONS
American Ethnological Society Election
Councilor Seat #5 (4-year term)
Gina Athena Ulysse

Anthropology & Environment Section Election
Councilor Seat #3 (2-year term)
Dana E. Powell
Councilor Seat #4 (2-year term)
Andrew Flachs

Archaeology Division Election
Secretary (2-year term)
Sandra L. López Varela
At-Large Seat #1 (2-year term)
Sarah Rowe
Student Seat (2-year term)
Laura W. Ng
Nominations Chair (1-year term as Chair-Elect, followed by 2-year term as Chair)
Whitney Battle-Baptiste

Association for Africanist Anthropology Election
President-Elect (1-year term, followed by 2-year term as President)
Yolanda Covington-Ward
Secretary (2-year term)
Joeva Rock
Treasurer (2-year term)
Anne S. Lewinson
Program Editor #2 (2-year term)
David Turkon

Association for Feminist Anthropology Election
At-Large Seats #1 & #2 (3-year term)
Omotayo Jolaosho
Michelle Ramirez
Treasurer (3-year term)
Jennie E. Burnet
Student Seat (3-year term)
Brenda McCaffrey

Association for the Anthropology of Policy Election
Co-Presidents-Elect (2-year terms, followed by 2-year terms as Co-Presidents)
William O. Beeman
Christina Garsten
At-Large Seat #1 (3-year term)
Jennifer Hubbert

Association for Political and Legal Anthropology Election
At-Large Seats #3, #4, #5 & #6 (3-year terms)
Rebekah Park
Georgina Ramsay
Livia K. Stone
Mark Schuller

Association for Queer Anthropologists Election
Co-Chair (2-year term)
Joseph Jay Sosa
Secretary (2-year term)
Jenny L. Davis
Communication Director (2-year term)
Nesette Falu

Association of Black Anthropologists Election
Secretary/Treasurer (2-year term)
Kalfani Ture

Association of Latina and Latino Anthropologists Election
President (2-year term)
María L. Cruz-Torres
President-Elect (2-year term, followed by 2-year term as President)
Jonathan Rosa
Treasurer (3-year term)
Lillian Milánés
At-Large Seat #1 (3-year term)
Carlos Andrés Arias

Association of Senior Anthropologists Election
President-Elect (2-year term, followed by 2-year term as President)
Tim Wallace
Treasurer (2-year term)
Margo Smith
Secretary (2-year term)
Susan M. Kenyon

Biological Anthropology Section Election
President-Elect (2-year term, followed by 2-year term as President)
Holly Dunsworth
At-Large Seat #1 (2-year term)
Kerry M. Dore
Student Seat (2-year term)
Amanda J. Hardie

Central States Anthropological Society Election
President-Elect/Vice President
2nd Position (1-year term as 2nd Vice President, 1-year term as 1st Vice President, 1-year term as President, 1-year term as Past President)
Heather O’Leary
Secretary-Treasurer (3-year term)
Nobuko Adachi
At-Large Seat #1 (3-year term)
Adam Kaul
At-Large Seat #2 (3-year term)
Kathleen M. Adams

Council for Museum Anthropology Election
President-Elect (2-year term, followed by 2-year term as President)
Cara Krmopotich
Treasurer (2-year term)
Jennifer Kramer
Secretary (2-year term)
Diana Marsh
At-Large Seats #1, #2 & #3 (3-year terms)
Christy DeLair
David Odo
Emily Stokes-Rees

Council on Anthropology and Education Election
President-Elect (1-year term followed by a 2-year term as President)
Soﬁa Villenas
At-Large Seat #3 (3-year term)
Melisa (Misha) Cahnmann-Taylor
Culture and Agriculture Election
Student Seat (2-year term)
Bradley Jones

General Anthropology Division Election
President-Elect (2-year term, followed by a 2-year term as President)
Jennifer Cool
Secretary-Treasurer (4-year term)
Shannon Sparks
Communications Officer (2-year term)
Katie Nelson
At-Large Seats #1 & #3 (3-year term)
Ira Bashkow
Ian Lowrie

Middle East Section Election
At-Large Seat #1 (3-year term)
Kim Shively
At-Large Member Seat #2 (Archaeology) (3-year term)
Ian Straughn

National Association for the Practice of Anthropology Election
President-Elect (2-year term, followed by 2-year term as President)
Cathleen Crain
At-Large Seat #3 (2-year term)
Sarah El-Hattab
Adopted revised Guidelines as proposed.

National Association of Student Anthropologists Election
President-Elect (1-year term, followed by a 1-year term as President)
Peter Lee
Anthropology News Contributing Editor (2-year term)
Stephanie Mojica
E-Journal Editor (2-year term)
Bridget Gilchrist Kelly

Graduate At-Large Seat (2-year term)
JessicaMichelle Posega
Undergraduate At-Large Seat (2-year term)
Ruth Flynn
Nomination Committee Chair (2-year term)
Peter Lee
Listserv Editor (2-year term)
Maura Stephens

Society for Anthropology in Community Colleges Election
President-Elect (1-year term followed by a 1-year term as President)
Evin Rodkey
Vice President Membership & Development (3-year term)
Beth Shook
Secretary (3-year term)
Isabel Scarborough

Society for East Asian Anthropology Election
Secretary (3-year term)
Satsuki Kawano
Councilor #1 (3-year term)
Andrew B. Kipnis
Councilor #2 (3-year term)
Nicholas Harkness

Society for Economic Anthropology Election
Student Seat (2-year term)
Emma McDonell

Society for Humanistic Anthropology Election
President-Elect (2-year term, followed by 2-year term as President and 2-year term as Past President)
Lauren Miller Griffith
At-Large Seats #1, #3 & #7 (3-year terms)
Brynn Champney
Joseph Michael Valente
Ather Zia

Society for Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology Election
Secretary (3-year term)
Luisa J. Rollins Castillo
Councilor #1 (Nominations) (3-year term)
Rachel A. Horowitz
Councilor #2 (Meetings) (3-year term)
Iván Sandoval-Cervantes

Society for Linguistic Anthropology Election
Secretary-Treasurer (2-year term)
Constantine V. Nakassis
At-Large Seat #2 (3-year term)
Courtney Handman
Adopted proposed Revision to SLA Bylaws: officers and terms.

Society for Medical Anthropology Election
President-Elect (2-year term, followed by a 2-year term as President)
Charles L. Briggs
Treasurer (3-year term)
Jessica Mulligan
At-Large Seat #1 (3-year term)
Matthew Wolf-Meyer
At-Large Seat #2 (3-year term)
Alice Street
At-Large Seat #3 (3-year term)
Erica Prussing
Adopted proposed Amendment to SMA Bylaws: award name change.

Society for Psychological Anthropology Election
At-Large Seat #3 (4-year term)
Jason DeCaro
At-Large Seat #4 (4-year term)
Neely Laurenzo Myers

Society for the Anthropology of Consciousness Election
President (3-year term)
Bryan R. Rill

At-Large Seats #1 & #2 (2-year term)
Daniel E. Moerman
Stephan A. Schwartz

Society for the Anthropology of Europe Election
President-Elect (2-year term, followed by 2-year term as President)
Gerald W. Creed
Treasurer (2-year term)
Maya Nadkarni
Secretary-Elect (1-year term followed by a 1-year term as Secretary)
Sarah Wagner
Program Chair-Elect (1-year term followed by a 1-year term as Program Chair)
Dace Dzenovska
Membership and Public Relations Seat (2-year term)
Vasiliki Neofotistos
At-Large Seat #2 (2-year term)
Dimitra Kofti
Student Seat (2-year term)
Dana N. Johnson

Society for the Anthropology of Food and Nutrition Election
President-Elect (1-year term followed by a 2-year term as President)
Joan Gross
Student Seat (2-year term)
Kelly Alexander

Society for the Anthropology of North America Election
President-Elect (2-year term, followed by 2-year term as President)
Alaka Wali
At-Large Seat #1 (3-year term)
Setha Low
**Society for the Anthropology of Religion**

**Election**

- **President-Elect** (1-year term, followed by 2-year term as President)
  - Courtney Handman
- **Secretary** (2-year term)
  - Timothy R. Landry
- **Student Seat** (2-year term)
  - Saliha Chattoo
- **At-Large Seats #5, #6 & #7** (2-year terms)
  - Jon Bialecki
  - Mara Leichtman
  - Elaine A. Peña

---

**Society for the Anthropology of Work**

**Election**

- **President-Elect** (1-year term, followed by 3-year term as President)
  - Sarah Besky
- **At-Large Seat #3** (3-year term)
  - Lauren Hayes

---

**Society for Urban, National, Transnational/Global Anthropology**

**Election**

- **President-Elect/Vice President** (2-year term as President)
  - Akhil Gupta (2017–19)
  - akgupta@anthro.ucla.edu
- **Secretary**
  - Susana Narotzky (2015–18)
  - narotzky@jamillan.com
- **Archaeology Seat**
  - Mark Hauser (2017–20)
  - mark-hauser@northwestern.edu
- **Biological Seat**
  - Kathryn Clancy (2017–20)
  - kclancy@post.harvard.edu
- **Cultural Seat**
  - Christina Garsten (2015–18)
  - christina.garsten@socant.su.se
- **Linguistic Seat**
  - Jocelyn Ahlers (2017–20)
  - jahlers@csusm.edu
- **Minority Seat**
  - Anna Agbe-Davies (2016–19)
  - agbe-davies@unc.edu
- **Practicing/Professional Seat**
  - Niel Tashima (2016–19)
  - ntashima@ltgassociates.com
- **Student Seat**
  - Saira Mehmood (2015–18)
  - smehmood@smu.edu

---

**Contact the AAA**

- **Ed Liebow**, Executive Director, eliebow@americananthro.org
- **Elaine Lynch**, Deputy Executive Director/CFO, elynch@americananthro.org
- **Elections**, elections@americananthro.org
- **Webmaster**, webmaster@americananthro.org
- **Membership Services**, members@americananthro.org
- **Publications**, pubs@americananthro.org
- **Meetings**, aaameetings@americananthro.org

---

**AAA 2018 Executive Board**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Alex Barker (2017–19)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:barkeraw@missouri.edu">barkeraw@missouri.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President-Elect/Vice President</td>
<td>Akhil Gupta (2017–19)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:akgupta@anthro.ucla.edu">akgupta@anthro.ucla.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Susana Narotzky (2015–18)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:narotzky@jamillan.com">narotzky@jamillan.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology Seat</td>
<td>Mark Hauser (2017–20)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mark-hauser@northwestern.edu">mark-hauser@northwestern.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Seat</td>
<td>Kathryn Clancy (2017–20)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kclancy@post.harvard.edu">kclancy@post.harvard.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Seat</td>
<td>Christina Garsten (2015–18)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:christina.garsten@socant.su.se">christina.garsten@socant.su.se</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Seat</td>
<td>Jocelyn Ahlers (2017–20)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jahlers@csusm.edu">jahlers@csusm.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Seat</td>
<td>Anna Agbe-Davies (2016–19)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:agbe-davies@unc.edu">agbe-davies@unc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicing/Professional Seat</td>
<td>Niel Tashima (2016–19)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ntashima@ltgassociates.com">ntashima@ltgassociates.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Seat</td>
<td>Saira Mehmood (2015–18)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:smehmood@smu.edu">smehmood@smu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undesignated #1</td>
<td>Cathy Costin (2015–18)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cathy.l.costin@csun.edu">cathy.l.costin@csun.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undesignated #2</td>
<td>Pamela Stone (2015–18)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pk86@hampshire.edu">pk86@hampshire.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undesignated #3</td>
<td>Jemima Pierre (2017–20)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pierrej@ucla.edu">pierrej@ucla.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section Assembly Convener</td>
<td>Richard Feinberg (2016–18)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rfeinber@kent.edu">rfeinber@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section Assembly EB-Large</td>
<td>Ellen Lewin (2017–18)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ellen-lewin@uiowa.edu">ellen-lewin@uiowa.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section Assembly EB-Medium</td>
<td>Carolyn Lesorogol (2016–19)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:clesorogol@wustl.edu">clesorogol@wustl.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section Assembly EB-Small</td>
<td>David Simmons (2016–2019)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dsimmons@mailbox.sc.edu">dsimmons@mailbox.sc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA Treasurer-Ex Officio</td>
<td>Edmund T. Hamann (2012–18)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ehamann2@unl.edu">ehamann2@unl.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director-Ex Officio</td>
<td>Edward Liebow</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eliebow@americananthro.org">eliebow@americananthro.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY
Assistant Professor of Anthropology
The Department of Anthropology at Brandeis University seeks a sociocultural or linguistic anthropologist with expertise in digital technologies and culture for a tenure-track Assistant Professor position, to begin July 1, 2019.

We envision a scholar who works on digital worlds as emergent from and constitutive of specific cultural, economic, political, and historical contexts. Possible specializations might include, but are not limited to, the internet and social media; language and semiosis; science, technology, and society; race/ethnicity, class, and/or LGBTQ+ identities; political and social action; governance and surveillance; infrastructures and labor; subjectivity, embodiment, and knowledge; and intersections of technology and value. Any of these specializations might also draw on innovative uses of digital technologies in research and teaching and might contribute to the department’s new laboratory in media and ethnographic arts. Regional specialization is open.

First consideration will be given to applications received by October 1, 2018; preliminary interviews will be held by web conference with the aim of bringing final candidates to campus in late November/early December. Applicants should submit a cover letter that discusses current and future research and teaching. The cover letter should briefly address how the applicant’s experiences, interests, or future goals could promote pluralism and equity in research, teaching, and/or service. Applicants should submit a CV; a writing sample of no more than 40 pages (such as a published article, article manuscript, or dissertation chapter); and the names and contact information of three referees.

Candidates apply at: https://academicjobsonline.org/ajo/jobs/11386

At Brandeis, we believe that diversity, equity, and inclusion are essential components of academic excellence. Brandeis University is an affirmative action, equal opportunity employer committed to creating equitable access and opportunities for applicants to all employment positions. We value and are seeking candidates with a variety of social identities, including those that have been underrepresented in higher education, who possess skills that spark innovation, and who, through their scholarly pursuits, teaching, and/or service experiences, bring expertise in building, engaging, and sustaining a pluralistic and just campus community.

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
Assistant or Associate Professor, Latin American Studies
The Global Studies and Languages Faculty, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA invites applications for a full-time faculty in Latin American Studies to teach in any period or discipline, effective July 1, 2019. The position is open at the rank of Assistant Professor or Associate Professor. Candidates must have completed a PhD in Latin American Studies or a related field, or expect to have done so, by September 1, 2019.

Candidates should provide evidence of innovation and excellence in research, as demonstrated by their published contributions or potential contributions to scholarship in the field as well as a strong commitment to and demonstrated excellence in teaching. The position requires teaching upper-level content courses in Spanish, in addition to teaching subjects in English. Native or near-native fluency in Spanish and English is required.

Please submit letter of application, CV, two writing samples of published or publication-ready scholarship (no longer than 30 pages each, one in English and one in Spanish), and two syllabi of undergraduate courses that you would be interested in teaching (one syllabus in English for a course taught in English and one syllabus in Spanish for a course taught in Spanish).

Apply online via https://academicjobsonline.org/ajo/jobs/11319. Complete applications must be received by October 10, 2018. Please send questions to gsl-search@mit.edu.

After the initial review of applications, semi-finalists will be asked to provide three letters of recommendation.

MIT is an equal employment opportunity employer. All qualified applicants will receive consideration for employment and will not be discriminated against on the basis of race, color, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, religion, disability, age, genetic information, veteran status, ancestry, or national or ethnic origin.

FRANKEL CENTER FOR JUDAIC STUDIES, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
Professor/Associate Professor, Contemporary Jewish Life
The Frankel Center for Judaic Studies at the University of Michigan invites applications for a tenured appointment at the Associate or Professor rank in the field of contemporary Jewish life. This is a university-year appointment with an expected start date of September 1, 2019. Specialization within the field is open. The successful candidate will be able to contribute to the Frankel Center’s strengths in graduate training, and offer undergraduate courses that contribute to the curriculum of Judaic Studies. Applicants should submit a letter of application, which includes a statement of current and future research plans and teaching philosophy and experience, a curriculum vitae, evidence of teaching excellence, a writing sample, and the names of three references. Note that references will be contacted for finalists only. Review of applications will begin November 5, and will continue until an appointment is made.

Women and Minorities are encouraged to apply. The University of Michigan is supportive of the needs of dual career couples, and is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer.

Application materials must be submitted electronically. Please go to https://webappslsa.umich.edu/Apply/1134 to apply.
UNIVERSITY OF VIENNA
University Professor, Social and Cultural Anthropology (Emphasis on Religious and Religious Movements)

The appointment of particularly qualified researchers to university professors is an important strategy of the University of Vienna. Become part of this vibrant and future-oriented organisation.

The successful candidate must be able to broadly represent the discipline of Social and Cultural Anthropology in teaching. In research, a focus on religions/religious movements is expected. Extensive experience with ethnographic fieldwork within a range of topics from religious rituals and myths to religious movements and the role of religions in globalization processes is a necessity.

**Successful candidates should have the following qualifications:**
- A completed doctoral degree/PhD and an outstanding dissertation and Habilitation (venia docendi) or internationally accepted equivalent in Social and Cultural Anthropology
- International academic experience and cooperation, preferably also outside of the German-language area
- Outstanding achievements in research, excellent publication record, international reputation
- Experience in designing, procuring and managing large research projects, as well as the willingness and ability to lead research groups
- Enthusiasm for excellent teaching, teaching experience at universities as well as the ability and willingness to teach students in all phases of their studies (bachelor’s, master’s, or doctoral level), to supervise academic theses and to promoting young academic colleagues

The University of Vienna expects the successful candidate to acquire, within three years, proficiency in German sufficient for teaching in bachelor’s programmes and for participation in university committees. In addition, the University of Vienna expects the successful candidate to be prepared to take over responsibility on the organisational level of the Faculty and the University, if necessary.

Application documents: Applications in English should be submitted by e-mail to the Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences of the University of Vienna, Rooseveltplatz 2/2, Stock, A-1090 Wien (dekanat.sowi@univie.ac.at).

Reference no.: 490-37

To view the application instructions and requirements please go to: http://careercenter.americananthro.org/jobs/11321763

---

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Assistant Professor, Archaeology Program

Wesleyan University’s Archaeology Program invites applications for a tenure-track Assistant Professor of Archaeology beginning July 1, 2019. The preferred candidates will be anthropologically trained archaeologists and will demonstrate interest in and ability to teach Introduction to Archaeology, as well as upper level courses of interest to majors and non-majors. Preferred areas of specialization include environmental or landscape archaeology and/or the application of contemporary scientific analyses to archaeological problems. Regional focus is open. Advanced tenure track candi-
Candidates must have a Ph.D. in Anthropology or related field in hand by the time of appointment to be hired as an Assistant Professor; a successful candidate may be hired as an Instructor if the candidate does not have a Ph.D. in hand at the time of appointment, but will complete the Ph.D. in Anthropology or related field within one year of hire. The teaching load is 2/2. Additional duties include advising and mentoring students, carrying on a program of research, and participating in faculty governance at the departmental and university level.

Wesleyan is a highly selective liberal arts college that values both scholarship and teaching very highly, has a strong, diverse undergraduate student body, and offers a generous sabbatical program and competitive salaries and benefits.

To apply, visit http://careers.wesleyan.edu/postings/Archaeology. A complete application includes a cover letter, curriculum vitae, writing sample, statement of current research, and documentation of teaching experience, including teaching statement, course syllabi and student evaluations. As part of the teaching statement (or cover letter), we invite you to describe your cultural competencies and experiences engaging a diverse student body. You will also be asked to provide the email addresses of three referees from whom we will obtain confidential letters of recommendation.

Applications should be submitted online at http://careers.wesleyan.edu/postings/Archaeology. Applications completed by October 15, 2018 will receive full consideration. Please contact Deborah Sierpinski at dsierpinski@wesleyan.edu or 860-685-2070 if you have questions about the application process. Please contact program and search chair Douglas Charles at dcharles@wesleyan.edu or 860-685-3266 if you have questions about the position.

IN MEMORIAM

Hyung Il Pai
JUNE 14, 1958–MAY 28, 2018

Hyung Il Pai died on May 28, 2018. Born in South Korea, Pai was an archaeologist of Northeast Asia whose incisive critiques of Korean archeology led her from an exploration of colonial and postcolonial reconstructions of the Korean past into questions of how Korean “heritage,” as both concept and institutions, took shape in the South Korean cultural imaginary. Pai received her PhD in anthropology-East Asian archeology from Harvard in 1989. In 1990, she joined faculty in the Department of East Asian Languages and Cultural Studies at the University of California, Santa Barbara, where she spent her career and where her enthusiasm for scholarship and teaching are fondly remembered.

Pai received a BA from Sogang University in Seoul (1991) and completed her graduate studies at Harvard, studying with K. C. Chang who had rewritten ancient Chinese history and Peter S. Wells who taught sophisticated anthropological modeling for questions of early cultural contact. Then classmate Lothar von Falkenhauen recalls how, early in her graduate career, Pai realized that as a woman, she would not be taken seriously by the old boy archeology establishment in South Korea. She boldly charted a career that would necessarily unfold outside Korea, taking on the big issues and core methodologies of the anthropological discipline and embracing feminism, deconstructionism, and postcolonial theory.

Pai’s first book, Constructing “Korean” Origins: A Critical Review of Archaeology, Historiography, and Racial Myth in Korean State-Formation Theories (2000), was a bombshell lobbed in the direction of the old boys. Combining an up-to-date archeological tool kit with a canny reading of Korean, Chinese, and Japanese sources, Pai argued that modern Korean archeology and cultural history were colored by a nationalist desire to confirm origin myths and dubious arguments for a cohesive ethnic “Korea” of great antiquity. South Korean archeology, she would argue, was an ironic mirror image of the Japanese colonial project it was intended to supplant. Heritage Management in Korea and Japan (2013) and the co-edited volume with Timothy Tangherlini, Nationalism and the Construction of Korean Identity (1998) built on Pai’s interest in colonial legacies and national identity construction. She was unafraid to offer the near-heretical view that colonial policies of site preservation and the development of tourist itineraries on the Korean peninsula were seminal for the South Korean nation’s own ambitious heritage projects. Her explorations in early Korean modernity led to intriguing publications on early photography, guidebooks, and postcards. She published in English, Korean, and Japanese.

Pai held prestigious grants including a University of California President’s Fellowship and chaired the Committee on Korean Studies of the Association for Asian Studies. She loved animals and adopted cats and dogs throughout her life. Few of her colleagues realized that this active scholar had been battling cancer since the 1990s. She is survived by her husband Alex José, her parents Soo Tong Pai and Kyung Dok Park, and her brother Hyungmin Pai.

(Laurel Kendall)
SHEELA ATHREYA, “PICKING A BONE WITH EVOLUTIONARY ESSENTIALISM”

MARC KISSEL, “NON-MODERN HUMANS WERE MORE COMPLEX—AND ARTISTIC—THAN WE THOUGHT”


SANG-HEE LEE, “WHERE DO WE COME FROM”

**ISAIAH NENGO, “GREAT APE HATERS”**
Chandler Zausner

Chandler Zausner is an undergraduate at the University of Southern California, where he is pursuing a double major at The School of Cinematic Arts (media arts and practice, ’20) and USC Dornsife (visual anthropology, ’20). He is interested in documenting unique, marginalized, and disenfranchised communities and recently traveled to Japan for his first international research project on hikikomori, a culture-bound syndrome of extreme social withdrawal. This is Chandler’s reflection on some of the challenges he faced.
Okay, I can sympathize with the need to withdraw.

I knew before coming that it could take me months or years to gain the trust of a hikikomori.

At Meiji University

Go away I don't exist.

I will gather as much cultural opinion as I can!

Have you heard about the hikikomori?

Sure!

Are hikikomori an important problem for Japanese society to address?

Wow, I expected little sympathy from adults but not the students!

No, they just need to get a grip!

After two weeks of focus groups and interviews.

Maybe some hikikomori would be willing to film themselves in their rooms?

We'd create ways to share their stories across multiple platforms using "transmedial storytelling," with video, comics, games, etc!

I have so much research data but I wish I could get closer to their lives, speak to their carers, and participate a little.

That way it wouldn't be just my observations from an outsider's perspective...

Because there is no heroine coming to save me!
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