

Anthropology 426 Spring 2015 Who Owns the Past? T 5:30-8:10 SAB 394
Professor Bettina Arnold

Office and Hours: SAB 229 (Archaeology Lab) M 1:00-3:00 or by appointment.
Tel: 229-4583 or e-mail: barnold@uwm.edu

REQUIRED TEXTS:

Feder, Kenneth L. 2013 ed. *Frauds, Myths, and Mysteries: Science and Pseudoscience in Archaeology*. Mountainview: Mayfield. Pb

ADDITIONAL REQUIRED READINGS on D2L

Selections from various sources, including:

Chatters, James 2002 *Ancient Encounters: Kennewick Man and the First Americans*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Renfrew, Colin 2009 ed. *Loot, Legitimacy and Ownership*. New York: Duckworth.

Vitelli, Karen and Chip Colwell-Chantaphonh 2006 ed. *Archaeological Ethics*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira.

COURSE DESCRIPTION: This course covers the social and political ramifications of the study, interpretation, presentation and conservation of the archaeological past and the institutions involved in those processes, including museums, scholars, members of affiliated ethnic groups and the media. Issues related to the tension between the preservation and conservation of archaeological sites and museum collections and various politically and economically motivated social forces are examined through case studies drawn from both past and present. Recognizing and understanding the complexities involved in these issues are critical skills for anyone living and working in an increasingly politicized and polarized global environment. Why preserve the archaeological past, and in what form? Should prehistoric relics be narrowly conceived or treated in the broader context of all cultural relics? How has the archaeological past been used and abused for political purposes in different historical and cultural contexts? In what ways have administrative policies and ethnocentric attitudes towards indigenous peoples alienated indigenes from anthropologists? How do museums, collections, the restitution of cultural property and the illicit traffic in relics contribute to this situation? What is being done to encourage communication between opposing interested parties in the ongoing struggle for control of the past? Students will read and discuss case studies ranging from the earliest known examples of the curation of ancient objects to the most recent 21st century instances of the looting and appropriation of cultural patrimony.

COURSE OBJECTIVES & STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES:

At the end of this course students should be able to:

- Identify the various stake holders and their respective positions on the way the **archaeological** past is recovered, perceived and valued
- Understand the symbiosis between the study of the **archaeological past** and the politics of contemporary societies
- Comprehend current debates regarding the definition and handling of cultural patrimony
- Critically analyze and be able to deconstruct arguments related to the presentation and interpretation of the **archaeological** past.

EVALUATION AND GRADING:

Workload Statement (Undergraduates): This class meets once a week for a total of 3 hours x 15 weeks = 45 hours of class time. You should expect to spend 5 hours per week (some weeks less, some more) over the course of the semester on required readings = 75 hours and another 30 hours reading and writing the summaries and short paper (undergraduates). All told, this class should take no more than 120 hours of your time, but this is an estimate and may vary depending on how well you are able to read and absorb information and whether you attend the class regularly.

Grade Distribution

Undergraduates:

1. **Two short (5-10 page) papers** (cite at least **3 non-textbook sources!**): **60%**
3. **Summarize three articles from the weekly readings (minimum two pages): 30%**
4. **Attendance and participation: 10%**
5. **Extra Credit: Three points** possible for attendance at **three archaeology-related talks** (see <http://www.uwm.edu/Dept/ArchLab/> for list of on-campus lectures this semester).

Graduate Students:

1. **Two short papers** (see above): **40%**
2. Revise/expand one of the two short papers into a 20+ page **final paper: 40%**
3. **Presentation:** Sources drawn from the **Additional Readings** for that topic: **20%**
4. **Attendance and participation:** Attendance and participation are a given.

	Undergraduate	Graduate
Attendance	10%	-
Paper #1	30%	20%
Paper #2	30%	20%
Article Summaries	30%	-
Final Paper	-	40%
Presentation	-	20%
TOTAL	100%	100%

Grade Scale

Final grades will be based on the percentage of total possible points earned throughout the semester. Grades will be assigned according to the following scale:

Percentage	Grade	Percentage	Grade
93-100%	A	73-76%	C
90-92%	A-	70-72%	C-
87-89%	B+	67-69%	D+
83-86%	B	63-66%	D
80-82%	B-	60-62%	D-
77-79%	C+	< 60%	F

GENERAL POLICIES:

Penalty for late assignments: One point per day. If you will be unable to turn in an assignment on time because of special circumstances, *you must talk to me in person at least two days before the due date.*

Cheating, plagiarism, or any other form of academic dishonesty will not be tolerated. The following web page provides more information about your rights and responsibilities as a student: www.uwm.edu/Dept/SecU/SyllabusLinks.pdf. Please contact me as soon as possible if you require any special accommodations in order to complete the requirements for this course.

TOPICS AND DUE DATES:

Weeks 1-3: **Fantastic Archaeology: Life on the Fringe**
Text: Feder *Frauds, Myths, and Mysteries* (whole text)

Weeks 4-6: **The Politics of the Past**
Text: Vitelli *Archaeological Ethics* Chapters 9-13
Graduate Student Presentations begin February 23!

Weeks 7-9: **Bones of Contention: Reburial and Repatriation**
Text: Chatters *Kennewick Man* (whole text)
Vitelli *Archaeological Ethics* Chapters 14, 16, 18-21
1ST SHORT PAPER DUE: March 9 (in class)

Weeks 10-12: **Looting, Collecting and Legislation**
Text: Renfrew *Loot, Legitimacy and Ownership* (whole text)
Vitelli *Archaeological Ethics* Chapters 1-8, 15, 17

Weeks 13-15: **Presenting the Past: Archaeology and the Public**
Text: Vitelli *Archaeological Ethics* Chapters 21-23
2ND SHORT PAPER DUE: April 20

Graduate Students: FINAL PAPER DRAFT DUE: April 20 (in class)
FINAL PAPER DUE: Monday May 11 in my office at 12:00 noon!!

Additional Reading Schedule: Articles marked * are required. Those not marked are also available on D2L and may be read and cited in writing article summaries and/or papers.

September 6-20: Fantastic Archaeology

*1. Arnold, Bettina. 2006 Pseudoarchaeology and nationalism. In Garrett G. Fagan (ed.), *Archaeological Fantasies: How Pseudoarchaeology Misrepresents the Past and Misleads the Public*, pp. 154-179. London: Routledge.

*4. Chippindale, Christopher. 1986 Stoned Henge: events and issues at the summer solstice, 1985. *World Archaeology* 18(1):38-58.

*5. Wallis, Robert J. and Jenny Blain. 2003 Sites, sacredness, and stories: interactions of archaeology and contemporary paganism. *Folklore* 114(3):307-321. (Read with Chippindale)

*6. Quaife, Milo M. 1934 The myth of the Kensington Runestone: the Norse discovery of Minnesota 1362. *The New England Quarterly* 7(4):613-645.

*7. Michlovic, Michael G. 1990 Folk archaeology in anthropological perspective. *Current Anthropology* 31(1):103-107. (Read with Quaife.)

Short Paper Option: Choose an example of "fantastic" or "cult" archaeology. What makes this particular case study an example of "pseudo-science"? Discuss the characteristics of "pseudo-archaeology" with reference to this example. How do you think professional archaeologists should respond to fantastic archaeology? How is "professional archaeology" different from the approach taken in the example you have chosen? How would you define "professional archaeology" vs. "pseudo-archaeology"?

Sept. 27-Oct.11: The Politics of the Past

General

*1. Trigger, Bruce. 1984 Alternative archaeologies: Nationalist, colonialist, imperialist. *Man* N.S. 19: 355-370.

2a. Arnold, Bettina. 2002 Justifying genocide: archaeology and the construction of difference. In *Annihilating Difference: the Anthropology of Genocide*, edited by Alexander L. Hinton, pp. 95-116 Berkeley: University of California Press.

2b. Arnold, Bettina. 2004 Dealing with the devil: the Faustian bargain of archaeology under dictatorship. In *Archaeology Under Dictatorship*, edited by Michael Galaty and Charles Watkinson, pp. 191-212. New York: Kluwer/Plenum.

*3. Kohl, Philip L. 1998 Nationalism and archaeology: on the constructions of nations and the reconstructions of the remote past. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 27:223-46.

Case Studies

1. Anthony, David W. 1995 Nazi and eco-feminist prehistories: counter-points in Indo-European archaeology. In P. Kohl and C. Fawcett (eds) *Nationalism, Politics, and the Practice of Archaeology*, pp. 82-96. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

*2a. Arnold, Bettina. 1990 The past as propaganda: totalitarian archaeology in Nazi Germany. *Antiquity* 64:464-78. (Germany)

2b. Arnold, Bettina 2006 "Arierdämmerung": Race and Archaeology in Nazi Germany. *World Archaeology* 38 (1): 8-31. (Germany)

*3. Diaz-Andreu, Margarita. 1993 Theory and ideology in archaeology: Spanish archaeology under the Franco regime. *Antiquity* 67:74-82. (Spain)

*4. Exhumation of Federico Garcia Lorca (Read with Diaz-Andreu)

a. Tremlett, Giles 2003 Exhumation may let a poet's bones speak. *The Guardian*, Saturday 6 September 2003 09.59 BST. guardian.co.uk

- b. Hannan, Daniel 2009 Lorca's skeleton speaks of a new Spain. *The Telegraph*, 29 August 2009, BST 6:12PM. telegraph.co.uk
- c. Fraga, Xesús 2010 Recovering the lost graves of the Spanish Civil War. *Planet* 198.
4. Dietler, Michael 1994 "Our Ancestors the Gauls": Archaeology, ethnic nationalism and the manipulation of Celtic identity in modern Europe. *American Anthropologist* 96(3):584-605. (France)
5. Edwards, Walter. 2003 Monuments to an unbroken line: the Imperial tombs and the emergence of modern Japanese nationalism. In Susan Kane (ed.) *The Politics of Archaeology and Identity in a Global Context*, pp. 11-30. Boston, MA: Archaeological Institute of America. (Japan)
6. Hamilakis, Yannis and Eleana Yalouri. 1996 Antiquities as symbolic capital in modern Greek society. *Antiquity* 70:117-129. (Greece)
7. Kelly, John D. 2000 Nature, natives and nations: Glorification and asymmetries in museum representation, Fiji and Hawaii. *Ethnos* 65(2): 172-194. (Hawaii)
- *8. Ratnagar, Shereen 2004 Archaeology at the heart of a political confrontation. *Current Anthropology* 45(2):239-259. (India)
9. Abu el-Haj, Nadia 1998 Translating truths: nationalism, the practice of archaeology, and the remaking of past and present in contemporary Jerusalem. *American Ethnologist* 25(2):166-188. (Israel)
- *10. Wernick, Robert 2004 In search of William Tell. *Smithsonian* August 2004:72-78. (Switzerland)
11. McManamon, Francis P. 2003 Archaeology, nationalism, and North America. In Susan Kane (ed.) *The Politics of Archaeology and Identity in a Global Context*, pp. 115-137. Boston, MA: Archaeological Institute of America. (North America)

Short Paper Option: Why do you think archaeological research lends itself particularly well to political manipulation? How important a role do you think archaeological research plays and has played in recent political events? Do you think the symbiotic relationship between archaeology and politics is good or bad or both? Cite specific examples from the reading to support your conclusions.

Oct. 18-Nov. 1: Bones of Contention: Reburial and Repatriation

Reburial and Repatriation: U.S.

Note: There is a lot of reading on this topic! Be sure you get a balanced perspective on the subject (i.e. skim articles and choose several that present different views on the subjects of reburial and repatriation).

- *1. McGhee, Robert 2008 Aboriginalism and the problems of indigenous archaeology. *American Antiquity* 73(4):579-597.

- *2. Wilcox, Michael 2010 Saving indigenous peoples from ourselves: separate but equal archaeology is not scientific archaeology. *American Antiquity* 75(2):221-227. (Read with McGhee)
3. Biolsi, Thomas and Larry J. Zimmerman (eds) 1997 *Indians and Anthropologists: Vine Deloria and the Critique of Anthropology*. Chapters 4 and 5 (articles by Randall McGuire and Larry Zimmerman). Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- *4. Deloria, Vine Jr. 1992 Indians, archaeologists and the future. *American Antiquity* 57(4):595-598. (Read with Meighan)
- *5. Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip 2003 Signs in place: Native American perspectives of the past in the San Pedro Valley of southeastern Arizona. *Kiva* 69(1):5-29.
- *6. Echo-Hawk, Roger C. Exploring ancient worlds. *SAA Bulletin* 11(4):5-6.
- *7. Mason, Ronald J. 2000 Archaeology and native North American oral traditions. *American Antiquity* 65(2):239-266. (Read with Echo-Hawk)
- *8. Manier, Jeremy. 1997 The clash of fact and faith. 1997. *Chicago Tribune* Nov. 30, 1997: 1, 10.
9. McGuire, Randall H. 1992 Archaeology and the first Americans. *American Anthropologist* 94(4):816-836.
- *10. Meighan, Clement W. 1992 Some scholars' views on reburial. *American Antiquity* 57(4):704-710. (Read with Deloria 1992)
11. Monroe, Dan L. and Walter Echo-Hawk. 1991 Deft deliberations. *Museum News* July/August 1991: 55-58.
12. Belsaw, April M. Memory, identity and NAGPRA in the Northeastern United States. *American Anthropologist* 112(2):244-256.
- *13. Morell, Virginia 1994 An anthropological culture shift. *Science* 264 April 1, 1994, pp. 20-22.
- *14. Nicholas, George 2004 What do I really want from a relationship with Native Americans? *The SAA Archaeological Record* May 2004: 29-33.
15. Peerman, Dean. 1990 Bare bones imbroglio: Repatriating Indian remains and sacred artifacts. *The Christian Century* October 17, 1990:935-937.
16. Roth, Evan. 1991 Success stories. *Museum News* January/February 1991:41-45.
17. Trigger, Bruce 1980 Archaeology and the image of the American Indian. *American Antiquity* 45(4):662-676.
- *18. Watkins, Joe 2000 Writing unwritten history. *Archaeology* November/December 2000:36-41.

*19. Watkins, Joe 2000 *Indigenous Archaeology: American Indian Values and Scientific Practice*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira. Read pp. 1-22.

20. Chapters in Zimmerman, Larry J., Karen D. Vitelli and Julie Hollowell-Zimmer 2003 *Ethical Issues in Archaeology*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira.

Reburial and Repatriation: Australia

*1. Finkel, Elizabeth. 1997 Native claims muddy waters in fight over Australian lake. *Science* 278:1556-1557.

*2. Jones, D. Gareth and Robyn J. Harris. 1997 Contending for the dead. *Nature* 386:15-16. March 6 1997.

*3. Lewin, Roger. 1984 Extinction threatens Australian anthropology. *Science* Vol. 225:393-394.

*4. Mulvaney, D.J. 1991 Past regained, future lost: the Kow Swamp prehistoric burials. *Antiquity* 65:12-21.

*5. Mulvaney, D.J. 1990. Bones of contention. *The Bulletin* October 9, 1990. pp. 104-106.

*6. Smith, Laurajane 2004 The repatriation of human remains – problem or opportunity? *Antiquity* 78(300): 404-413.

*7. Webb, S. Reburying Australian skeletons. 1987 *Antiquity* 61:292-6. 1987.

*8. Zimmerman, L.J. 1987 Webb on reburial: a North American perspective. *Antiquity* 61:462-463.

Short Paper Option: Discuss the main issues involved in the conflicted relationship between many archaeologists, anthropologists and aboriginal communities in the U.S. and Australia (other examples also possible). Be sure to present the various perspectives on this issue. Address the question of the ethics of excavating burials. What kinds of things do you think could/should be done to resolve some of the conflicts? What could anthropologists do? What could aboriginal peoples or other groups opposed to the excavation, study and display of human remains do? Do you feel the U.S. and Australian (or other examples) conflicts are comparable? How are they different? How are they similar? How do you think people (Native Americans, anthropologists, general public) will view the resolution of the reburial issue fifty years from now?

November 8-22: Looting, Collecting and Legislation

*1. Fitz Gibbon, Kate 2005 Chronology of cultural property legislation. In Kate Fitzgibbon (ed.) *Who Owns the Past? Cultural Policy, Cultural Property, and the Law*, pp. 3-8. New Brunswick, New Jersey, and London: Rutgers University Press.

*2. Vincent, Stephen 2005 Indian givers. In Kate Fitzgibbon (ed.) *Who Owns the Past? Cultural Policy, Cultural Property, and the Law*, pp. 33-43. New Brunswick, New Jersey, and London: Rutgers University Press.

- *3. Abungu, George O. 2001 Examples from Kenya and Somalia. In Neil Brodie, Jennifer Doole and Colin Renfrew (eds.) *Trade in Illicit Antiquities: the Destruction of the World's Heritage*, pp. 37-46. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
4. Gilgan, Elizabeth 2001 Looting and the market for Maya objects: a Belizean perspective. In Neil Brodie, Jennifer Doole and Colin Renfrew (eds.) *Trade in Illicit Antiquities: the Destruction of the World's Heritage*, pp. 73-87. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
5. Veletta Canouts and Francis P. McManamon 2001 Protecting the past for the future: federal archaeology in the United States. In Neil Brodie, Jennifer Doole and Colin Renfrew (eds.) *Trade in Illicit Antiquities: the Destruction of the World's Heritage*, pp. 97-110. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
6. Wills, Eric 2010 The inside man: going undercover to protect the nation's public lands. *Preservation: The Magazine of the National Trust for Historic Preservation* January/February 2010, pp. 16-23.
7. Arden, Harvey. 1989 Who owns our past? *National Geographic* 175(3):376-393.
8. Landesman, Peter 2001 The curse of the Sevso Silver. *Atlantic Monthly* 288(4):63-90.
- *9. Brent, Michel 1996 A view inside the illicit trade in African antiquities. In *Plundering Africa's Past*, edited by Peter Schmidt and Roderick McIntosh, pp. 63-78. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- *10. Garen, Micah 2004 The war within the war: in southern Iraq specialized troops pursue looters. *Archaeology* July/August: 28-31.
- *11. Gill, David. 1997 Sotheby's, sleaze and subterfuge: Inside the antiquities trade. Review of Peter Watson's 1997 *Sotheby's: The Inside Story*. *Antiquity* 71(1997):468-71.
12. Hamilakis, Yannis. 1999 Stories from exile: Fragments from the cultural biography of the Parthenon (or 'Elgin') marbles. *World Archaeology* 31(2): 303-320.
- *13. Neary, John. Project "Sting". *Archaeology* September/October 1993: 52-59.
14. Rose, Mark and Özgen Acar. 1995 Turkey's War on the Illicit Antiquities Trade. *Archaeology* March/April 1995: 45-56.
15. Sandler, Lauren 2004 The thieves of Baghdad. *Atlantic Monthly* November 2004, pp. 175-182.
- *16. Staley, David. The antiquities market. 1993 *Journal of Field Archaeology* 20(3)(1993):347-355.

Short Paper Option: This topic deals with the demands and agendas of a number of different groups: 1) Museums 2) Looters (within and outside the U.S.) 3) Dealers in antiquities, whether within or outside the U.S. 4) Collectors 5) Indigenous peoples (sometimes also members of groups 1-4). The interests of these groups often conflict. Choose a particular venue (United States, Central America, South America, any other nation or group of nations discussed in the reading or that you are able to

identify on your own). Present the problem of looting, dealing and legislating the traffic in antiquities in the context you have chosen. Do you think collecting antiquities is defensible? Would you limit or regulate such collecting in this country? If so, how? Should the U.S. allow antiquities of questionable origin to be brought into the country legally? Do you think collectors "protect" the past? What do you think motivates collecting? What would you do to improve/solve the looting and antiquities trafficking problems in this country? Do you think legal measures in place today are stringent enough? What would you do to change them? What can be done about the looting of archaeological sites in other countries?

November 29-December 13: Presenting the Past: Archaeology and the Public

*1. Holtorf, Cornelius 2005 Beyond crusades: how (not) to engage with alternative archaeologies. *World Archaeology* 37(4):544-551.

*2. Fagan, Garrett G. and Kenneth L. Feder 2006 Crusading against straw men: an alternative view of alternative archaeologies: response to Holtorf (2005). *World Archaeology* 38(4):718-729. (Read with Holtorf)

*3. Hale, Christopher The Atlantean box. In Garrett G. Fagan (ed.) *Archaeological Fantasies*, pp. 235-258. London: Routledge.

*4. Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip 2010 Fascination and terror. *Current Anthropology* 51(3):445-446.

*5. Addyman, Peter V. 1990 Reconstruction as interpretation: the example of the Jorvik Viking Center, York. In *The Politics of the Past*. pp. 255-264.

6. James, N. 2008 Repatriation, display and interpretation. *Antiquity* 82:770-777.

7. Levy, Janet 2006 Prehistory, identity, and archaeological representation in Nordic museums. *American Anthropologist* 108(1):135-147.

*8. Blakey, Michael. 1990 American nationality and ethnicity in the depicted past. In *The Politics of the Past*, pp. 38-47.

9. Chapters in Brown, Thomas 2003 *Who Owns Native Culture?* Cambridge: Harvard University Press. **(On 2-day Library Reserve)**

*10. Bonyhady, Tim and Tom Griffiths 1996 The making of a public intellectual. In Bonyhady, Tim and Tom Griffiths (eds) *Prehistory to Politics: John Mulvaney, the Humanities and the Public Intellectual*, pp. 1-19. Victoria: Melbourne University Press.

*11. Fagan, Brian. Archaeology and the wider audience. 1984. In *Ethics and Values in Archaeology*. pp. 175-183.

*12. Ford, Richard I. 1984 Ethics and the museum archaeologist. 1984 In *Ethics and Values in Archaeology*, edited by Ernestene L. Green, pp. 133-142. New York: Macmillan.

13. Gero, Joan and Dolores Root. 1990 Public presentations and private concerns: archaeology in the pages of National Geographic. In *The Politics of the Past*, pp. 19-37.

*14. Hanson, Allan. 1989 The making of the Maori: Culture invention and its logic. *American Anthropologist* 91:890-902.

*15. Nicholas, George P. and Kelly P. Bannister 2004 Copyrighting the past? Emerging intellectual property rights issues in archaeology. *Current Anthropology* 45(3): 327-350.

16. Skinner, S. Alan. 1994 Archaeological integrity: Mercenaries, weasel words and privatization. *SOPA Newsletter* 18(3):1-6.

*17. Stoddart, Simon and Caroline Malone. 2001 Editorial on Archaeology and the Media. *Antiquity* 75: 459-86.

18. Stone, Peter G. 1997 Presenting the past: a framework for discussion. In John H. Jameson, Jr. (ed.) *Presenting Archaeology to the Public: Digging for Truths*, pp. 23-34. Walnut Creek: AltaMira.

19. Trigger, Bruce. 1986 Prospects for a world archaeology. *World Archaeology* 18(1):1-20.

Short Paper Options: 1) Go through the last five years of a journal that covers archaeological topics and carry out an analysis of the contents of its articles, photographs and presentation along the lines of the Gero and Root article. Some relevant magazines might be: *Natural History*, *Smithsonian*, *Scientific American*, and *Nature*. 2) Check out a local museum exhibit that deals with archaeological data; try the Milwaukee Public Museum or the Field Museum in Chicago. Again, you should analyze and critique the displays: discuss label copy, choice of material on display (vs. what sorts of things were not chosen), coherence and continuity within the exhibit, and whether you feel the exhibit is effective in getting its message across to the public. Identify the message, if you think there is one, and the target audience. 3) Choose an example of "archaeological fiction", in the form of a film or book aimed either at adults or at children. Critique the piece, paying particular attention to the accuracy of the information presented and the effectiveness of the presentation style. You can choose either a particularly good or a particularly bad example (or compare two examples), but be prepared to justify your choice(s). Suggest ways in which such fictional treatment of archaeological data can be both true to its source material and entertaining. Consider the following questions in your paper: Do you think it is feasible, desirable or necessary for all professional anthropologists to strive toward promoting and preserving a "global prehistory"? Looking back at what you have read in previous sections this quarter, have you changed your opinion of what archaeologists do, and for whom they do it? Is there, or will there ever be, a "One World Archaeology"? What do you think archaeology's social and political role will be in the decades to come? Insignificant? Vitaly important? Controlled by nationalistic regimes? Controlled by profit motives? Can archaeologists afford to abdicate all control over the way in which the past is interpreted and made use of? What do you think the result will be if they do?

SHORT PAPER GUIDELINES: FORMATTING

1. All papers **must** be typed (computer or typewriter), with 1" margins and either 10 or 12 point font **only!** All papers must be **double-spaced!** **Paginate all pages beginning with page 2!**

2. All short papers **must** have a title and a bibliography, and must be **five pages** minimum. You must cite **at least ten sources**. If you choose a specific example or case study from the readings to discuss, you will still be expected to refer to relevant reading not directly associated with the topic you have chosen. This is meant to ensure that you get more than just a one-sided perspective on what are complex problems/concepts.

3. When citing sources within the text of your papers, the following rules apply:

Sources which are part of the assigned reading should consist of the author's last name (first initial if there are two authors being cited in the paper with the same last name) followed by the year of the publication, a colon and the page number(s). (This is the standard procedure in anthropological publications). Quotation marks should be used where appropriate, as in the examples below.

Example #1: "The moon is made of green cheese" (McDonald 89:123).

Example #2: According to Williams, the moon is made of fried green tomatoes (1988:19-23).

4. If you have experienced a burst of energy and ambition and have done some additional reading not assigned in the syllabus (unlikely but not impossible), then you should cite the authors as above.

5. You should include a References Cited with all citations at the end of your papers!! Use a standardized format appropriate to anthropological publications. *American Antiquity* or *American Anthropologist* style are good examples, but I'll accept others as long as you are consistent.

FINAL PAPER (Graduate Students Only): Final papers must be a minimum of **20 pages**. You are expected to explore one of the course themes further in the final paper. This includes a) citations from the reading and b) original ideas/thoughts/opinions, backed up by cogent arguments. You must cite **at least 20 sources** in constructing your argument. You may expand one of your Short Papers for your Final paper.

ARTICLE SUMMARY GUIDELINES (Undergrads only)

1. Summaries **must be typed** (computer or typewriter).

2. Summaries **must be at least TWO pages** long. **Paginate all pages beginning with Page 2!**

3. Summaries **must be double-spaced**. (I need to be able to write comments, so make sure **margins are 1" all around**, no more, no less.)

4. Cite **at least TWO** sources in your summary that relates to the article you are discussing. Only **one** of these can be a Web source, and you must cite the URL and author in the bibliography. **NOT ALL WEB SITES ARE CREATED EQUAL!** How to evaluate Web sites found on the Internet:
<http://www.uwm.edu/letsci/edison/webevaluation/>

5. You must include all references cited at the end of the paper (see Short Paper Guidelines and Reading Schedule for formatting).

6. Be sure to:

- a. Provide a brief synopsis of the arguments presented in the article you have chosen to summarize.
- b. Evaluate the arguments presented critically, citing additional readings (this may include textbook or e-Reserve readings but must involve at least two sources).
- c. Are you convinced by the arguments made by the author? If not, why not? Justify your response.

The course is structured to give you a maximum amount of writing experience. The article summary/short paper format ensures that at least some of the work will be done throughout the semester rather than in a mad rush three days before the last day of classes. Good luck! Contact me at barnold@uwm.edu if you have any questions.

WRITING CENTER INFORMATION: The Writing Center in Curtin 127 and a satellite location in the East Wing of the Library welcomes writers from any discipline, at all skill levels, inexperienced through advanced, freshmen through graduate students. No matter where students are in a task, whether still exploring a reading, brainstorming, drafting or revising, they can benefit from talking to one of our well-qualified and trained tutors. Call 229-4339, make appointments online 24/7: www.writingcenter.uwm.edu, or walk in. Writers can make their own 30 or 60 minute appointments on the website or simply walk in to CRT 127 or the Library to see if a tutor is immediately available. Open until 7:00 pm Mon-Wed nights. Synchronous online tutoring is also an option via the website: www.writingcenter.uwm.edu.

Fall 2010 WRITING CENTER HOURS:
Monday-Wednesday 9:00 am - 7:00 pm
Thursday 9:00 am - 4:00 pm
Friday 9:00 am - 1:00 pm