tions. This combination forces scholars to look more closely at human nature in relation to society rather than merely in relation to some abstract sentence structures. I would hope that these trends will continue, both because I think they are important and because of my personal interest in them since 1954. That interest may be seen in my holistic approach to language and society and, more recently, philosophy. I believe that an understanding of people (important to anthropologists) involves an integrated view of people with garbage, with government, with family, and with thought. I hope that this will develop holistically over the next millennium! [If not, why should we choose to lose interest in people in favor of abstract math?]

AK: I have always considered myself a linguistic anthropologist or an anthropological linguist [in the tradition of Franz Boas, Edward Sapir, and the latter’s many prolific students, some of whom were my own teachers]. How close do you view your own work, as well as the contributions of your contemporaries such as Joseph H. Greenberg or Dell H. Hymes (two linguistic anthropologists who have accomplished much in very long careers), to have been a part of linguistic anthropology in the Sapirian tradition? Also, is the genre of scholarship going to survive, considering the Chomskyan revolution in theoretical formal linguistics?

KP: Ever since I studied with Sapir in the summer of 1937, I have felt closely allied to his approach differentiating phonemic from phonetic likenesses [notice my 28 references to him in the index to my 1967 volume]. These principles are too deeply ingrained in human nature to be forever bypassed [even by a revolutionary approach which is for the moment ignoring them while making, also, an enduring contribution to the discipline]. Scholars will either “reinvent the wheel” or return to them indirectly in some form. They are already doing so in relation to text linguistics, for example, and in noting the cognitive relevance to language background. It is important to realize, however, that such changes are not just circular, coming back to the same starting point, but [as I said in 1991] rather simultaneously circling around while traveling upward in a helix.

Anthropologists have joined in this upward-circular struggle. This can be seen in the work of Dundes [1962], treating folktales in relation to etics and emics, and in the work of Hymes, which includes narrative structure, speech acts, and conversational inference and considers them “not matters of anthropology and linguistics alone” [Hymes 1990:125]. I am delighted to see the growth of the joint field both where I would have hoped for it and where I would never have imagined its contribution.
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Despite unstable political conditions and economic hardship and the difficulties these presented for scholar-
ship, the Seventh International Conference on Hunting and Gathering Societies (CHAGS-7) was held in Moscow August 18–22, 1993, and seems to have been a success, thus rewarding the enthusiasm of its organizers. The field of hunter-gatherer studies has changed considerably since the first conferences of the 1960s (Shnirelman 1990, Smith 1991); approaches, themes, and goals have altered significantly. At least some hunter-gatherer societies have proved more resistant to change than was once believed, and rapid industrialization and the emergence of postindustrial societies have stimulated a search for alternative pathways for humanity and caused scholars to look at their subject from quite a different angle.

In the beginning, analysis of the variation in economic and social systems among hunter-gatherers predominated, with strong emphasis on adaptation to the local environment, relationships with neighboring food-producing communities, and correlations between tradition and innovation. Over time new topics emerged, among them demographic changes, conflict, gender, symbolic systems, and behavioral patterns and, increasingly, the status of hunter-gatherers within modern plural societies, their relations with political institutions, their incorporation into a modern market economy and its consequences, and their struggle for land rights. The last of these problems is of special importance, and it is no accident that a whole symposium was devoted to it at CHAGS-6. The notion that hunter-gatherers had no concept of land rights was long used to legitimate the predatory appropriation of the land of indigenous populations, and while this notion is a thing of the past in the West it is still being promoted in Russia (Artemova 1992, 1993). The loss of traditional cultures and original languages has become a serious problem. Having lost their heritage, many hunter-gatherers find themselves unwilling or unable to adapt to the new environments created by alien cultures, and alcoholism, drug use, and antisocial behavior including incest, homicide, and suicide are increasing among them.

Concern over these problems was reflected in the conference program. Sessions were devoted to (1) the impact of the state and indigenous peoples’ responses [chaired by Robert K. Hitchcock and Zoya P. Sokolova, the latter unable to attend because of illness], (2) ecological and demographic issues [chaired by Alexander I. Pika and Eric A. Smith], (3) the changing role of gender [chaired by Pierrette Dezy and Sofia Marcetina, the latter being absent], (4) aggressive behavior and peacemaking [chaired by Polly Wiessner and Victor A. Shnirelman], and (5) symbolic and spiritual aspects [chaired by Sergei A. Arutunov and Tim Ingold]. Some 70 scholars participated in the conference. The largest groups came from the U.S.A., Canada, and Australia; smaller numbers came from England, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Italy, Finland, Japan, India, Tanzania, South Africa, and Argentina. Russia was represented by some 30 scholars, primarily from Moscow. Representatives of the indigenous peoples of Russia themselves were unable to participate for economic reasons; Yevdokija A. Gaer, a scholar and politician of Nanai origin, was the only person present who could express their position.

As might have been expected, the first and last sessions were the most popular; more than 20 papers were presented in each. The sessions on ecology and aggression contained 18 and 15 papers respectively and the session on gender 8. The numbers reflected the somehow different emphases of Russian and Western studies in an interesting way. The second, fourth, and fifth sessions were well balanced in terms of Russian and Western participation; Russians were all but absent from the first and the third. It is worth mentioning that gender problems were widely discussed among Russian ethnographers from the 1920s to the 1950s and thereafter lost their appeal because their conclusions did not correspond to the Soviet bureaucracy’s view of what was going on in the country. Problems of warfare and aggression have never been addressed by Soviet/Russian ethnographers, but several scholars did respond positively to the invitation to take part in that session—probably because of the high level of conflict, in particular interethnic conflict, in Russia today.

It is a pity that Russians were far from active in the first session. For several years the political, economic, and cultural rights of the small communities of the North have been receiving serious attention from the Russian mass media, academics, and the indigenous peoples themselves, and some Russian academics are in fact engaged in the preparation of new Northern legislation. The speakers in this session argued that the efforts of many governments, including those of the Third World, to modernize, to exploit local natural resources (wood, natural gas, oil, minerals), and to establish national parks are radically altering the traditional ways of life of indigenous peoples, forcing them to become sedentary and restricting their traditional areas. The drastic socio-economic changes attendant on this process include an increase in wage labor and level of education and a loss of original languages, values, and traditions. This process was documented for the San of Botswana and Namibia [by Hitchcock and Bieseke], the Hadza and Dorobo of Tanzania [by Ndagala and Kaare], tribal populations of India [by Venkatesan, Prakash Reddy, and Mann], the Tsimshian of British Columbia [by McDonald], and the Ainu of Japan [by Irimoto]. As a rule the results are poverty and stress. Volker von Bremen showed, however, that among the Ayoreode of northwestern Paraguay a number of traditional patterns have survived the economic and social changes associated with colonization.

Debra Schindler presented a comparative study of the small communities of the Russian North focusing on their chances of survival in the emerging market economy. David Anderson discussed the Evenks’ informal political movement for collective rights, presenting it as

3. Linda J. Ellanna and Richard Lee were my coorganizers, and Valery Tishkov was convener. The organizing committee included Pierrette Dezy, Robert K. Hitchcock, Fred Myers, Peter Schweitzer, Eric A. Smith, and Polly Wiessner. The conference staff consisted of Irina Babich and Tracie Cogdill.
a useful model for aboriginal populations elsewhere but expressing concern over its prospects in a Russia under monopoly capitalism. Indeed, judging from world history, the emergence of capitalism, especially the primary accumulation of capital, has been a heavy burden for indigenous communities, which have often experienced persecution, forced resettlement, ethnoicide, and sometimes genocide in the process. This threat must now be recognized in Russia (see Shnirelman 1993). Sergei Sokolovsky stressed the need for improvements in national and international law on the rights of indigenous peoples. He argued for clearer definitions of individual and collective rights (which often contradict each other) and of “indigenous people” and “territorial autonomy” and for clarification of the status of the traditionally exploited territory that is critical for indigenous peoples’ survival. Olga Gostin pointed to conflicts between the aims of the Green movement and Australian Aborigines’ interests with regard to hunting, exploitation of mineral resources, and archaeological research. Peter Schweitzer compared trends in Russian and Western hunter-gatherer studies over time.

In the ecology session, Kenneth Good and Matthew Spriggs offered an affirmative answer to the widely debated question whether hunter-gatherers could have survived without horticulture in the humid tropical forest, Spriggs pointing to new archaeological data from the Bismarck Archipelago and the Solomon Islands, first settled more than 30,000 years ago (i.e., obviously by nonfarmers). The rest of the papers in this session dealt primarily with the consequences for hunter-gatherers of modernization. The indigenous groups of the Andaman Islands are dying out (Sudarsen); the Agta of Luzon are threatened by the loss of their cultural identity in the face of a mass invasion of newcomers (Earley, Thomas and Janet Headland); the demographic picture is a matter of concern with regard to the Mansi of western Siberia (Pivneva) and the Saami of the Kola Peninsula (Ivanova). A high death rate due to alcohol-related accidents is characteristic of indigenous populations all over the North (Bogoyavlensky). Homicide and suicide are widespread, especially among younger men (Ivanova). Ecological conditions are worsening in many northern areas because of industrial development (Lukyanchenko on the Kola Saami).

There are, of course, some cases of skillful adaptation to new environmental trends. For instance, the decline of the caribou population in the Banks Islands caused the Inuvialuit Inuit to shift first to musk-ox hunting and then, in 1990, to commercial herding of musk-oxen. At the same time, the modern situation of many indigenous peoples, especially in Russia, calls for government intervention to ensure their survival. Olga Murashko proposed the notion of special legislation aimed at maintaining these peoples’ traditional territories (as “ecological refugia”) and modes of exploitation of those territories. One problem with this is that Russia has only a few well-trained scholars who could lay the groundwork for such legislation, since ecological anthropology is still underdeveloped here.

Problems of modernization were discussed in the gender session as well, and here the changes identified were far from uniform. Sedentarization and the introduction of an incipient food-producing economy seem to have resulted in a transition from egalitarianism to a somewhat depressed position for women among the Agta (Bion Griffin) and the San (Kent, Lee). The opposite has been observed among the Aborigines of the Western Desert (Tonkinson), and among the Yup’ik and Inuit of Alaska women are now very active in local politics and trade (Zane Jolles, Linda Ellanna). Ellanna argued that women’s role among the Inuit in former times had been undervalued and that the problem of women as economic managers in traditional societies deserved more attention.

The papers of the session on aggression and peace-making dealt with such fundamental phenomena of human culture as attitudes toward strangers, the role of behavioral stereotypes in the maintenance of human relationships, including special cultural concepts promoting control of aggression, the management of conflict in various cultural settings, the character and results of peacemaking, the equipment, tactics, and leadership of armed conflict, and the role of magic and religion in conflict development and resolution. It was pointed out that the Jahai of the Malacca Peninsula (van der Suyss) and the Aka Pygmies of the Central African forest (Bahuget) avoid expressing anger for fear of irritating the spirits and causing misfortune. Case studies among the Agta (M. Griffin) and the Inuit (Briggs, Condon) suggest that traditional means of conflict avoidance/resolution lose their effectiveness with sedentarization, increase in community size, decline of the role of kinship, economic differentiation, and the consequent increase in the variety of individual interests and weakening of band solidarity.

The Russian contributions on traditional warfare patterns and military organization among the Ob’ Ugrians and the Neten (Chindina, Golonnev, Vasilyev), the Chukchees and the Koryaks (Battanova), and the Amur River valley peoples (Smoliak) were of great interest to participants in that they called for modification of popular concepts in the anthropological work. For instance, warfare among these populations was more like that characteristic of early farmers than like that of the Australian Aborigines or the San. For the Russians themselves, the session revealed the promising prospects of a new field of study.

The fifth session was the largest and richest, and it must suffice here to list the main subjects considered: a bear cult among various peoples of Siberia (Alexeenko, Kim, Novikova) and Canada (Scott); prestige totemism on the Northwest Coast of North America (Grinev); the social role of rock art among San in a contact situation (Dowson); the role of local ideology in the identity of indigenous peoples under modernization (Woodburn), especially in legitimating resistance to the expansion of alien culture among the Cree (Feit) and the Inuit (Turner); the transformation of name-giving and its meaning among San under contact conditions (Widlok);
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Establishing the earliest documented evidence for human occupation has always involved controversy, usually centred upon the *artefactual character of an assemblage and/or its chronological position*. Examples are such controversial cases as Brixham Cave, the colith problem, the Calico Hills, the KBS-tuff controversy, and, very recently, the age of a newly discovered *Homo erectus* skull from Java. Our field thrives on such disagreements, discussions (ideally) test the strength of data and hypotheses and thus provide us with constant fresh and solid ground on which to build our archaeological theories.

The field of European Palaeolithic archaeology has recently been deeply ploughed. A group of 22 Palaeolithic archaeologists and representatives of other disciplines met on November 19 and 20, 1993, at the Centre Européen de Recherches Préhistoriques at Tautavel [France] for a workshop on the earliest occupation of Europe. This meeting was organized by the newly established Network on the Palaeolithic Occupation of Europe funded by the European Science Foundation [Strasbourg]. The aim of the Tautavel meeting was a highly critical review of the evidence concerning the earliest occupation of European regions from the United Kingdom to the Russian plains and from Scandinavia to the Mediterranean. The workshop consisted of two full days of discussion on the basis of a series of precirculated papers. The discussions focused on four themes: chronology [chaired by Alain Tuffreau], environment [chaired by Clive Gamble], industries [chaired by Gerhard Bosiński], and subsistence [chaired by Cathérine Farizy].