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Opening the Museum: The Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology

RUBIE WATSON

Rubie Watson is William and Muriel Seabury Howells Director at the Peabody Museum, Harvard University.

During the 1990s, museum attendance skyrocketed. On August 9, 1995, the New York Times reported that more people attended museums than all sporting events combined. Whether one thinks this newfound popularity has been beneficial or not, it is clear that visitors now demand a great deal from their museum experience. Museums are expected to combine education and entertainment, commemorate heroic deeds, document "real history," give voice to the strivings of minorities, and provide a forum in which new (and sometimes unpopular) ideas can be discussed. Museums have become places where national and regional cultures are celebrated, criticized, and, on occasion, refashioned. Many public museums offer a host of cultural and commercial services, including exhibits, films, shopping, restaurants, concerts, and even a safe place where urban "singles" can mix and match. All this must be done with limited resources, making the pursuit of funds necessary and pervasive.

Small regional museums have struggled to find a special niche in this changing environment, and some have been spectacularly successful in capturing a dedicated following for their exhibits and programs. In this brave new world, university research museums have kept to the sidelines or looked for ways to adapt. Although few have gone so far as to add cappuccino bars or singles evenings, some university museums have acknowledged that they serve multiple audiences and—given years of neglect and limited resources—have struggled mightily to decide how best to meet new challenges.

What are museums like the Peabody for? A textbook answer to this question would include the following: the purpose of museums is to acquire, house, preserve, and interpret their collections. Museums like the Peabody, which maintain extensive research collections, have further responsibilities to provide access to researchers and to disseminate research results through publications and teaching.

Indeed, during its 135-year history, the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology has performed the required tasks; it has acquired, housed, preserved, interpreted, taught, and researched its collections. Unfortunately, the Peabody has no written history—official or unofficial. Little attention has been paid to how or why the Peabody came to be what it is today. In the following brief account, I draw a sketch of the museum at three moments in its history: 1877, 1928, and 2001. Although this sketch is based on the museum's annual reports, directors' correspondence, and archives, my primary source is the Peabody Museum building itself. I propose to treat the museum building at 11 Divinity Avenue as an artifact. The arrangement of bricks and mortar, display cases, storage areas, and laboratories tells us a great deal about the Peabody as well as the ideas and values of those who have labored here.

Before proceeding, a cautionary note may be useful. Change, not status, has been the order of the day during the Peabody's long history. Since the 1870s, two large extensions were added to the original building and exhibits have been fashioned and refashioned as collections have been moved from one gallery to another to make room for new arrivals. From the 1890s when anthropology was first formally taught at Harvard, the quest for teaching space, faculty offices, and laboratories has been ceaseless. But amidst the "make-do" changes and shifts, certain patterns can be discerned, and, I believe, these patterns are instructive of the history of museums and of anthropology. Although the three snapshots provided here highlight important information and benchmarks, they do not tell the entire story. For that, more than a brief article is required.

The Peabody Museum, the oldest museum of anthropology in the Americas, was established by George Peabody—a New Englander, a self-made man, and a cotton merchant with extensive business contacts in England. On October 8, 1866, Peabody committed $150,000 to be used, according to the terms of the trust, to establish the position of Peabody Professor-Curator, to purchase artifacts, and to construct a building to house its collections. Peabody directed his trustees to organize the construction of "a suitable fireproof museum building, upon land to be given for that purpose, free of cost or rental, by the President and Fellows of Harvard College." In 1877, the long-awaited museum building was completed and ready for occupancy.

The Museum's early acquisition and exhibit rationale is well described by its longest serving director, F. W. Putnam. Writing in 1877 soon after becoming director, Putnam summarized a decade of achievements: "In conformity with Mr. Peabody's expressed wish, much has been done . . . toward the accumulation of material for the proper understanding of the condition of the early inhabitants of America, and their relation to those of other parts of the world. For this purpose special explorations in America have been made with marked success, and large and valuable collections from abroad have been secured for the purpose of comparison." According to Putnam, the
originating vision was of a museum focused on the Americas but broadly defined so that artifacts from “other parts of the world” could be included. By means of comparative methodologies, Putnam implied, the still fledgling study of New World cultures would expand and deepen.

Collections: Go Forth and Acquire

The Peabody Museum was established in the heyday of nineteenth-century collecting, when the world was becoming smaller and people of vastly different backgrounds and cultures were coming into regular contact with each other. Of course, the collecting impulse is almost as old as human history itself, but during the late eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries what was being collected, how it was being collected, and the object of collecting were all significantly different from earlier eras. A move from curio and religiously motivated collecting was taking place, although, of course, these earlier forms never disappeared.

By the early 1800s, the quaint, the curious, and the beautiful were being joined by massive collections of the ordinary and mundane. Increasingly, collections were expected to represent the earth and its fauna, flora, and cultures. Systematic collecting was done not to amaze or to glorify spiritual truths but for purposes of study and research. The collections that were being amassed by scientists were routinely documented with field notes and maps detailing the natural or historical contexts of specimens and artifacts. Photographs, precise measurements, and elaborate descriptions based on agreed-upon standards supported museum collections. During these institution-building decades, type collections set the standards by which classifications of New World crops, Mimbres pottery, or hand axes were established, thus making it possible for scholars to compare and speak intelligently to each other.

Nineteenth-century museums of science, a designation that Director Putnam would have unself-consciously embraced, attempted to manage what has been described as an “empirical explosion” brought about by voyages of discovery, increased travel, and enhanced forms of communication. During the 1700s and 1800s, as ideas of comparison and comparative methodologies were being established, direct observation and “knowing by seeing” became a privileged epistemology. Museums emerged during this period as places where knowledge was created and revealed to an interested public.

A History of Peabody Displays: 1877

The Annual Report of 1878 provides a detailed description of the newly opened Peabody Museum building and its internal arrangements. The museum’s architect, Robert Slack, gives us a description that is charming in its detail and simplicity: “The outside walls are built of dark red brick, laid in black mortar, with brown stone belts, window sills, caps and main cornice, with granite steps and underpinning. The external dimensions are 87 ft. from North to South and 44 ft. from East to West. The First floor is about 5 ft. above the ground, the main cornice 52 ft., the top of Mansard story at gutter about 61 ft., and the highest point of roof 72 ft.” Slack goes on to describe the building’s interior, which was organized on six floors with galleries on the second and fourth levels opening onto the floors below them. This was the heyday of the nineteenth-century
version of “visible storage” when seeing was believing and massive arrays of specimens lined the walls of all the best museums.

In 1877, the Peabody staff was keen to display the collections—all the collections—ordered primarily by regional-cultural origin (e.g., North America, Swiss Lakes, Pacific Islands) and secondarily by object type or function (e.g., mortars, stone axes, pottery). Thousands of artifacts were displayed with minimal or no use of labels. The message—or interpretative principles as we would say today—was not offered in words printed on text panels; instead it was encoded in the arrangement of the artifacts themselves. Artifacts were not exhibited but “arranged,” and visitors were expected to draw the same conclusions from these arrangements that scientists had drawn from their comparative studies.

As collections increased from a few thousand items in 1866 to nearly five million by the 1930s, cases were rearranged and new ones were added. In 1888 and again in 1913, additions to the original building (adding nearly 50,000 square feet) helped to alleviate space problems, but these additions, which allowed for a purpose-built storage area in the basement and laboratory spaces on the fifth floor, appear to have had little impact on the internal arrangements of the museum’s collections. The ordering principles of geography and artifact type prevailed.

According to many sources, it is clear that from 1877 until the 1920s scientists working at the Peabody Museum taught students, trained their own replacements, conducted research, managed artifacts, wrote learned articles, and met the public amidst the museum’s collections. In 1877 and for many years thereafter, the Peabody was a museum where anthropology was produced and where those productions were displayed for all to see. The visual and, very likely, practical effect was of a “library of objects”—the cases forming “stacks” where artifacts were shelved in full view and ready for use.

The Peabody Museum: 1928

During the late 1920s and 1930s, artifacts continued to be presented in arrangements rather than exhibits, and more continued to be better, but anthropology museums, including the Peabody, were changing. Anthropology became a university-based discipline during the 1890s, and gradually throughout the first decades of the twentieth century, professional anthropologists found employment in newly established anthropology departments. With departmental status came obligations to provide students with regular classroom instruction and to train the next generation of professionals. By the 1930s, highly specialized research facilities (with laboratories, professional seminars, and disciplinary journals) had emerged—all of which were effectively off limits to the public. During this period, artifacts at the Peabody were moved into increasingly inaccessible closed storage to make way for laboratories, offices, classrooms, storage rooms, and processing areas.

The Peabody Museum is still recovering from this “putting away” of artifacts, which was done in haste and with little attention to issues of access. A 1934 document entitled “Case Plans Showing Numbers” reminds us, however, that thousands of cased artifacts remained open to researchers, faculty, students, and visitors. In fact, according to these plans no fewer than 2,098 display cases were arranged throughout the museum. A nineteenth-century visitor miraculously transported to the Peabody of 1934 would have noticed changes. Faculty offices and labs were being carved from the galleries, but the “arrangements” would have been familiar. However, the manner and purpose of the arrangements were beginning to change.

These changes were first signaled by a new, activist director, Edward Reynolds, who declared in his first annual report (1928) that “a rearrangement of the collection on a more modern and scientific system would make the Museum a far more efficient teaching implement—the essential reason for the existence of any university museum.” This rearrangement, he continued, “should be accompanied . . . by the preparation of very many thousands of descriptive labels so arranged as to cover everything on exhibition. The present almost complete absence of such labels,” Reynolds lamented, “greatly lessens its value to the public, and, what
seems of more importance, to the students who should use it." In 1929, Reynolds laid out ambitious plans for a rearrangement of exhibitions and spaces. Although Reynolds was director for only four years, some of his plans were implemented. Interestingly, he placed museum-based teaching for Harvard students and public education on his agenda. Although neither of these concerns was new to the Peabody, Reynolds signaled a change in emphasis.

During his tenure, Putnam operated a kind of apprentice-training system, in which students of all ages and backgrounds were given a mentor and a research space and put to work on special projects. Gradually, this gave way to more formal teaching. (The Department of American Archaeology and Ethnology was formed at Harvard in 1890; in 1903 the title was changed to the Department of Anthropology.) Although the museum had always been open to the public, Reynolds demonstrated a new concern for what visitors were making of all those "arrangements." In 1928, display cases still dominated the museum building, but object labels were now deemed necessary for proper understanding.

Reynolds did not manage to remake the Peabody Museum, but his writings suggest an approach very different from Putnam's. Apparently, he lacked Putnam's confidence in the ability of visitors to "read" the wordless and artifact-heavy arrangements. Or, perhaps, he cared more than Putnam that they got the "correct" message. He may also have been responding to anthropology's retreat from public view into restricted laboratories, private offices, classrooms for fee-paying students, and professional societies. No longer were museums the primary locus of anthropological research and teaching. As knowledge production moved into evermore jealously guarded departmental strongholds, museums became more reactive and the job of translating scholarly research more demanding. Into this changing environment, Reynolds interjected two innovations, explanatory texts and special "synoptic collection" displays. The newly organized synoptic room was firmly based on an evolutionary schema—from Stone Age to Iron Age to Bronze Age to Civilization—expressed through the arrangement of artifacts from cultures throughout the world. Reynolds' synoptic display was intended as a kind of interpretative guidebook, which would equip visitors with the information they needed to "read" the Peabody Museum's galleries. On the research front, during the Reynolds and immediate post-Reynolds years, the Peabody continued to sponsor large research projects, but these were increasingly led by faculty-curators ever more closely tied to the department.

**Peabody Museum: 2001**

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, the Peabody Museum building is bursting at the seams. Currently, a growing and fully functioning museum as well as a substantial portion of Harvard's Department of Anthropology are housed there. Just under one-fifth of the building is devoted to exhibits, which display less than one-half of one percent of the Peabody's collections. Faculty offices, laboratories, and classrooms take up approximately 50 percent, while collections storage (about 45 percent of total space) and museum services account for the remainder. Most of the archaeology collections are temporarily stored off-site.

The way collections are housed and exhibited has changed dramatically since the 1920s. Collections are currently held in secured storage areas where light, humidity, and temperature can be better controlled. These collections, I hasten to add, are available for special programming efforts and to users of all kinds, including researchers and members of communities from which objects originated. But, unfortunately, fewer than 3,000 objects are exhibited, and these tend to be heavily interpreted via labels, text panels, photographs, and videos. In 1877 and 1928 the goal was to display all or most of the collections, but since the 1970s artifacts have been increasingly presented within an elaborate matrix of interpretation. It would appear that since the 1930s Peabody directors have embraced the view that visitors need all the interpretative help they can get.
Today the Peabody Museum building is dominated by two entities: the Department of Anthropology and the collections. In many important respects, the relationship between the two mirrors the changing relationship between university museums and academe. For some faculty-curators the collections remain vital to their research and teaching, and for others the collections are utilized mostly for teaching and graduate training. For many years, cultural anthropologists and historians maintained a distance from artifact collections. However, since the 1980s, cultural studies and a reengagement with “things,” borne in part by a rapprochement between archaeology and cultural anthropology, gave new vitality to a rather tired, but now more broadly defined, study of visual anthropology. In this redefinition, artifacts have been transformed into visual culture and deemed worthy of serious anthropological research. Increasingly, the tangible past is seen to provide valuable clues to the study of ethnicity and nationalism, the history of heretofore “silent groups,” and colonialism. Interest in globalization and emerging consumer cultures has opened up the study of material culture to new ideas and methodologies. There is no doubt that the wholesale transformation of many classes of artifacts into art (masks from Africa or Northwest Coast carvings are good examples) has contributed significantly to a newfound interest in anthropology museums.

In 1928, anthropology, like many other academic disciplines, was already in retreat from public view. Seventy-three years later that retreat is even more pronounced. The gap between those who do research and those who do not is greater than ever. Museums like the Peabody can play a vital role not only in translating recent research for the public but also in producing research; university museums offer especially fertile grounds for cross-discipline research and discussion. This is a job that is increasingly important as scholars struggle to free themselves from the straightjacket of outmoded departmental architectures established during the early twentieth century.

In my view, one of the most telling criticisms leveled at contemporary museums is the lack of openness. This critique appears in many forms, from “museums are hegemonic appropriators of other peoples’ culture” to “I can’t figure out how to get an appointment to see the XX collection.” One cannot please everyone, but museums can do a better job of opening collections to those who want to engage them. Members of indigenous communities, including artists, must have a place in the twenty-first-century museum. Their perspectives are essential, and it is especially important that they be given opportunities to communicate those perspectives.

The Peabody is working to achieve a cherished dream of creating a new kind of institution that can open its collections to the many communities it serves. Visible storage is part of this “opening” process, although I hasten to add that the Peabody has no intention of recreating the densely packed “arrangements” of the 1880s. By 2004, the museum will have a fully searchable electronic database of its artifact collections. Digital images of all-important collections—tens of thousands of images—will form an integral part of that database. The Peabody Web site will make the collections available to students, faculty, researchers, indigenous artists, tribal elders, schoolchildren, teachers, and members of the public. Anyone who is interested and has access to the Internet will be able to explore the Peabody’s collections. Of course, digital images can never replace seeing the artifacts with one’s own eyes, but electronic access will make it possible for many people to use the collections more efficiently.

Few museums can contemplate displaying their entire collections, no matter how much they might wish to achieve such a lofty goal. But, by means of a creatively orchestrated Web site, innovative forms of visible storage, and thematically interpreted...
exhibits, the Peabody’s collections can and will be opened. Visitor figures and media coverage make it clear that the demands on museums are ever growing, but the ways that museums present the objects under their care are still locked into the 1980s. Many museum visitors do not feel challenged and resent being spoon-fed. They expect to be entertained, but they also want to be informed in challenging ways. University museums, I believe, have a special responsibility not only to present their collections to visitors, but also to ground those presentations in the context of new research. University-based museums should not compete with but, rather, complement the work of large public museums by enhancing (and, when appropriate, by challenging) common understandings of how and why research is done.

As the Peabody enters the twenty-first century, the collections that it houses are recognized (and utilized) as one of the world’s great resources for the study of the human past. Many of these collections are unique and could not be assembled today. Indeed, those who steward these collections recognize that they have significant responsibilities toward the artifacts themselves and to the many communities these collections serve. University museums should contribute to the great civic debates that are taking place in America’s cultural institutions, but they cannot do this if collections remain hidden and exhibits continue to be encumbered by overlays of heavy-handed interpretative agendas. Electronic access, visible storage, and thoughtful exhibits are the foundations upon which a new kind of museum can be built—one that allows for engagement within an atmosphere of respect for individual exploration and for the originating communities whose visible past is, in part, contained within museum collections.

Notes

13. Including conservation, information technology, collections management and records, publications, security, human resources, and finance.
14. In part, cultural anthropologists were reacting to the excesses of nineteenth-century “armchair anthropology.”
15. For example, in the study of human origins, nationalism and cultural diversity, looting of archaeological sites, environmental issues.
16. It will also help teachers prepare their charges for museum visits and build upon what they learned when they return to the classroom. And, Internet linkage will provide an open and inexpensive way for members of native communities to acquaint themselves with the museum’s holdings and resources.
17. In the next issue of Symbols, I will discuss in detail the role that the 1990 Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) has played in reinvigorating the Peabody’s contacts with Native American communities.
Textiles from the American Southwest at the Peabody Museum

LAURIE D. WEBSTER

Laurie D. Webster, Ph.D., is an independent textile consultant.

During 2000–2001, the Peabody Museum conducted an evaluation of its extensive collection of textiles from the American Southwest. Support from the Barbara McCue Curatorial Fund made this evaluation possible. Four noted specialists (Tony Berlant, Ann Hedlund, Laurie Webster, and Navajo weaver Kalley Keams) examined the collection during visits to the Peabody. Their expertise has been central in assessing the museum’s holdings in this important area. Through a series of three exhibits and four lectures by the four advisors, I am very pleased that the museum was able to share their findings with the public. The following is extracted from a written assessment made by Dr. Laurie Webster.

Rubie Watson

The Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology has a highly significant collection of nineteenth- and twentieth-century textiles from the American Southwest and Mexico including 369 Navajo blankets and rugs, 105 Pueblo blankets and wearing garments, 11 Navajo or Pueblo textiles, 28 Rio Grande Hispanic blankets and rugs, and 19 Mexican serapes. The collection spans the period from the early nineteenth century to the present and is particularly strong for the period 1860 to 1890. In size and depth, the Peabody Museum textile collection rivals Southwestern and Mexican textile collections at such institutions as the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, the Southwest Museum, the Heard Museum, the Museum of Northern Arizona, the School of American Research, the Museum of New Mexico, the American Museum of Natural History, and the Smithsonian Institution. Nevertheless, the Peabody Museum collection is relatively unknown to the outside public and scholarly community. Of the 539 pieces considered in this assessment, fewer than ten percent have appeared in published works.

In addition to its outstanding aesthetic value, the Peabody’s Southwestern and Mexican textile collection constitutes an invaluable anthropological resource, providing important information about craft production, the marketing of American Indian and Hispanic art, and trade relations between Native American tribes and between native peoples and Euro-Americans. The most important group of weavings is the William Claflin, Jr., Collection, composed primarily of nineteenth-century Navajo and Pueblo

Fourth phase chief’s blanket, nine-spot style, Navajo (985-27-10/58885, N34807). Photo by Hillel Burger.
textiles (accessions 975-17, 985-27, 994-33, 995-2). Claflin not only acquired a number of collections made in the 1870s and 1880s by early visitors to the Southwest, he also recorded their histories, resulting in a valuable archive of important historical data.

The Claflin Collection is followed in importance by the Mary Hemenway Collection (accessions 95-30, 44-35, and 45-25) and the William Wright Collection (accession 995-29). The Hemenway Collection constitutes not only an important group of late nineteenth-century Hopi (and a few Navajo) textiles, but it also provides an important record of collecting activities by such well-known figures as Thomas Keam, Alexander Stephen, and Jesse Walter Fewkes. At the other end of the spectrum, collector William Wright amassed a large and impressive collection of Navajo, Pueblo, and Rio Grande Hispanic textile art, mostly contemporary pieces, in many cases recording the names of the weavers who produced them. Other very important holdings at the Peabody include the collections made by Walter C. Langer (accessions 980-6, 981-20), Mrs. Francisco J. Manrique (accession 36-76), Grace Nicholson (accessions 08-4, 12-29), Samuel D. Stevens (accession 38-98), and Amelia Elizabeth White (accession 37-113, 54-55).

Notes

1. These totals refer to flat textiles only and exclude such items as braided and woven belts, knitted and crocheted leggings, and woven saddle cinches. The Pueblo total only includes Hopi brocaded sashes from the Wright Collection.

2. In addition to these ethnographic Southwestern textiles, the Peabody Museum also holds important archaeological collections of early historic Navajo and Pueblo textiles. These include fragments of Navajo textiles from Massacre Cave in Canyon del Muerto and Pueblo textiles from Awatovi Pueblo at Hopi. These collections are not considered in the present assessment.
In 1900 the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology was given a memorial totem pole. It was carved with a bear peering out of its den, marked with the imprints of a climbing bear’s paws, and topped by a large loon. One hundred years later, on May 29, 2001, under the mandate of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, the pole depicting the Brown Bear crest of the Tlingit clan Teikweidi began its return journey to its regional home in Ketchikan, Alaska.

In early May 2000, the Peabody commissioned Master Carver Nathan Jackson to create a new pole for the museum. Jackson’s work has been widely exhibited in North America, Asia, and Europe. It is very exciting and highly appropriate that Nathan Jackson has been chosen for this commission. He is Tlingit, resides in Ketchikan, and is a superb carver. The new pole, entitled the Kaats and Bear Pole, will be formally installed in the Peabody Museum on November 19 at 3:30 p.m. in the Hall of the North American Indian, where it will join another of Jackson’s carvings, a house front. Cape Fox Corporation at Saxman provided the red cedar tree from which the new pole was fashioned.
Sacred and Profane Smoking Pipes

NEAL L. TRUBOWITZ

Neal Trubowitz, Peabody Museum Hrdy Visiting Research Curator 2000-2001, is an archaeologist specializing in the interaction between Native Americans and Europeans during the colonial era. He received his Ph.D. from SUNY, Buffalo, and has served as Historic Site Administrator for the Missouri Division of State Parks, Survey Archaeologist for the Arkansas Archaeological Survey, and Assistant Professor at Indiana University at Indianapolis.

As the Hrdy Visiting Research Curator, I spent the past year studying the Peabody Museum collections and using the Harvard libraries to investigate how smoking pipes reflect the ethnicity and interaction of Native Americans and Europeans during the first 350 years of contact in eastern North America, from A.D. 1500 to 1850.

Tobacco smoking was unknown outside the Americas until European explorers learned of it from Native Americans and spread its use around the world. Pipes and tobacco were important to native peoples in both sacred and profane aspects of their lives. Observing these practices, Europeans experimented with tobacco for medicinal and aphrodisiacal uses, but soon largely settled upon using it as a recreational herb.

Library research showed that European pipes eventually appeared on Native American sites, but they usually remained in the minority and did not totally replace Native American pipes until long after first contact and under circumstances of severe change in Native American lifeways. The persistence of native forms of pipes reflected the central importance and survival of sacred themes of the pipe/tobacco/smoking complex. Europeans learned this complex from Native Americans, reinterpreted the pipes into new forms of their own manufacture, and used European-derived clay pipes for profane recreational use. These pipes have been ubiquitous on North American archaeological sites inhabited by northern Europeans during this time interval.

In the interaction between Europeans and Native Americans, transculturation took place in the imitation of sacred forms of stone pipes with the European invention of metal pipe tomahawks. Both parties found that this form of pipe fit their needs for developing cross-cultural communication, trade, and alliance. The Peabody Museum collections include thousands of Native American and European pipes and exemplify both the sacred and profane uses of the smoking pipe. Based on my research at the Peabody, I am completing a book-length manuscript entitled “The Sacred and Profane Smoking Pipe: A Reflection of Ethnicity in Eastern North America, A.D. 1500-1850.”

NEW AND RECENT PUBLICATIONS FROM THE PEABODY MUSEUM PRESS

Mary Malloy, Souvenirs of the Fur Trade: Northwest Coast Indian Art and Artifacts Collected by American Mariners, 1788-1844. Peabody Museum Press. $35.00.

Michael W. Diehl and Steven A. LeBlanc, Early Pithouse Villages of the Mimbres Valley and Beyond: The McAnally and Thompson Sites in Their Cultural and Ecological Contexts. Papers of the Peabody Museum, vol. 83. $30.00.

RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics, edited by Francesco Pellizzoni. Volumes 37 (Spring 2000) and 38 (Autumn 2000) were produced in the last year. Subscription prices: Individual $30 (North America), Institution $64 (North America), Individual $42 (rest of world), Institution $74 (rest of world).


To request a catalog or to order books, please contact the Publications Dept. at the Peabody Museum, 11 Divinity Ave., Cambridge MA 02138. FAX: 617/495-7535; Voice mail: 617/496-9922.
Theodore C. Bestor has been appointed Professor in the Department of Anthropology. He will also be affiliated with Harvard’s Reischauer Institute of Japanese Studies.

Bestor is a specialist on contemporary Japanese society and culture and has focused much of his research on Tokyo. He has written widely on urban culture and history, markets and economic organization, food culture, the fishing industry, and popular culture. His current work focuses on globalization, consumption, and identity. Bestor first visited Japan as a teenager and since then has spent about eight years in Japan as a student, researcher, and teacher.

His first book, *Neighborhood Tokyo* (Stanford University Press, 1989), an ethnography of local social institutions and the invention of community tradition in the daily life of an ordinary middle-class district of Tokyo, received the 1990 Robert E. Park Award for Urban and Community Studies from the American Sociological Association and the 1990 Hiromi Arisawa Memorial Award for Japanese Studies from the American Association of University Presses.

For the past ten years, Bestor has been conducting research at Tokyo’s vast Tsukiji wholesale market, the world’s largest marketplace for seafood and the center of Japan’s sushi trade. His ethnography of Tsukiji, entitled *Tokyo’s Marketplace*, to be published by the University of California Press during the coming year, examines the market both historically and contemporarily as a case study in the interaction between cultural patterns and institutional structures that frame complex economic organization.

Bestor has also done fieldwork in fishing communities and seafood markets in New England, Korea, and Spain, looking at the global reach of Japanese markets in their quest for a worldwide supply of the freshest and finest seafood. His current research also looks at the development of Japanese food culture, both in contemporary Japanese life and as a global culinary trend. He is working on a book tentatively titled *Global Sushi*, which will look at anthropological perspectives on globalization through the interaction of production in the fishing industry and cultural influences in culinary trends. This research is summarized in his recent article in *Foreign Policy*, “How Sushi Went Global,” (Nov./Dec. 2000).

With Patricia Steinhoff (University of Hawaii) and Victoria Lyon Bestor (NCC Japanese Library Resources), Bestor has recently completed an edited volume on research in Japanese studies. *Doing Fieldwork in Japan* will be published next year by the University of Hawaii Press.

Bestor is currently the President-Elect of the newly formed East Asia Section of the American Anthropological Association and is a past president of the Society for Urban Anthropology. He has been the Chair of the Northeast Asia Council of the Association for Asian Studies. Before coming to Harvard, Bestor taught at Cornell University, where he was Professor of Anthropology and Asian Studies 1997–2001, Acting Chair of the Department of Anthropology 1998–1999, and Acting Director of the East Asian Program 1995–1996. From 1986 to 1993, he was on the faculty of Columbia University. He served as the Director of the Japanese and Korean Studies programs at the Social Science Research Council from 1983 to 1986.

He received both his Ph.D. (1983) and A.M. (1977) in Anthropology and an A.M. in East Asian Studies (1976) from Stanford University. He received his B.A. in 1973 from Fairhaven College of Western Washington University.

David Carrasco has been appointed the Neil L. Rudenstine Professor of the Study of Latin America, a joint appointment with the Divinity School. He received the Ph.D. in History of Religions in 1977, the M.A. in History of Religions in 1974, and the M.Th. in 1970 from the Univ. of Chicago. Before coming to Harvard he was Master since 1994 of Mathey College, and Prof. of History of Religions 1993, Princeton University.

A historian of religions, Professor Carrasco specializes in New World religious imaginings, millenarian movements, and colonialism as ceremony and ritual violence. His interests include both the contemporary and historical study of religions, ranging from Aztec religion to contemporary issues in Latino studies.

Published writings by Prof. Carrasco include the following books: *Mesoamerica’s Classic Heritage: From Teotihuacan to the Aztecs*, edited with Lindsay Jones and Scott Sessions, Univ. Press of Colorado, 2000; *City of Sacrifice: The Aztec Empire and the Role of Violence in Civilization*, Beacon Press, 1999; *Daily Life of the Aztecs: People of*
Published writings by Prof. Lieberman include the following:


Daniel Eric Lieberman has been appointed Professor in the Department of Anthropology. He received the Ph.D. in Anthropology in 1993 and the A.M. in Anthropology in 1990 from Harvard, the M.Phil. in Biological Anthropology in 1987 from Cambridge University, and the A.B. (summa cum laude) in Anthropology in 1986 from Harvard. Before coming to Harvard he was an Associate Professor at George Washington University from 1998 to 2001.

Professor Lieberman’s current research centers on the origin of human craniofacial form and the interactions that occur between bones and their mechanical environments, with a special focus on experimental studies.


Daniel Eric Lieberman has been appointed Professor in the Department of Anthropology. He received the Ph.D. in Anthropology in 1993 and the A.M. in Anthropology in 1990 from Harvard, the M.Phil. in Biological Anthropology in 1987 from Cambridge University, and the A.B. (summa cum laude) in Anthropology in 1986 from Harvard. Before coming to Harvard he was an Associate Professor at George Washington University from 1998 to 2001.
A symposium in honor of Irven DeVore, Ruth Moore Professor of Biological Anthropology at Harvard, was held on October 7, 2000, at the University of Minnesota. The symposium, titled "Mating, Parenting and Subsistence: The Evolution of Male and Female Strategies in Humans and Primates," was sponsored by the L. S. B. Leakey Foundation. Prof. DeVore has been Co-Chair of the Foundation’s Scientific Executive Committee since 1980.

William L. Fash, the Bowditch Professor of Central American and Mexican Archaeology and Ethnology, received the Petra T. Shattuck Excellence in Teaching Award by the Harvard Extension School in June.

Prof. Arthur Kleinman was on sabbatical leave in the 2000–2001 academic year, having stepped down after nine years as Chair, Department of Social Medicine. During this sabbatical, Kleinman has given lectures at the University of Tarragona, Spain; National University of Ireland, Maynooth; and Royal College of Surgeons of Ireland. He gave the Boyden Lecture at Providence–St. Vincent’s Medical Center, Portland, Oregon. He and Joan Kleinman (Research Associate) conducted research on W. H. R. Rivers and the origins of medical anthropology at the University of Cambridge Library, the Library of University College, London, and the Welcome Library of the History of Medicine in London. This research is part of a book he is writing entitled "Where Our World Is Taking Us: The Remaking of Moral Experience in a New Epoch."

Kleinman also chaired a review committee of the Ph.D. Program in Medical Anthropology at the University of California, San Francisco. He is a member of the Committee on Nervous Systems Disorders in the Developing World at the Institute of Medicine, National Academy of Science, which is preparing a major report on this subject. He is Co-Chair of an Institute of Medicine report on adolescent suicide and is participating in the World Health Organization’s first report on world mental health. In October, Violence and Subjectivity, of which he is co-editor, was published by the University of California Press and is the second of three volumes put out by the SSRC Committee on Culture, Health and Human Development. In Spring 2001, Kleinman participated in several ongoing research projects in China, which he co-directs, including an ethnography of rural suicide, a study of how the elderly die (Shanghai), and an ethnography of experiences of depression (Guangzhou).

Prof. C. C. Lamberg-Karlovsky gave the plenary address at the conference “Complex Societies of Central Eurasia in the Third and Second Millennium” at Arkhaim, on the Russian steppes, held from August 25 to September 2, 2000. From January 12 to 16, 2000, he attended and read a paper at the conference “Late Prehistoric Exploitation of the Eurasian Steppes” at Cambridge University. He has recently agreed to serve on the editorial boards of the new journals Eurasia: Archaeology, Ethnology, and Anthropology and Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia. He has been appointed to the Specialists Committee of the Research Center for Ancient Civilization of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, to the Academic Council of the Institute of Cultural Heritage of Turkmenistan and Central Asia, to the Executive Board of the Institute for the Study of Long Term Economic Trends (ISLET), and he was elected as a Life Trustee of the American Schools of Oriental Research. Lamberg-Karlovsky’s recent publications include Beyond the Tigris and Euphrates: Bronze Age Civilizations, Ben Gurion University Press, 1998; “Households, Land Tenure, and Communications Systems in the 6th–4th Millennium of Greater Mesopotamia,” in Urbanization and Land Ownership in the Ancient Near East, eds. M. Hudson and B. Levine, Peabody Museum Bulletin 7, pp. 167–201, Harvard University, 1999; “The Indus Civilization: The Case for Caste Formation,” Journal of East Asian Archaeology, vol. 1, pp. 87–113, 1999; “Colonialism, Nationalism, Ethnicity
and Archaeology,” The Review of Archaeology, 18(4) and 19(1), 1998/99; “The Near Eastern ‘Breakout’ and the Mesopotamian Social Contract” in The Breakout: The Origins of Civilization, ed. M. Lamberg-Karlovsky, Peabody Museum Monographs, no. 9, pp. 13–23, 2000. In the summer of 1999, Prof. Lamberg-Karlovsky initiated a new program of archaeological excavation and survey in Baluchistan, Pakistan. The summer of 2000 was the first season of excavation at the Bronze Age site of Tor Ghundai (Panj Pye), located west of Quetta in Baluchistan. Tor Ghundai is a large site that was inhabited from the seventh to the second millennium B.C. It will be the focus of excavations over the course of the next three summers.


Prof. Moore is preparing an edited book of papers given at the panel “Forming the Future,” at the American Anthropological Association meeting, San Francisco, Nov. 17, 2000, and is continuing work on the history of legal studies in anthropology.


Prof. Emer. Evon Z. Vogt, Jr., gave shipboard lectures on a Harvard Alumni tour to Patagonia in February 2000, which included visits ashore in various fjords in Southern Chile and a good look at Tierra del Fuego from a cruise through the Beagle Channel to Ushuaia, Argentina. On April 28 he was inducted as a member of the American Philosophical Society of Philadelphia. On October 7 to 8 Prof. Vogt attended a symposium at Dumbarton Oaks, “Pilgrimage and Ritual Landscape in Pre-Columbian America,” which was organized by Prof. John B. Carlson, Univ. of Maryland. Vogt was one of the honorees and also presented a paper, “Micro-Pilgrimages to the Mountain and Waterhole Shrines in the Tzotzil-Maya Community of Zinacantan.”


Sarah R. Demb, Archivist, traveled to Copan, Honduras, for a week this May to consult with the archaeological site's research center (CRIA) staff on their library and archives.


Ian Graham, Director of the Maya Corpus Program at the Peabody Museum, has completed a biography, “Alfred Maudslay, the First Maya Archaeologist,” which will be published by British Museum Publications. Future fieldwork includes a short season of work in Chiapas, Mexico.

Barbara Isaac, Assistant Director and Coordinator of Repatriation, organized on behalf of the museum a symposium entitled “A Decade of NAGPRA: Reviewing the Law” on April 14, 2000. Speakers were Dr. Timothy McKeown of the National Park Service, Prof. Keith Kintigh, President of the Society for American Archaeology, and Dr. Joe Watkins, BIA Branch of Land Operations at Anadarko, Oklahoma. Equally distinguished discussants were Alan Ray, Assistant Dean of Harvard Law School; Heather Whiteman Runes Him, a student at Harvard Law School; Allan Ryan, Harvard University attorney; and Bruce Duthu of Vermont Law School. The event was held in the conference room of the Adolphus Busch Hall, which was full to overflowing.

Together with two staff members, Mrs. Isaac attended two sessions of the National Review Committee for NAGPRA: at Salt Lake City, November 1999, and at Juneau, April 2000. On each occasion accountings were given on the museum’s success in meeting the reporting quotas set by the secretary of the committee. Also,
Ian Graham, Director of the Maya Corpus Program at the Peabody Museum, received two honorary degrees, an LL.D. from the University of Dublin in November 2000 and a D.Litt. from Trinity College, Dublin, in December 2000.

A reception was held on June 28 to honor Barbara Isaac, Assistant Director, Repatriation Coordinator, and former head of the Photo Archives Department, for fifteen years of service to the Peabody Museum. Photo by Hillel Burger.

Rubie Watson, William and Muriel Seabury Howells Director of the Peabody Museum, has been appointed Chair of the Smithsonian Institution Council. The council serves as an advisory body to the Secretary of the Smithsonian. Dr. Watson has been a member of the council since 1999.

In Alaska a joint public announcement was made by Cape Fox Corporation and the Peabody Museum about the repatriation of a Tekweidi Kwaan memorial pole to the Corporation.

In June of 2000, Mrs. Isaac was invited by the American Association of Museums to take part in a roundtable to discuss “NAGPRA at 10,” which was reported in Museum News for September/October.


Catherine Linardos is the Editor of Symbols.
**WATERCRAFT REMOVAL**

In order to enhance storage conditions and accessibility of the Peabody Museum’s watercraft collection and to accommodate the reorganization of Herbarium and Botanical Museum collections, last September the Peabody Museum removed 27 watercraft from the Herbarium and Botanical Museum, where they had been stored for over 20 years. The watercraft collection, acquired by the Peabody between 1867 and 1939, includes skin kayaks, birchbark canoes, outriggers, and dugouts from the Arctic, southeastern United States, Northwest Coast, California, New England, Greenland, Thailand, the Solomon Islands, the Philippines, Ecuador, and Mexico.

Most of the watercraft were moved to the third floor of the Peabody Museum building to an environmentally stable storage space. Eleven of the largest and heaviest craft were transported to off-site storage.

---

**RESEARCH PROJECT ON LEWIS AND CLARK ARTIFACTS**

Early this year, the Peabody Museum began a collaborative project with the historic site of Monticello, Thomas Jefferson’s home, and United Tribes Technical College (UTTC) in Bismarck, North Dakota. Native American artists from UTTC will study the Peabody’s Lewis and Clark collection in order to create objects for an exhibit of Jefferson’s “Indian Hall” at Monticello during the upcoming Lewis and Clark bicentennial.

The Peabody has the only surviving Native American objects collected by Lewis and Clark during their epic exploration of the American West from 1804 to 1806, and is collaborating with a number of institutions and tribal representatives to commemorate the bicentennial of the expedition throughout 2003–2006.
NEW EXHIBIT

*Distinguished Casts: Curating Lost Monuments at the Peabody Museum,*

This exhibit features some of the most important and valuable casts from the unique Mesoamerican collection at the Peabody Museum. Dating from the nineteenth century, the Peabody’s cast collection is among the largest in the world and preserves a wealth of hieroglyphic and iconographic information now lost forever on the original monuments. Once used to generate interest in and to inform the public about remote archaeology sites, reproductions like those presented in *Distinguished Casts* provide invaluable information about the cultures and languages of ancient Mesoamerica. Due to rapid environmental erosion or to damage and destruction by vandals of the original monuments in their countries of origin, there is renewed interest in preserving these casts. The exhibit, which highlights the significance and diversity of the Peabody’s collection, emphasizes the importance of conserving these valuable collections.

Curated by Mesoamerican scholars at Harvard University, *Distinguished Casts* is organized in conjunction with several class and seminar offerings in the Department of Anthropology. The casts selected for this exhibit represent canonical Maya and Aztec monuments and sculptures ranging from Honduras to Mexico City. Topics including kingship, ancestor worship, cosmology, communication, and warfare are highlighted.

For the first time in many years, scholars, students, and museum visitors alike will be able to admire and study famous pieces such as the Maya lintel of Yaxchilan, the Aztec turtle from Tenochtitlan, and the Maya tablet from the Temple of the Sun at Palenque. Line drawings and historic photographs complement the casts.

Student Valerie Edmondson working on casts of Maya hieroglyphs for the exhibit *Distinguished Casts: Curating Lost Monuments at the Peabody Museum.*

A lifelike portrait of the Maya king K’inich Kan Balam (Snake Jaguar), from the cast of an eighth-century limestone tablet at Palenque, Mexico. The cast is in the Peabody Museum’s collection. Photo by Barbara Fash.
Barkcloth from the Peabody’s collections is the subject of a forthcoming exhibit, which will open on the museum’s third floor in early February.

Tapa cloth with overall painted design of floral and spider-web motifs, late nineteenth century, Samoan Islands (11-2-70/83930). Photo courtesy of the Peabody Museum Conservation Department.

News from page 15

The Institute of Human Origins honored Richard Wrangham at its annual dinner on November 6, 2000. Wrangham is Professor of Anthropology at Harvard, Trustee of the Jane Goodall Institute, Former MacArthur Foundation Fellow, and Director of the Kibale Chimpanzee Project, Uganda.
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