

University of Montana

ScholarWorks at University of Montana

Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, &
Professional Papers

Graduate School

1986

Patterns without rhythm : Social structure ambiguity in an archeological field camp

Larry Moore

The University of Montana

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd>

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Moore, Larry, "Patterns without rhythm : Social structure ambiguity in an archeological field camp" (1986).
Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers. 7303.
<https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd/7303>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

COPYRIGHT ACT OF 1976

THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED MANUSCRIPT IN WHICH COPYRIGHT SUBSISTS. ANY FURTHER REPRINTING OF ITS CONTENTS MUST BE APPROVED BY THE AUTHOR.

MANSFIELD LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA
DATE: 1986

Patterns without Rhythm:
Social Structure Ambiguity in an Archeological Field Camp

by

Larry Moore

B. A., University of California, Irvine, 1981 and 1983

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

University of Montana

1986

Approved by


Chairman, Board of Examiners


Dean, Graduate School

Date July 15, 1986

UMI Number: EP38104

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP38104

Published by ProQuest LLC (2013). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Moore, Larry, M.A., July 1986

Anthropology

Patterns without Rhythm:

Social Structure Ambiguity in an Archeological Field Camp (79 pp.)

Director: Frank Bessac *F.B.*

Based on the technique of participant observation, this thesis is an ethnography of an archeological field camp located in a rural area of the United States. The archeological project is described with emphasis on its social structure and a fractionation within it. This fractionation and the tensions associated with it focused on differences between ascribed and achieved statuses, older and younger participants, and was expressed in class terms, moral taxonomies. This fractionation is interpreted in terms of American world view and as a product of a structural change within the project.

PREFACE

This thesis is an ethnography of some historical archeologists living in a field camp. These people were excavating a group of archeological sites and I observed them during their work and free time. I lived with these people for the duration of two field seasons and considered myself a member of the camp community. The main topic of this thesis is a conflict that occurred during one of these seasons and it is presented as a fractionation of the camp community due to tensions between subgroups. However, the reader will also note that I describe the community as having had unity. The discussion does, then, focus on contradictions between ideals, expectations, and conduct, unity and disunity, and equality and inequality. The conflict is described in a synchronic and diachronic context. Thus, the theoretical discussion is one of culture change. The people observed all belong to the fuzzy category "American", which does have its limitations, especially if one likes to atomize the world. But since atomization is one of the generalizations made about American world view, this thesis is a case study in this category.

Some people have asked whether this study is a critique of Anthropology or of Archeology. No, it is not. This thesis is a discussion of social structure and world view, and it is not self-flagellation in the tradition of Hymes (1974), Fabian (1983), or Freeman (1984). I have no guilt pains for what anthropologists do, and the observations made by the above people are obvious to some of us from the

younger generation of Anthropology.

Moreover, my study has not been inspired by the work of Sellers (1973) or Butler (1976). These papers are interesting, but my work began long before I became familiar with theirs. My idea came from Duane Metzger of the University of California, Irvine, who said it would be interesting to read about people digging. And so, I hope it is.

Everyone involved on the archeological project knew what I was doing. I was not confronted with any objections to my plans, although I did receive several jokes to the effect that the ethnographer should be studied too. But, nonetheless, the names of all people and sites involved are omitted or vaguely described. Those with intimate knowledge of this project will probably recognize people in the report and they may conclude that I have made some people look good or bad. But I did not intend to judge and would argue that any such judgements are the creations of the reader. However, there is one exception to this point: all the people involved should look good because the confidence that they displayed in letting me do this project reflects well upon themselves and me. I thank them for their willingness to be patient and humorous with me.

Thanks are also due to several people who have had to deal with me and this project. Sharon Rose was able to interpret my scrawl and made it readable print. Bill Long more than once listened patiently as I waxed not so eloquently about all of this. My committee was very tolerant of their independent graduate student. Wesley Shellen, from the Interpersonal Communications Department, was always straightforward

with me and I only had to listen. Dee Taylor, archeologist, endured my treatment of his profession as ethnographic data. And Frank Bessac, my advisor, allowed me to plod down my own social theory road even though I always junctioned with his. My parents, Robert and Clara Moore, have supported me throughout and this' thesis is more for them than it is for me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstact	ii
Preface	iii
1. Introduction	1
2. Community	5
3. Cohesion	30
4. Inequality	38
5. Americana	54
6. Moral Fiber	69
Appendix	73
References	77

LIST OF TABLES

2.1 Amount of Program A contribution by number of sessions
signed up for and year. Source: brochures from 1983 - 1984 . . 13

2.2 Cummulative breakdown of Program A applicants by sex,
occupation, and numbers of sessions signed up for: 1981 -
1984 14

2.3 Participants of Program A for 1983 and 1984 by year, sex,
number of sessions participated in, and occupation 16

2.4 Percentages of core group participants to total participants
by session and year: core group/total (percentage) 17

2.5 Staff personnel and their years of attendance 24

All, too, will bear in mind this sacred principle, that though the will of the majority is in all cases to prevail, that will to be rightful must be reasonable; that the minority possess their equal rights, which equal law must protect, and to violate would be oppression.

Thomas Jefferson, First Inaugural Address

All America is divided into two classes,--the quality and the equality. The latter will always recognize the former when mistaken for it. Both will be with us until our women bear nothing but kings.

Owen Wister, The Virginian

INTRODUCTION

I was involved in a certain archeological project for five years, the first three as a volunteer excavator and the last two as an ethnographer observing the project. The excavations were located on a farm in a rural area of the United States. Excavations were seasonal, occurring in early summer. While there, field crews lived in a tent camp. This is an ethnography of some of the social life in that camp during the year 1984.

The archeological project has changed over the years. Starting from a small field school lasting two weeks in 1980, it expanded to a nine-week season consisting of two field schools in 1984 and 1985. I took notes in 1983 and 1984. The directing archeologist of the project allowed me to do this, and I will refer to him as the Old Timer as he fits Flannery's (1982) characterization of an old time archeologist quite well. The year 1984 marked a turning point in the project. It was the first time that two field schools were offered on the project. These two schools ran contiguously, contrasted in organization and in intent. They will be referred to as Program A and Program B. The addition of the second field school, Program B, was a structural change within the project. And this change readjusted the social structure, the status and role relations between people (Nadel 1957), in the camp such that they became ambiguous, and the differences between power and authority, achieved and ascribed status, and the ages of participants were highlighted. This ambiguity did, then, allow the camp

community to divide into factions and this thesis explores the nature and causes of these divisions.

Archeologists are undefinable characters and I doubt if any modal personality could or should be created to describe them. So we must describe them by what they do. Archeology is the study of extinct peoples and the origins of present peoples as manifested in the cultural materials left behind by these people and recovered by archeologists. By analyzing these materials, explicitly, artifacts and features, archeologists infer culture, "the acquired knowledge people use to interpret experience and generate behavior" (Spradley 1980: 6).

But more importantly, for this study at least, an archeologist in charge of a project is a manager. He must plan a project and carry these plans through to completion. This, of course, involves acquiring labor, considering the time period, distance away from home, transportation, and financing. Also, he is a public relations person representing his profession to the public and to his crew. And, internally, the key to a successful project is keeping people happy and motivated to work in the field. Thus, crew members' immediate needs may take precedence over the short term goals of the project. People working and living together must cooperate with each other and let their behavior be guided by the explicit and tacit norms of the overall society and those particular to the project which may conflict with the former.

And if the norms of the project and those of the overall society conflict then the differences between culture and conduct become even

more salient. As I am using the concepts, culture and behavior, although interdependent, are not the same and never match exactly. Culture is a system of labels and conceptions about behavior and other cultural forms. As such, cultural forms remain inherently multivocal, that is, open to variable use and interpretation, and cannot be mapped directly onto experience. So, people are frustrated when their ideals and expectations are not met.

This difference between culture and conduct is one way of looking at the fractionation of the camp community. In Chapter Two I describe the camp setting, the two programs, and the routine of work. It will be pointed out that the application process for each program led applicants to expect that they would have a certain status in camp and that the two programs had different intentions expressed in their routines. Simply, one was excavation oriented and the other, excavation-lecturing oriented. In Chapter Four, the fractionation is described with emphasis on status and authority, status and power, and female and male participation. Since the status relations in camp were ambiguous, one group created new terms to classify people. In Chapter Five I use American world view to interpret these terms, which I refer to as class labels, not in the socio-economic sense, but as moral taxonomies. In doing this, the participation of the women in the conflict will be seen as their using their roles as the upholders of American morality to protect their social status. Thus status recognition became an important factor in the tensions in camp because it hindered people from making friends. And I see this paradox of status recognition hindering

friendship as an aspect of American world view too.

In a more abstract sense the conflict is seen as a result of a structural change. The reorganization of the project changed status relations between staff and crew members. Instead of a simple field school as Program A had been, a special training field school was set up, Program B. In Program A the primary relationship was that between the teachers of archeology and students of it. But in Program B, the primary relationship was between professional archeologists and professional historians, with the archeologists teaching the historians about archeology. Further, these historians-as-archeology-students were mixed in with some younger archeology students. People's statuses then became ambiguous and tension occurred. But social tension is not uncommon in field camps and it is usually broken by some social event, as described in Chapter Three. But during Program B in 1984 no social event broke the tension. People merely endured the situation, fulfilled their obligations, and went home with an experience to talk about.

COMMUNITY

Americans are said to be concerned with the idea of community. They are often idealistic about what a community is, meaning, of course, that it should be a certain way. However, prescriptions aside, "The real beginning of a community is when its members have a common relation to the center overriding all other relations: the circle is described by the radii, not by the points along its circumference" (Buber 1949: 135). For the archeological community studied here the center was an obligation, a commitment, to the project that became established in one of three ways (the radii): one obligated himself to be a staff member, an A participant, or a B participant. In this chapter, I discuss the background of the project and how people got involved in it. In doing this, I define the community as persons bound by this common denominator of obligation.

The farm is located on a generally north to south lying peninsula formed by a curl of a large river. It is bounded on the north and east by this river and on the south by a creek of the same name as the farm. A slight ridge runs from the northwest towards the southeast, dividing the farm almost in half. This ridge is, besides the river, the most commanding geographical feature on the farm. In total area, the farm covers about 1500 acres divided into forest, pasture, crops, swamp and shoreline. The principal crops are corn, peanuts and soybeans while livestock include cattle, sheep and horses. The farm is relatively isolated as the nearest country store is two miles away and the nearest town is ten miles away.

The landowner, a retired lawyer, chartered a nonprofit educational foundation, referred to here as the Institution, to preserve and study the cultural history of the local area and to interpret the past to the general public. The farm is designated a state historic landmark and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The Institution partially funds the archeology done on the farm and operates a small museum there.

Several other buildings are on the farm. The landowner and his wife live there as do the families of the farm manager and a farmhand. The owner's son lived there in a trailer during the early 1980's, but in 1983 and 1984 he used this place on only weekends. Also, as one would expect, there are numerous sheds, barns and a granary on the farm. In 1982 one of the storage sheds was converted into an office, archeological laboratory, library and work area for the Institution. In 1984, this area was expanded into adjoining sheds for the growing Institution. Prior to all this, these facilities had been housed in the museum. This museum is located in an old school house, which also served as a residence prior to its being used as a museum. It stands just off the ridge overlooking some pasture lands. The archeological field camp has been located on this ridge 75 to 100 yards southeast of the museum every field season.

In 1983 and 1984 the camp consisted of twenty to twenty-five field tents, a tent kitchen, a storage tent, a shower house, and port-o-johns. Crew members usually shared tents, with two people in each, while staff had their own. People slept on cots or air mattresses. In 1983 wooden platforms were made for staff tents; in 1984, most tents had platforms.

The kitchen was a large platform with three framed supports covered with a tarp that was held in place with rope. In 1984, the kitchen included a butane stove/oven, a refrigerator, sink, and cupboards. Electricity was taken from a powerline near the museum. Only the kitchen had electricity. Water for the kitchen and showers was tapped from faucets in the camp area, which used to be a garden. The storage tent was a small version of the kitchen. These facilities were all supplied by the Institution.

I am not aware of all the details about the Institution but believe that it was set up in 1979. At first the landowner administrated it with help from its director, but gradually a Board of Directors was organized and administrative and financial responsibilities were distributed. This changeover occurred, I believe, in 1982. At that time the Old Timer became a member of the Board of Directors also. In 1983 the Institution's staff consisted of its director, one archeologist, one historian, a museum shop manager, a carpenter, and a couple of others who ran the museum shop, gave tours of the archeological and historical exhibits, and did odd jobs. These people were locals, worked year-round, and provided substantial support to the seasonal archeologists.

The field crews for the project have been recruited in two ways. First, for the years 1980 through 1986, the Old Timer had been affiliated with a volunteer program and drew most of his crews through this program. Here I refer to this as Program A. In 1984 the Institution received a three-year grant so that a field school could be offered. The second source of labor came from this field school--

referred to as Program B. Overall, the project has had seven field seasons during which time both programs were used as such: In 1980, Program A for two weeks in August; in 1981, 1982 and 1983, Program A for six weeks each year in June and July; in 1984, Program A for four weeks in May - June and Program B for five weeks in June - July; and in 1985, Program A for four weeks in June and Program B for five weeks in July - August. The seventh season had two weeks of Program A in June and again five weeks of Program B in July - August.

Program A has been sponsored by an organization affiliated with a state university system, referred to as the Organization. For the last several years the Organization has offered research projects from various disciplines that interested lay people could participate in as volunteers. Anthropology has been well represented, and this archeological project has been one of the more popular ones. Project directors have come from universities within the state university system. As the Old Timer has been teaching at one of these campuses and has been directing the museum affiliated with that campus, his participation in the Organization is understandable. The term "Program A" refers to a particular project sponsored by the Organization.

To recruit people for projects, the Organization has advertised internationally by sending out pamphlets and a brochure. These publications have included descriptions of all projects, their dates, cost, and other information concerning application procedures. A four page application has been included in the brochure, had to be filled out, and signed. This application was designed such that applicants

evaluated themselves. Applicants were first asked to state their preference of projects (ie. first, second and third choices) that they wished to join. Next they were asked how they heard about the Organization. Following this, personal information was requested, such as, one's name, address, telephone number, occupation, and the same information for someone the Organization could contact in case of emergency. Applicants were then asked to state any special medical conditions they might have had because medical treatment may not have been available or close to the project area. After that, applicants were asked to state their interest in the project of their first choice, why they chose it, and what experience they had had that might have been helpful on the project. What was important here was that the applicant express an interest even though they may not have had any experience. After that section, applicants were asked to state their educational background and any foreign travel experience they had had.

The next two sections of the application required people to evaluate themselves on their own adaptability and certain abilities according to the scale "excellent, good, fair, poor." Since some research areas have been remote with variable conditions, the applicants were asked to rate themselves on their adaptability to isolation, limited and/or unusual food, limited water, primitive facilities, wilderness experience, shared living space, living and working with a small group of people, and extreme heat, cold and humidity. Next, since most projects have been self-contained, it was important for project directors to know what practical skills the volunteers had had; thus they were asked to rate themselves on interpersonal, outdoor, mechanical

and technical skills. These categories included: observational skills, interviewing experience, patience, flexibility, experience with people from other cultures, ability to work as a team member, ability to follow directions, initiative, sense of humor, knowledge of a foreign language, physical stamina, first aid knowledge, camping, backpacking, hiking, camp cooking, swimming, scuba diving, snorkeling, boat handling, vehicle repair, truck or four-wheel drive vehicle experience, still photography, motion picture and video taping, sketching, illustrating, drafting, technical drawing, map reading, surveying, computer analysis, electronics, mechanics, professional writing, and journalism. Applicants were then asked if they wished to comment on anything not included in the form or if they wished to elaborate on any skills or experiences rated above. The application concluded with a request for a one-line description from the applicant about themselves to be included in the participant list, which was then distributed to all volunteers on a project.

All applications were reviewed by the project leaders. I have no information on the selection process but feel that few if any applicants have been rejected. The Organization has been partially run by the monies contributed by the volunteers and could not afford to forfeit proffered money. Further, a volunteer had the choice to quit a project at any time and a cancellation before a project began allowed the Organization to provide only a partial refund of monies contributed and to keep the rest as a processing fee.

The interesting point about Program A is that volunteers paid to participate in the project. "Participants", as they were called, were

considered active members of the field team and each contributed an equal share of money to cover the project costs. The staff of the project did not pay any fees and their expenses were considered part of the project costs. However, the contributions were tax deductible because the volunteers were said to be donating both funds and personal service to research sponsored by the university system. Part of the contribution covered a volunteer's room and board and was considered an out of pocket expense while he rendered service to the university. The rest went for field costs, staff travel expenses, project planning, and administration; and, it was considered a direct contribution to the university. The contribution qualified as a tax deductible contribution under Federal Income Tax Law, Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. The Organization collected the money for each project, deducted a percentage for its own operating costs, and released the rest to the project directors.

Furthermore, as the contribution covered only one's room and board during the project, ground transportation during the project, camping and field gear, research equipment and supplies, and orientational materials, the participants had to pay for all travel expenses to and from the project area, visas, passports, inoculations, medical treatment or emergency evacuation expenses, and any other personal expenses such as sight-seeing trips and alcoholic beverages. These personal expenses applied to the staff also. However, the travel expenses were tax deductible if they were direct to and from the project area and documented.

Without the incentive of a tax break, the Organization's projects

may not have existed because people probably would not have paid to work without some return. But with this detail included people got, as a morning television show host said about the Organization's projects, "a tax deductible vacation."

Many of the projects were held for several weeks or months. Each project was divided into parts, "sessions", based on the time frame for that project. The applicants chose the session or sessions in which they wished to participate. Program A has always had sessions lasting two weeks, as such: one session in 1980; three sessions each for 1981, 1982, and 1983; two sessions each for 1984 and 1985; and one session in 1986.

Contributions were priced per session or sessions. People could sign up for more than one session and this could be expensive. However, as an incentive to get people to sign up for more than one session, the Organization offered a reduction in the total contribution for subsequent sessions signed up for beyond the first. The total amount of the contribution for Program A, in United States dollars, is given by number of sessions signed up for in Table 2.1 for the years 1983 through 1986. These prices were lower than other projects located within in the United States sponsored by the Organization. This was due to the partial funding of the project by the Institution. Program A was, then, funded by two sources, the Organization and the Institution.

Table 2.1 Amount of Program A contribution by number of sessions signed up for and year. Source: brochures from 1983 - 1984.

Year	# of sessions		
	1	2	3
1983	500 ^a	650	775
1984	525	650	-
1985	575	685	-
1986	575	-	-

^aDollars

For the volunteer, these prices were high considering that he also had to pay transportation fees. However, students and teachers could have gotten partial scholarships from the Organization by applying for them. Further incentive was given to college students because they could have gotten credit for their work through their own school, usually as "independent credit" courses. Finally, a person who wanted to participate on a project could have gotten a friend or relative to pay the contribution and travel expenses because the paying party got the tax break. Thus, a person who did not have the income to enjoy a tax break did not necessarily have to pay the contribution and could have still participated.

The Organization's projects attracted a variety of people but tended towards students, people who were in high school, college, or were recent graduates without "career" type jobs. From the participant

lists for Program A for the years 1981 through 1984, I have the names of 82 people who signed up for the project. These lists do not include people who signed up after these lists were made up, neither do they indicate those people who actually participated during those years, as some people cancelled. However, these lists do reflect the kinds of people who were willing to sign up for such projects. Table 2.2 has the cumulative breakdown for those years divided twice vertically into female and male groups, and indicates whether they signed up for one, two, or three sessions. The horizontal division is by occupation, but since the sample is biased towards students I lumped all the others as nonstudents. The nonstudent category includes insignificant numbers of other categories, such as teachers, engineers, lawyers, physicians, housewives, waitresses, and retired.

Table 2.2 Cumulative breakdown of Program A applicants by sex, occupation, and numbers of sessions signed up for: 1981 - 1984.

Sex:	Female				Male				TOTAL
	Sessions:	1	2	3	Total	1	2	3	
Student	11	9	10	(30)	4	9	9	(22)	52
Non-	18	0	0	(18)	11	1	0	(12)	30
TOTAL	29	9	10	(48)	15	10	9	(34)	82

From data presented in this table I make the following observations. First, students comprised a little more than half of all applicants, 52 of 82 (63 percent). Second, students tended to sign up for more than one session whereas nonstudents signed up for only one; of the nonstudents only one retired male signed up for two sessions while 37 of 52 students (71 percent) signed up for more than one session. And third, more women tended to apply than men, with here 48 women to 34 men (or 59 percent women). Among the students, two-thirds were women. These figures accurately reflect the personnel makeup of Program A over the first five years and, perhaps for the Organization's projects on the whole. However, during the two field seasons that I observed, a majority of students stayed for more than one session.

The participant lists were mailed out (along with other information) a few weeks prior to the beginning of the project. Thus people were given a chance to familiarize themselves with the names of people they were likely to have met in camp. But, one was more likely to have found any number of people in camp who were not listed. Table 2.3 contains the actual count of people who participated in Program A for the 1983 and 1984 field seasons. This table is divided vertically in three ways: by year, by sex, and by number of sessions participated in; horizontally, it is again divided into students and nonstudents.

Table 2.3 Participants of Program A for 1983 and 1984 by year, sex, number of sessions participated in, and occupation.

Year:	-----1983-----									-----1984-----					
Sex:	---Female---			----Male----						-Female--		--Male---			
Sessions:	1	2	3		1	2	3	T		1	2		1	2	T
Student	7	4	4 (15)		2	3	7 (12)	27		4	6 (10)		0	5 (5)	15
Non-	10	0	0 (10)		0	0	0 (0)	10		1	0 (1)		4	0 (4)	5
TOTAL	17	4	4 (25)		2	3	7 (12)	37		5	6 (11)		4	5 (9)	20

In 1983 and 1984 Program A had 37 and 20 participants respectively. Students tended to participate in more than one session; in 1983, 18 of 27 students participated in more than one session while in 1984, 11 of 15 did. On the other hand, not one nonstudent participated in more than one session (although in 1984, one female nonstudent attended the entire Program B field school but not as a participant of that field school). Those students who stayed more than one session comprised more than half of the total labor force for each field season. In 1983, 18 students participated in more than one session and in 1984, 11 did. These students were a core group of workers within each field season. But more importantly, for each session the core group was not only a stable body of experienced workers but also the majority of them. Table 2.4 contains the percentages of core group participants to total participants by session for the 1983 and 1984 Program A seasons. The core group comprised at least 60 percent of the participants for the

initial session of each season and this percentage increased for the later sessions. This group was, then, a substantial block within the social organization of the field camp and were recognized as such. They were given some status because of their experience.

Table 2.4 Percentages of core group participants to total participants by session and year: core group/total (percentage).

Year	Session		
	First	Second	Third
1983	14/23 (61)	18/26 (70)	15/17 (88)
1984	11/17 (65)	11/14 (79)	- -

However, the status of the core individuals was not due to Program A. There was nothing inherent in the organization of the program which gave its participants any kind of special recognition. Just the opposite was the case: participants were nothing more than that, and ideally their status outside of the program was irrelevant during it. The organization of Program A leveled the statuses of its participants. Therefore, the status of the core participants was acquired during the project. In contrast, Program B was designed to recognize one's social status within the overall society. A person could not participate unless he had a certain status (or potential thereof). The status of Program B participants was, therefore, ascribed. This contrast will be discussed in Chapter Four.

Program B was a five-week field school financed by the Institution and by a three-year grant from a national granting institution. The 1986 field season was the last year of Program B unless the grant has been renewed for the forthcoming 1987 season. Renewal of the grant is partially dependent on the success of the program, as determined by the granting institution, the program's staff, and the participant's evaluations of the program. The first field season of this program was in 1984 and one would expect problems to exist during an initial year. Thus the conflict described in Chapter Four should not be taken too seriously; it was partially resolved in 1985.

Program B offered high school and college level history and social studies teachers an opportunity to incorporate an archeological perspective into their teaching format by giving them firsthand experience at a group of archeological sites. Through a combination of field excavation, laboratory work, research, and formal lectures, these people were introduced to the basics of archeology and the study of cultural materials. Program B participants also worked on individual research projects that related to the overall goals of the field school and to their own teaching programs.

The Program B application process was more formal than that of Program A. Applicants were solicited throughout the United States and were screened on a competitive basis according to the following three criteria: first, applicants had to supply evidence of demonstrated skill and success as a teacher; second, applicants had to supply evidence that the field school would relate to their teaching fields and

that it would enrich their teaching skills; and third, applicants had to supply evidence of a commitment to the concentrated study of the field school. Upon completion of the program, participants received a certificate.

To meet the above criteria, an application form with one's name, age, sex, address, telephone number, level of and subjects teaching, and signature had to be submitted along with a one page resume outlining one's educational and teaching experience. Further, a letter of recommendation from the applicant's department chair, academic dean, or principal had to be submitted separately. This letter should have explained how the applicant's participation in the program would have benefited the applicant and his institution. Also, applicants had to submit a statement discussing their professional and personal reasons for wanting to participate in the program. Finally, applicants could have submitted any other evidence of their teaching skills, academic interests and achievements, and, importantly, of their ability to work with others.

The costs of Program B were minimal to the participants in 1984. Each participant was required to obtain a pledge from their own institution to contribute 250 dollars to the program. This pledge was to have been made in the letter of recommendation. Participants also received a stipend from the program of up to a maximum of 400 dollars to cover their documented travel expenses. Further, they received at no cost all texts, course materials, and room and board. Participants were responsible for all other costs, which were, if documented, tax

deductible.

Fifteen people participated in Program B in 1984, which was ten below the limit designated by the sponsors. This low turnout was probably due to the late release of the program announcements and did not reflect a lack of interest in it. All fifteen of the participants were considered professionals, as they were all employed at that time in some capacity dealing with history and the social sciences, or, they were striving to become so. Four college and university history professors attended as did three community college history teachers, three high school teachers, one school district administrator, one librarian, one museum administrator, and two graduate students (one in history and one in American studies). This group reflected the flexibility of the program because while the selection criteria emphasized teachers, non-teachers were welcome too as they provided diversity in camp.

The staff personnel constituted the third group of people in camp. The number of staff people to participate in this project increased steadily over the first five years. In 1980 there were three staff people; in 1982 there were eight; and in 1984 there were eleven people during Program B. As the project is still ongoing it will probably not get much larger than it has, for two reasons: first, at any given time there are a limited number of the Old Timer's graduate students who are ready and willing to participate in the project; and second, a large increase in the staff would require a reorganization of the project, which would involve a different recruitment process of crew members.

However, the increase in staff reflects two concerns held by the Old Timer and his staff. First, there was a concern to give graduate students supervisory experience and sites to work on for their dissertations. In 1980 only one site was tested and that work was supervised by the Old Timer himself, with the help of an assistant. In 1982 three graduate students supervised three sites. And during Program A in 1984 four sites were supervised by graduate students. A fifth site was opened during Program A in 1984 because one of the others was closed at the end of Program A. So crews worked on four sites during the 1984 Program B.

The fifth site was important because of who supervised it. Two of the Old Timer's museum colleagues co-supervised that site. These people were mature responsible men who also helped manage camp. Thus, the second concern was with the smooth operation of Program B. The complexity of Program B and its added funding required and allowed for a larger staff. The Old Timer needed responsible people in key positions so that the initial Program B would be a success. He relegated duties that he had often done himself to other people so that he could attend to overseeing the project. Namely, he reintroduced a camp cook, something he had done in 1981 and 1983, and created the camp manager position, a job that he had always filled himself.

The staff can be divided into three groups based on their responsibilities; these are: the director, the primary staff, and secondary staff. The primary staff performed the professional duties, which were supervisory ones dealing with crew management and

archeological field practices. In an analogy with the military, those people were the line officers. The secondary staff performed support duties involving transportation, food and lodging, and documentation of the project. The director coordinated the two branches, dealt with the public, the news media, and distinguished guests. He was also responsible for the planning and operation of the project. To meet their academic and personal goals, the staff had to keep the crew members interested, healthy, and working with minimal interpersonal conflict and misrecording of data. And, since the project did not involve an employer/employee relationship between the staff and crew members, supervision was a matter of tact, encouragement, and example.

The primary staff were the crew chiefs and any assistants they might have had. A crew chief was in charge of the excavation of a particular site in accordance with the standard field techniques of archeology. Briefly, this entailed laying out a grid, mapping, bagging artifacts, noting the progress of the digging, and seeing that workers had the necessary tools to work with, such as, trowels, shovels, buckets, wheelbarrows, and screens. In managing the crew, the chiefs had to be aware of people's attitudes, manual abilities, and social relations so that they could determine work assignments for the crew members. In other words, the chiefs managed the pace of the excavation.

The secondary staff were a diverse group. Since 1981 there has been a photographer on the project. This person was also an employee of the museum that the Old Timer has been directing. His main duty was to take in-progress and final photographs of all the sites. Secondly, he

photographed the camp, social events, and crews. Also, as part of the orientation given to crews each year, he gave slide shows of the previous years. And, as occasional nightly entertainment, he gave in-progress slide shows during a season. During Program A in 1984, there was also an assistant photographer helping out; she had participated as a volunteer in 1981 and wanted to return for another season. In 1980, 1982, and 1984 a camp cook was in charge of planning and preparing meals, and of the supply of food in camp. For Program B in 1984 an assistant cook was hired to help out; this person was one of the 1984 Program A volunteers. A camp manager position was created in 1984; this person was responsible for the daily camp budget, the project vehicles, arranging transportation to town for people, tent assignments, tent maintenance and arrangement, assigning kitchen patrol duties to crew members, keeping the camp area clean, and any other miscellaneous problems that occurred. I have included myself as a secondary staff member for the years 1983 and 1984, during which time I was the "camp ethnographer". Besides note taking, I ran errands, gave people rides in my car, gave slide shows, and was a "myth maker" because I was always "telling lies" about the early years of the project. See the Appendix for a justification for this position.

In the five-year period of 1980 through 1984 there were at least nineteen people involved in the project as staff (Table 2.5). There may have been more, but if so, I have forgotten them. However, it is important to note that it was in the early years of the project that most of the 1983 and 1984 season's staff people got their introduction

Table 2.5. Staff personnel and their years of attendance.

Personnel	Year 19 ¹						Relationship to Old Timer and Comments
	80	81	82	83	84A	84B	
Director							
Old Timer	+ ^a	+	+	+	+	+	
Primary Staff							
PF1 ^b	+						G ^c field assistant
PF2	(+)	+	+	+			G crew chief
PF3	(+)			+	+		G crew chief
PF4			+	+			G field assistant; lab chief
PM1	(+)		v	+	+	+	G crew chief
PM2		+	+	+	v	+	G crew chief
PM3		(+)	+	+	+	+	G crew chief
PM4					v	+	C crew chief
PM5					v	+	C crew chief
Secondary Staff							
SF1		+					O assistant manager
SF2		(+)			+		U assistant photographer
SM1	+						S camp cook
SM2			+				S camp cook
SM3					+	+	R camp cook
SM4					(+)	+	U assistant cook
SM5				(+)	+	+	U camp manager
SM6		v	+	+	v	+	C photographer
SM7	(+)	(+)	(+)	+	+	+	E ethnographer

^a+ = attended whole field school; v = arrived late in field school;
() = attended but not as staff.

^bPF = primary female; PM = primary male; SF = secondary female;
SM = secondary male.

^cG = graduate student of Old Timer; U = undergraduate student of Old
Timer; S = friend of Old Timer; R = relative of Old Timer;
C = museum colleague of Old Timer; O = employee of the
Organization; E = exception to rule

to the project. That is, four volunteers from 1980 later became staff; two from 1981 did; and one from 1983 did. On the other hand, this is not to say that staff people were recruited from the volunteer ranks. Prospective staff people were probably encouraged to volunteer, and after they had worked out in the field, they became staff. Of the nineteen staff people, nine had been volunteers before becoming staff, but the other ten entered the project as staff members. Thus, becoming a staff person on the project had little to do with whether one had already participated in it in some other capacity. The best characterization of a staff person is that they had some external relationship with the Old Timer; that is, the Old Timer surrounded himself with people he knew well. In relation to him, ten staff people had been students of his; three were colleagues from the museum he directs; one was an employee of the Organization; two were friends of his family; and one was his son. The only staff person who did not know the Old Timer before being involved in the project was myself--and this status is self-proclaimed.

In a general sense, primary staff people have been involved in the project for a much longer period than secondary staff. Of the nine primary staff people in the first five years of the project, four attended for four seasons, one for three seasons, one for two seasons, and three for one season. (However, of these last three, two became involved in the project in 1984 and attended the 1985 and 1986 seasons.) Involvement at the primary staff level has been a long-term commitment whereas a secondary staff position has not. Of the nine secondary staff

during the years 1980 through 1984, five attended only one season, two attended two seasons, and two attended for four and five years respectively. (These last two, the photographer and myself, could also have been considered as a fourth category of staff because our roles, like the director's, were not restrained by the work routine, as the other staff's were.) The staff of the project consisted, then, of a stable block of people who knew each other well.

The three groups, the A participants, the B participants, and the project's staff constitute the community under study. I am not including the Institution's personnel nor several other people who lived in camp and whose presence did not affect the status relations in camp. These latter people are referred to as auxiliaries. While some of these outsiders might be offended by being placed in this category, I justify it by considering it only as a heuristic one. Moreover, this community does not reflect the "natives'" point of view as they did not have any explicit conception of themselves as a group; but they did, at times, act as an implicit group.

The criterion used to define this category is the presence of a contract; the members of the community formally obligated themselves to participate in the project. This community contrasted, then, with the Institution's staff because those people were obligated to perform duties for the Institution, which has been responsible for the cultural resources of the farm. Also, the community members were not locals as the Institution's staff were. The auxiliaries, too, were not locals but

they contrasted with the community members because they were not contractually committed to the project and attended because of some other relationship. So, as stated earlier, the number of people in camp was variable but the three main groups constituted the community. This is not to say that the others were not important, they were merely marginal to my study.

In 1983, 49 people were in camp during Program A: there were 37 participants, 9 staff, and 3 auxiliaries (two of the latter lived in camp but worked at another archeological project nearby while the other was the son of a staff member). Session one had 35 people in camp, 23 of whom were participants. Session two had 38 people with 26 being participants. And session three had 29 people, with 17 participants.

In 1984, 34 people were in camp during Program A: there were 20 participants, 12 staff, and 2 auxiliaries (both of whom lived in camp but worked at another archeological site nearby). Session one had 31 people in camp, with 17 being participants. And session two had 28 people in camp, with 14 participants. During Program B, 37 people were in camp: there were 15 B participants, 6 A participants, 11 staff, and 5 auxiliaries. The auxiliaries included the two above, the daughter of a staff member, a friend of the Old Timer, and a Program A participant from the 1982 season who wanted to return, but not as a participant.

The routine of the project was much the same for each program, although Program A included more time spent excavating than B. There was a weekly and daily routine. At the beginning of each program in 1984 crew assignments were made. As there were generally four sites

being excavated, four crews were created. Participants became a member of a particular crew for the period of their contract. Each crew was assigned to dig at a site for one week, and then rotated to another the next week.

During Program A, people worked Tuesday through Sunday with Monday off. Thus, crews rotated to a new site on Tuesday. This gave core people a chance to work on all four sites and one-session people, two sites. During Program B, people worked Monday through Friday with weekends off. Planned sight-seeing trips to local historic and archeological exhibits were usually done on Saturdays. Thus, crews rotated sites on Monday. As Program B was five weeks long, all crews worked one week at three different sites and the first and last weeks at the same site.

The daily routine for Program A had seven and a half hours of work time. Crews were awakened about five in the morning, taken to their sites at six, returned to camp for breakfast at eight, returned to sites at nine, returned to camp at noon for lunch, returned to sites at one, and they quit work at three-thirty. People could also use what was called the "afternoon option", which was a rule that allowed people to work at another site after lunch. Other than this exception, people were expected to work at their assigned sites. Two participants a day were assigned kitchen patrol duty; this duty rotated through the list of participants and each could expect to do it once every two weeks. Kitchen patrol duty consisted of helping the cook prepare food and cleanup after meals. People on KP had the option to excavate or not

that day. Dinner was usually served about seven in the evening.

The daily routine for Program B had four hours of excavation time and one to three hours of lecture. People were called to get up about six, had breakfast at seven, were taken to sites at eight, had a break at ten, returned to camp at noon for lunch, and either went to the laboratory or stayed in camp for lectures from one to about three. Lectures lasted usually about one or two hours, but some extended longer. If the lectures ended early, some people went back out to sites for another hour or so, but this was not expected. Program B people had to do KP duty also, but only one person a day did this because an assistant cook had been hired.

During free time people did as they pleased. They had to amuse themselves and did so by playing card games or horseshoes, walking or jogging around the farm, reading, letterwriting, doing laundry, and just loafing. B participants had to do their research, so many of them spent part of their nights in the laboratory after dinner. There was much drinking and parties were held with visiting archeological crews. Thus, free time was usually spent socializing. People tended to congregate in small groups of two to five people, regardless of what crew they belonged to. And there were no cliques as the small groups tended to gather spontaneously. But nonetheless, the camp community during Program B in 1984 fractionated along cultural and contractual lines. This fractionation is discussed in the last three chapters. The next chapter is a brief description of unity in the field camp during Program A in 1983.

COHESION

Victor Turner wrote at length on the concept of *communitas*, which to him "emerges where social structure is not" because it involves "the whole man in his relation to other men" (1969: 126, 127). So, ideally, the structure of *communitas* is no social structure; for it is the leveling of all statuses. Further, his discussion is contained in a broader one about the developmental cycle of the social human being. As people mature they pass through social states and the passage from a lower to a higher status is through a period of statelessness. And, such periods are often sacred and ritualistic, putting not only the matriculating people into *communitas* with each other but also the observers and directors of the situation or ritual. Thus, a feeling of communal unity is created that revitalizes people such that conflicts, frustrations, and ill feelings are temporarily suspended after the social structure is restored. Finally, sometimes romanticism sets in and people desire to perpetuate *communitas* by trying to make it the normal state of affairs, thus giving rise to modalities, normative and ideological, of *communitas* based on the prior spontaneous one (c.f. Turner 1969: 94-165).

And thus the implication is that *communitas* can be found elsewhere, in other situations that do not involve ritual or sacredness. In any gathering where a communal atmosphere is attained a state of *communitas* exists. And so, at the risk of overextending this concept, I will describe an unusual event, a talent show, that occurred in the

archeological field camp during 1983. The community exhibited a general "bad attitude" prior to the show, and the talent show improved morale and relieved tensions such that the archeological crew was revitalized.

The talent show occurred the night of July 13, 1983, which was the Wednesday of the fourth week of the field season. At the end of that week the crew was going to be reduced by eleven people as their two or four week commitments were about up. Thus during that week almost a third of the camp was looking forward to going home. But for those continuing on, the project had another perspective. The Old Timer, who has had twenty-five years of experience with field crews, once generalized to me a pattern that a crew will go through during a project: At the outset, a crew will be fun loving and enthusiastic; next, they will settle down and work hard; and towards the end, they will be exhausted, burnt out. However, this is not to say that the fun and enthusiasm wanes but that their character changes from being a function of the novel situation to that of enduring, tolerating, that situation. And it is in the latter sense that the talent show should be understood.

On Tuesday of the fourth week, a group photo was taken and pranks increased in camp as the camp mascot, a plastic chicken, was stolen and a brief water fight raged through camp right after work. But besides that good humor six people complained that day of being sick or "under the weather." Two of those people had back pain, two had cramps, one had an infected foot, and one hung over person vomited and collapsed at a site. The camp port-o-johns were noticeably foul most of that day

until they were pumped in the afternoon. One crew was assigned to do lab work after lunch but did not enjoy the task as their crew chief was considered to be "grumpy." At another site at that time a tense situation occurred. The Institution's staff archeologist had been trying to help out by building an earthen ramp down to the river with a backhoe. The machine went over the cut bank, hung on some branches and debris, and almost rolled. Everyone who was there was relieved that he was not hurt or killed and joked about it only later. After work, people relaxed, napped, and the cook, the Old Timer, complained about making dinner, a task he usually enjoyed.

Wednesday of that week started misty and muggy with the red sunrise watched from the sites. Some of us had to walk the third of a mile to a site because two of the project vehicles did not work. Later, at noon, the third vehicle quit too. In the meantime the crew I was with shoveled and troweled clay and debris down inside an eighteenth-century icehouse which was said to turn into an "oven" during the heat of the day. The crew worked slow and complained of the ticks that characterized that site. Some of us took a couple minutes break and killed them--I killed 16 within an arms reach. Then, back at work, one of the crew began to expose a wine bottle, and all of us hoped it would still be intact. Exposing this bottle took thirty minutes and all other work stopped because the crew watched. At one point the tentmate of the bottle digger told him to be careful and was promptly told to shut up in response. The bottle was not intact and that night the digger became a star in the talent show.

At noon that day we were back in camp for lunch and one conversation turned to changing the work routine to avoid the heat of the day; some people wanted to start earlier and quit earlier, which would have meant working in the dark as the crews were at that time already out at six in the morning. Simply, people were complaining about the heat. Then, back at the icehouse, people worked in spurts and one crew member got the water Igloo dumped on him to cool him off after shoveling hard. I took the Igloo to camp, filled it, counted ten stragglers there, noted the shade temperature at 92 degrees, heard a good story, and returned to the icehouse. The story was that down at another site the crew had quit working, "mutinied", because they were angry with their site chief. By three in the afternoon everyone was in camp, having quit half an hour early. Mint juleps, a regular Wednesday afternoon drink, were served and several people napped until dinner. Just before dinner one person told me to emphasize the boring side of field work and another added that there was "nothing to write here."

At dinner there were some notable absences. All but two of the staff were not in camp because they had accepted invitations to spend the night elsewhere. Of the two remaining staff, one stayed in the archeology lab most of the night while the other, a popular site chief, started the talent show. After dinner he announced that the first annual dance would be held in fifteen minutes, but he was told to wait until the temperature cooled off for it was then about 86 degrees.

An hour and a half later, about eight-forty-five, the camp kitchen was cleared of its picnic tables and a tape player was set up. Four

men, the crew chief, the bottle digger, the one who had been drenched with water, and one other, began to do a chorus line act for a small crowd. Within a few minutes two more men were on stage and the crowd had grown to include almost all those in camp, about twenty people. Some of the women in the crowd yelled at the dancers to strip down because they were "not skimpy enough." And so the dancers stripped down to their shorts in a burlesque fashion, amid much laughter and applause from the crowd.

Then the bottle digger took the lead by imitating the characteristic behavior of the crew chief. This went on for a few minutes and climaxed when he began chanting one of the officer's favorite sayings, "you got that right slick, uh," with appropriate suggestive movements. He exited stage leaving the crowd impressed with his dancing ability. Next came a juggling act with eggs by another dancer; he broke one egg and added an apple. In this act he was highlighted by a member of the crowd, the one who had been bored earlier, who used a flashlight as a spotlight.

After the juggling act, the six men went back to a chorus line, and kicked up their feet to a song on the player. One female from the crowd, who the day before had had an infected foot, got up and danced with the juggler. She got a dollar bill, held it in her mouth, passed it to the juggler's mouth, who passed it to the one who had gotten drenched earlier, then it went back to the juggler, and then to the woman again. She then danced with the chorus line, while someone in the crowd mentioned that that was the only way to "pass the buck."

Another song came on the radio, the Rolling Stones' old hit "Jumping Jack Flash," and immediately the chorus line began to do jumping jacks. After that song, one of the dancers got another woman from the crowd and danced with her. Then the woman with the dollar again took the lead by doing a suggestive dance along with the bottle digger which ended amid applause when she put the dollar in his shorts. For the next song, some flowers were taken from a vase and each male dancer went around the stage with one in his mouth. At the end of the song they threw the flowers to women in the crowd.

Next, the one who earlier professed that there was nothing to write took the lead and imitated playing guitar and singing a song. The crowd cheered him on and asked him to do his favorite song, "Roxanne." So, as he went to get the tape the chorus line continued, this time with cereal bowls on their heads. The crew chief cried out that this was a "Jewish ceremony," a joke aimed at the bottle digger's ethnicity. The dancing stopped as the rock star returned. He took the center of the stage and all lights went off except the flash spotlight. The crowd went quiet in anticipation of the act and were not disappointed. The rock star imitated the stage antics of a real one by using a broom as a guitar and mouthing the lyrics.

After this act the chorus line ran out of ideas. Some found a roll of toilet paper and wrapped up one ill-feeling person from the day before. Then someone joked about setting him on fire but that idea did not go well with anyone else. The imitation rock star and the bottle digger again began separate solo acts to a song on the player while the

rest of the dancers thought of something to do. They decided to get cups of water, did so, and ran out on the stage like they were going to douse the crowd. A wave went through the crowd as several people backed off to avoid getting wet. Seeing this, the dancers turned on the digger, who was then imitating the smoking style of the crew chief, and "put his cigarette out" by dousing him. At this everyone laughed and the chorus line began again with three women from the crowd joining in.

After a song all the dancers took a break and shared a few beers. Dancing then resumed with several women joining the men on stage. Those who did not want to dance or watch began to leave for their tents. At ten the dancing stopped as that was the usual quiet hour in camp. But some people wanted more; they talked and laughed a few minutes and then decided they wanted the bottle digger to do another solo act. But he was then in the shower. A small group ran to the showers, got him out, and chased him across camp back onto the stage. The digger had been able to get his pants on so he then dropped them on stage and used his towel to flash his shorts as he danced around. The remaining crowd enjoyed this last act and broke up when it ended. By eleven the camp was quiet with most people in bed or sitting in the dark watching the heat lightning in the distance. And some expressed their hope that it would rain.

On the following day work proceeded as usual. The "dance night," as it came to be known, was talked about for the rest of the season and the following one, 1984. Work continued with its ups and downs; the icehouse was completed but two of its ten-foot high sidewalls slumped.

At three other sites, archeologically important features were defined and examined. But the social high point was the dance night which temporarily relieved the tension in camp, made people laugh and enjoy the company of each other. The camp social hierarchy, while partially removed, was also leveled in the imitations of the authority figure and his counter imitation. The camp was revitalized and the productive season finished with some people concluding that archeology was certainly the most fun one could have with their pants on (c.f. Flannery 1982).

Certainly not all of Program A during 1983 was like this. Most of the days were long but people did not go that far to amuse themselves. The talent show served an important function; it perpetuated the esprit de corps of the community. The second annual talent show was performed during Program A in 1984. But it was a planned affair, was not well attended, and did not revitalize the group. Program A in 1984 was not a socially tense period; I am not sure of how to characterize it. It was not as high spirited as the previous season's had been because it seemed as if an unsaid restriction had been placed on the camp. The staff seemed to be anticipating Program B, preoccupied with it, and so the social life of Program A in 1984 was foreshadowed. But these concerns were mainly those of the older staff personnel and the Institution's staff. Everyone else mingled well and enjoyed themselves.

INEQUALITY

The archeological field schools, Programs A and B, were an intense social period for those involved. For the professional and aspiring archeologists, the field seasons helped to perpetuate or enhance their reputations within the discipline. For the volunteer, the field seasons were a vacation from school or work. For all, the seasons were a break in the yearly cycle and were, non-normal periods. Moreover, during these periods the small things in life became salient such that objects, activities, and events became overly important to people. Some of this heightened awareness may have been due to people's feelings of out-of-placeness in a new environment, desituation, while some may have been due to the slow pace of the work day and its flexible routine.

There were also more tangible factors that added to the stress and strain of the field situation. Living in a tent for two, four, or six weeks could make one appreciate the comforts of home, for there were no air conditioners, hot tubs, or private rooms. Also, the work required was rough on the soft hands, feet, and backs of people used to sitting behind desks most of the year. For some, the environment could seem hostile especially when mosquitoes and ticks demanded attention and repellent. And, of course, the weather was hard to take when summer daytime temperatures reached highs over ninety degrees only to be offset by violent storms that sometimes flooded sites and camp.

In a social sense, the field camp was full of the intrigues that one would expect to find in any group. Many people entered camp not

knowing anyone, and thus friendships were established quickly, often seemed shallow, and usually ended when the group disbanded. The situation was also conducive to fast romances, or unfulfilled hopes thereof. On the other extreme, serious relationships also came about. During the first five years of the project two marriages resulted from the interactions that began in camp. But, for the most part, these relative strangers lived in a patient tolerance of each other's behavior, knowing that shortly it would all end. This restraint belied the intensity of the situation. And when given the opportunity, these people did voice their frustrations.

The conflict to be discussed in this chapter is that of a fractionation process in the camp community during Program B in 1984. This conflict concerned three groups of people: the staff, the participants of Program B, and some Program A people who stayed for Program B. These three groups held differing conceptions of themselves which indicate an ambiguous social structure.

In brief the conflict resulted when in 1984 as Program A was ending its participants were asked if they wanted to stay and continue doing field work during Program B. Six undergraduate students of the Old Timer did stay and paid a nominal fee priced per week. The staff hoped that these holdovers would help the incoming B participants ease into the camp setting. However, the presence of the A people did not aid in this adjustment, but rather it enhanced the alienation that some of the B people felt. When, at the end of Program B, those participants were allowed to voice comments about the program in an open forum they

complained that the younger people in camp, or those with a "swinger" lifestyle, were running the camp. Certainly, no one group was responsible for the fractionation because all were involved. The ambiguity of the situation becomes apparent when we focus on the grouping of the B people. There were two paradoxes in the camp social structure due to the grouping of B people.

The desire to have the A people help the B people adjust to camp life created the first paradox. The staff considered themselves to be in control of the situation; they had authority because they supervised and supported the non-staff, those without authority. The staff merged A and B people as one group and these people were called "participants", "folks", and "everybody". Staff members tried to maintain this position even though they recognized a contrast between the two non-staff groups. In doing this, they were asserting their authority. Further, there was no reason to believe that the two groups would not get along because Program A had been mixing people of different ages and statuses through five seasons without serious conflict. But the difference between the two groups in terms of authority was reflected in the idea of status and not the generation gap. The holdover A people were all, except for one, students while the B people with two exceptions were all successful professionals. Under normal conditions in American society, B people would have been seen as high status people when compared to the A group. Thus merging the two groups elevated the A people up to the level of the B people. And so, the first paradox was that two incompatible groups were seen as one by the staff.

This elevation of the A people can be best understood from their point of view. These individuals recognized their low status in camp. They described B people as "arrogant", "snobby", and "uptight" -- terms often used to describe people who act as if they are better than those doing the describing, who might consider themselves as equals or know that they are of low status but wish to berate those of higher status. Further, the A people exploited the staff's attempt to merge the non-staff participants by taking advantage of their greater familiarity with the staff. In effect, they allied themselves with the staff by overemphasizing the arrogant attitude of the B people, of which the staff were also aware. They did this by complaining that the B people would not "lighten up" or "relax". Instead of being elevated to the level of the B people, A personnel tried to elevate themselves to a position equal to that of the staff. Otherwise, they would have been at the bottom of a local social hierarchy: staff, B people, and A people.

Moreover, A people could justify their grouping with the staff in two ways. The first is a matter of precedence; the B people were newcomers and the alliances were well established within the camp community. Second, A people understood that their presence in camp was wanted by the staff, who were taking advantage of the A people's field experience. The holdover A people were all, but one, core people, each having participated in the entire Program A. They had become familiar enough with the local sites to help the novice B people and the staff.

The staff have always favored core participants during the Program A seasons. At the outset of each season the core people had been

singled out as "fourweekers" or "sixweekers" by the staff because they were people who had to be lived with for a longer period. The "twoweekers" have always had a temporary position in camp and, even though they may have been liked, rarely acquired any recognition for their efforts. Two weeks has not been long enough for most people to assert themselves and make a lasting impression on the community. Core people usually did make such impressions and were often rewarded for their efforts by being given little responsibilities that demonstrated the confidence that the staff had in them. For example, on the second day of actual digging during Program B a Group A girl was asked at one site to supervise temporarily a crew of B people, all of whom were at least twice her age. Her four previous weeks of experience qualified her for this position. She enjoyed her task and I do not know the reaction of the crew at that time but this example gives validity to their complaint. The favoritism shown by the staff towards the A people was practical; those with experience were given duties commensurate with their competency.

The alliance between Group A and the staff did have its usefulness. During Program B there were 37 people in camp in four groups: 15 B people, 11 staff (including one holdover A person), 6 A people, and 5 auxiliaries (who had no impact on the status relations in camp). Thus the alliance was the majority group in camp and could have, in good democratic fashion, asserted their will and felt secure in their numbers.

Group B was a threat to the rest of camp because of the high status

stigma, antagonistic stereotype, that was given to its members. These people represented respectability, and their favorable evaluations of Program B were important to the staff for its continuation. Thus, the staff's desire to have a successful initial program meant that they had to perform well for these people, who were making their own judgments about the program's success. The stigma of respectable high status given to the B group reflected back on all the rest, who then had to conform to an ideal conception of "goodness" or lose respect themselves. The staff and the holdover A people knew that as a group they all had to, in their words, "cleanup their act". Program B was relatively so formal in its organization and intent that it contrasted sharply with the informality of Program A. And surely, the five previous Program A seasons did not prepare any of the staff for dealing with high status participants during Program B. Since the two programs ran contiguously in 1984, the alliance saw themselves as having to give up their comfortable informal atmosphere for a more formal one. Part of the tension was a resistance to change in the face of respectability by members of the alliance.

Coincidence was also involved in the conflict. The stigma of respectability given to the B people could have been de-emphasized if the first B person to arrive had not been exactly what the alliance had expected. This person was a history professor with a doctorate from a prestigious university. On the one hand he made it clear to all exactly what his status was, as he might have thought he needed to, and on the other hand, he offered friendship. In return, people recognized his

status and, working from their first impression, were ambivalent about accepting his friendship. His attempts at friendships with members of the alliance seemed clumsy. Unfortunately, it was too late in the project before people acknowledged that he was honest in presenting both his status and friendliness; that is, he was not as "bad" as they first thought. But the precedent had been set and most of the older B people were treated in this way.

The B people had a different conception of the project than those in Group A. The conditions under which they were participating provided a different orientation than did those in Program A. This distinction is best seen in a comparison of the salient characteristics of both programs. I have already described these programs as informal and formal for A and B respectively. The formal character of Program B was based on its particularistic focus; it was designed to isolate a group of people -- professionals in the social studies field. The salient characteristics of this program were: 1) participants were not explicitly considered to be team members; 2) a participant's institution donated funds to the project; 3) a participant's expenses were partially refunded; 4) a third party letter of recommendation was required; 5) research projects were required; 6) formal lectures were emphasized in the daily routine; and 7) participants received a certificate. In contrast to Program B was the informal character of Program A, which had a general focus and did not isolate any group. Noticeable characteristics of this program were: 1) participants were considered as team members; 2) participants funded themselves; 3) a participant's

expenses were not refunded; 4) participants evaluated themselves in the application; 5) no research project was required; 6) excavation was emphasized in the routine; and 7) participants did not receive a certificate. In other words, isolating a particular group of people was a statement of status recognition while a general, everyman emphasis was a statement of status leveling.

Group B people were marked as a group while A people were not. The stigma of respectable high status for B people was best expressed in the term "success", which was a key term in the Program B application form. A person had to demonstrate success in his field to be a Program B participant while participants of A did not have to make any such demonstration. By being accepted to the project, B people had been reassured that they were successful and expected to be treated as such. When such expectations were seen as unfulfilled, B people felt slighted. These B people demanded respect but did not command it because they were not the only successful people in camp.

The demonstrated success of the B people was a formality while the favoritism of the staff to the A people indicated that this latter group had, as workers in the local context, been successful too. The A people had earned their privileges; B people had not, but they also expected that their given status would allow them certain privileges. Also, the staff resented having to attend to the wants of people who were temporarily subordinate to them, as temporary students, but who also felt themselves to be equals with the staff as successful professionals. Therefore, the alliance treated the B people as guests and not as

incorporated team members of the project. During the 1984 field season many of the college students were using the slang term "dude" quite liberally, and it became a joke to refer to anyone as such. In a humorous moment during Program B, one staff person elaborated on this term while reflecting on the obvious fractionation in camp--he said it was like an "Archeological dude ranch". And so it seemed to the alliance.

The second paradox was that B people became members of the community but were treated as guests by the rest of the community. And they had every right to feel some resentment for they were as much "core" people as the A group. But the difference was again one of status. During Program A, core people always had been students and the staff were familiar with the teacher/student relationship. They were not familiar with the teacher/professional-as-student relationship. Much of the tension came from the B group being treated as guests because it placed those people in a "tight" position. Since they were treated as guests they had to respond as such and could not relax and loosen up without losing status.

I think that B people did not see themselves as guests but rather as members of the community, and their complaint was a statement to that effect. I recorded only one complaint concerning the setting apart of the B people and it came from one of the B group's graduate students who did assimilate well into the community. She complained that she felt as if her forehead had been stamped with her group label, something like "B-er". She resented being set apart because she was a member of the

community. However, I did note some complaints about the opposition "swingers" and "conservatives" made by members of the B group, which was also the group that used these terms. These complaints were made by people who would have liked to relax but could not because to do so would have meant being considered a swinger. Thus, before B people could relax they would have had to be in control of the camp, running it themselves. Otherwise, they had to remain on their best behavior to keep their status. The B people's complaint was, then, a resentment of the two factors, having been set apart and not having been able to relax.

Obviously, the tension was not simply one of status differences or of who had authority and who did not, as described so far. I believe that the three groups verbalized the problem in the way I have described, but a slightly different picture emerges if one looks at the problem in terms of status and power, not authority. I stated earlier that the conflict did not involve the age factor in terms of authority but in terms of power it did. In terms of authority, age was less important because several of the staff were in their mid-twenties and were supervising people much older than themselves. And since that relationship was based on agreement and did not exist beyond the duties of the staff, cooperation was a matter of tact, not power. The powerful people were not necessarily those with authority.

The distinction between swingers and conservatives allows me to focus on the problem in terms of power. The swinger group included all those under the age of 35. This group includes the younger B people

(the graduate students and museum worker), all the A people but one, and the staff except for four individuals. The conservatives included the four oldest staff (the Old Timer and his three museum colleagues), the 12 B people over 35, and one A person (the non-core person). The term "swinger" was descriptive of the group because that group mingled well, spent much of its free time pursuing enjoyable activities in a seemingly carefree manner, and included some public romances. The conservatives were more reserved and careful to avoid such public behavior.

The conservatives were the powerful people in camp. And this category is split into two groups. The four oldest staff members comprised one group and the rest the other. This staff power bloc included mature men who were successful in their profession. Each had worked over twenty years in their field and held important positions in a museum. In contrast, the rest of the staff were still developing their reputations. The Old Timer's three colleagues essentially ran the camp by taking charge of those duties that required constant or daily attention. Their vigilance in these matters earned them a nickname, the "dodads". The Old Timer knew these men well and knew that they would take charge of the important responsibilities in camp, as apparently they had done at the museum. These men knew this, and one mentioned to me his regret that the project was not a vacation for him but rather a job in itself. In other words, the staff power bloc maintained its position through constant attention to events and problems in camp and not by slacking off at hours defined in the work routine.

The Old Timer, as director, was, of course, responsible for the

management of the project and its success or failure. The rest of the staff knew this and respected his wishes during the project because most of them were subordinate to him in some way outside of the project. They knew that their performance on the project would affect their relationship with him at home. In return, he considered their needs and wishes without being too authoritarian. Further, while he could be commanding in private conferences with his staff, he was, as he has jokingly described himself, a "benign dictator". Most notably, during Program B, he did not sleep in camp but at the home of the Organization's director, thereby letting his three lieutenants control the camp. During Program A, even in 1984, he always slept in camp. In other words, he downplayed his position while interacting with his staff and relied on tact and persuasion to manipulate them.

The Old Timer's downplaying of his position was more obvious in public. Geoffrey Gorer's statement of how a powerful American male should behave accurately describes the Old Timer in camp:

It is imperative for those in positions of great power to manifest in their persons the absence of authority, or the desire for authority. They must be conspicuously plain citizens, with the interests and mannerisms of their fellows; whatever their private temperament they must act as "one of the boys", glad-handed, extravert, mindful of first names, seeing their subordinates in their shirt sleeves and with their feet on the desk, democratically obscene in their language, with private interests, if any, simple and within the reach of all (Gorer 1964: 40).

This behavior does not contradict his reserved attitude but complements it. He knew that he should not stand out while so many were dependent upon him, for to do so would have labeled him authoritative and perhaps oppressive. His three lieutenants behaved this way too, but to a lesser extent.

The difference between the staff and B power blocs now becomes apparent. The power of the older B people lay in their respectability and the threat of their making unfavorable evaluations of Program B. They were reserved and could not relax, for to do so would have meant that they would have lost not only respectability, as they themselves partly defined it, but also power. That is, for them to have joined the swinger group would have let the staff question any unfavorable evaluation they might have made. Many of them avoided camp in the evenings and night by studying in the laboratory. Further, since they had no authority and that their respectable behavior was not seen as a model to be emulated by others, they resorted to social criticism. That is, by stating that the swingers were running the camp they were: 1) pointing out to all that the younger people were setting the standard lifestyle in camp, 2) stating that this lifestyle was not respectable, and 3) insulting their near peers, the staff power bloc, by implying that they were not really in charge.

In contrast, the staff power bloc was reserved and relaxed. For them to have tightened their hold on camp would have made them appear to be too authoritative. This would not have been appropriate because they were dealing with people who had paid to participate and those who did not. Therefore, as the swinger group contained several staff, the staff power bloc used persuasion and tact to make sure that events did not go beyond the limits of appropriateness. And for the Old Timer this limit involved human dignity; as long as people did not infringe upon the rights of others and bystanders did not get hurt, people could do as they please. And no American could disagree with this position, even

though he might have condemned the behavior of others.

There is one final point to be made concerning this conflict and it is a sensitive one in these days of equal rights campaigns. The conflict described was not a violent event but rather a tension in camp between the groups. The only absolutely public expression of the conflict was the open forum, which was a heated discussion where people expressed their opinions of Program B in a ritualistic-like setting. Other than this, the tension in camp was manifested in brief insults between individuals of the different groups. The statements that I recorded about the tension were observations made by men, but it was the women who I observed actively participating in the conflict. Two examples of this are described below: the first event occurred between an A swinger and a B conservative; the second was between a B swinger and a B conservative. While both these confrontations seem trivial in retrospect they did not go unnoticed in camp.

During Programs A and B a couple of the camp rules were that people stay out of the food in the kitchen at night and stay out of the museum after it closed in the evening. However, the museum could be used on occasion when the need arose. At the end of the first week of Program B, two conservative B women moved into the museum for a couple of nights because their tent had been taken down and sent off to be repaired. This was an inconvenience to them because they had to move their possessions each day when the museum opened. One of the swinger A females, who had just returned to camp after spending a few days away and was celebrating her return, confronted the two older women with the fact that they should not be in the museum after dark. The two women

were offended by this, especially since it came from someone who was ignorant of their situation. The next day the younger woman found herself assigned to a crew with one of the above conservatives. Each avoided the other as much as possible during the work hours. A week later, these two got into a brief argument in the kitchen. When the younger one was fixing herself a snack after hours, the older woman reminded her of the kitchen rule. And so, the insult was returned.

The second example is best told in the words of one of my informants. When I asked her to write me something about her weekend, she included the following story, which describes events that I had noted too. Where she used names I have substituted others. My editorial remarks are in brackets and she did not use quotation marks. Also, swingers are S, conservatives are C, staff are X, and participants are A or B.

" . . . Now for the juiciest gossip of the day: everyone was in a good mood trying to get all of the coolers of food and all of us into the van. The back seat was Trudy [CA] and Jeff [CB]; the second to back seat was Steve [CB] and Diane [CB]; the third to back seat was Mike [CB], [herself], and Helen [SA]; and in the beginning John [CB], Patty [SB], and Valerie [SB] were in the front [bench] seat but Valerie moved into the front single seat. Fred [CX] drove. Anyway...no one noticed that Liz [CB] had put her jacket and purse on the front seat since we had cups and plates and that sort of stuff right on top of the area where her stuff was. Everyone was in the van about ready to leave when Liz walks up and bitchily asks Patty to hand her her purse and stuff. Patty gave it to her and she stomped over and sat down on a picnic bench

under the blue tent [kitchen]. Patty starts apologizing: Is this your seat? I'm sorry -- I didn't know! (She starts to get up and move).

Liz: Don't bother. I'm not going. Someone else (Steve? or Diane?): There's plenty of room!

"Martha [CB] also was taking her car to [the place they were visiting] so she consoled Liz and just said Liz'll ride with me. (Note: It was really weird -- Martha talked just like Liz was a recalcitrant child and Liz liked it enough to be talked into going!) Strange . . ."

The conflict described in this chapter centers around others evaluations of how some individuals behave during their free time. These evaluations have been expressed in terms connoting morality, with the term "swingers" having been a derogatory term. Of course, those who used these terms, the B conservatives, did not impute any immorality to themselves. In doing so, they implied that they are "better" in some sense than the rest. However, while their evaluations were important in a literal sense, they also reflected unstated social relations. This point will be discussed in the next chapter.

AMERICANA

During Program B several of the lectures were about the concept of culture. People were told that archeologists study culture through the analysis of cultural materials, that is, artifacts and features found in the ground. And if one observes archeologists in the field, they will find that archeologists make a distinction between soils that are the product of human behavior and those that are not. The former soils are called "cultural" and the latter "natural" even though excavation makes all soils exposed "cultural". What this suggests to me is that archeologists, like everyone else, are using their terms to guide their behavior. In this chapter, the described conflict will be interpreted within its cultural context, American, and in terms of culture change.

The concept of culture is a key symbol in American world view. At the core of this concept is the belief that man is unique in the natural world, which is, of course, defined by humans. This uniqueness is based on the perception that man is self-aware, is sapient, uses symbols, and has technology. Other animals are said to not be like this and have no culture. Moreover, many Christians might argue that man is not even an animal because he has morality, which animals lack. It is morality that makes man human and a man without morals is said to act like an animal.

This anthropocentrism has religious connotations. The American adoration of humanity and things human is linked to their key religious symbol, God, which is an abstraction anthropomorphized as a man controlling the universe. As they worship God, they worship themselves

in word and deed because they believe that they control nature. The first responsibility of any human is to control his own natural drives through refinement of behavior and values. It is no wonder, then, that the words culture, cult, and cultus are all cognates of the Latin colo, to take care of, attend to, as in the land, self, and the gods.

Further, it is no wonder that "no other nation has given such space to social character explanation of itself" as has the United States (Wilkinson 1983: 167). The American fascination with "self and society" is a distinctive part of their world view. According to Wilkinson, there are five historical and modern reasons for this fascination. First, the Puritan errand requires people to reassess constantly their spiritual and social progress. Second, the idea of republicanism contains the belief that democracy depends on the virtue of the people. Thirdly, the ideas of nationalism and egalitarianism establish the tension between an individual's achievement and the belief that all Americans are alike. Fourth, there is American intellectualism, which emphasizes asking who we are, what holds us together, and what are we becoming. And fifth, there is American pride and boastfulness, which stress that because of its size, America produces more of everything and that this is not enough (Wilkinson 1983: 184-187). All these themes are indirectly relevant to the conflict in camp.

The tension between self-fulfillment and the idea of social equality is a paradox of American social structure. To say that all men are created equal says nothing about the product of that creation. As being an American is an act of will (Gorer 1963: 188), social

equality is an act of will. Betterment, self fulfillment, is a social obligation for Americans because for the individual to expand his horizons, fulfill his potential, "be all that you can be," implies that the nation will be all it can be because individualism implies community (Varenne 1977: 40). And those who do not fulfill this moral obligation are segregated from the majority: Tramps symbolize failure, not only of the individual but of the community (cf. Spradley 1970); the elderly symbolize resignation of fulfilling one's potential, have no future, and do not live in an expanding world but a shrinking one (cf. Jacobs 1974).

This paradox is expressed in the key concept of culture which in contemporary usage has two popular versions, one broad in its semantic range and the other narrow. The broad version is a product of Anthropology and is now embedded in the world view of Americans. A contemporary definition is: culture is "the body of learned beliefs, traditions, and guides for behavior that are shared among members of any human society" (Barret 1984: 54). Such a definition is two things at once: it is segregative in that other animals are left out, and, it is universalistic in that all humans are treated the same. This universalism is based on cultural relativism, which is a belief that all ways of life are equally viable. Thus, the universality of mankind is expressed as horizontal segregation. Culture, in this broad sense, is a statement of equality in diversity.

In the narrow sense, culture is a statement of inequality because of diversity. Culture is the act of developing the intellectual and moral faculties, especially by education. Moreover, since people will

be variable or perhaps obstinate, in their development of such cultural traits they can be classified according to the degree of development. Or they can be classed as developed and undeveloped, with the developed "better" than the undeveloped. Development is a type of conformity. Further, since the traits used to measure development are not absolute but vary with context, inequality can only be understood in its cultural context (Fallers 1973: 5). Ideas of the individual and equality are not universal but vary with the society and within a society (Beteille 1986).

In this narrow sense then, culture allows for ethnocentrism, the differentiation of cultures, and, within a plural society like America, the formation of classes. "In a true class system, what is ranked are the culture traits. Then one takes one's position by what culture traits one either practices, demonstrates, or stands for. It leads to a system primarily based on education and sophistication" (Bohannan 1963: 172).

The ranking of culture traits includes evaluations of subtle items such as modes of walking, speech, and behavior. Evaluations of behavior are most important. One's position within the class system is achieved, developed, in that one conforms to the traits of a certain class. A class is not an organized social group but is little more than a set of culture traits as marked by the people who practice them (Bohannan 1963: 175,178).

In America the moral doctrine of equality has allowed for a classification of life styles based on culture. This classification is a horizontal differentiation based not on economics but the

respectability of a life style. While capitalism may be the catalyst for the good life, the demarcation of it is guided by moral values. This differentiation is horizontal not vertical because that would imply ranking classes into superior and inferior levels. Also, it would imply a power relationship between levels. But, such ranking is not consistent with the definition of class as given. To suggest that a class is in power implies that it is organized, which classes are not. However, a class can be used as a standard by which other classes are compared: it is a pivotal class. But a class is not a group, although, certainly, class standing can be a criterion for admission to a group (Bohannan 1963: 175). Vertical differentiation in the United State is based on the ranking of roles, situs. Horizontal differentiation is based on ideology. In a democracy where all people are equal through the letter of the law, inequality is a matter of spirit, attitude.

Class in America is based on ideals and expectations of public behavior and appearance. And realities aside, American idealism is very moralistic. This is not to say that Americans are moralistic, rather that they rationalize their world this way. Idealism "is the laying down of rules for the conduct of others which need not apply to oneself" (Gorer 1963: 59-60). Thus, one's public image is important for his class standing because it is evaluated by others.

Those most active and discriminating in evaluating other people are women because they are expected to be the upholders of American morality and virtue. In the "motherland" of the United States, women lay down the rules of conduct for others, and in doing so create and perpetuate

class rankings. These rankings are not absolute or nationwide but vary with locality and standards even though the words used may be quite common. There is a general principle that guides the evaluators in making their rankings: it is a statement of respectability, with perhaps an aspect of sophistication, as these are determined by women (cf. Gorer 1963: 50-69, 215-218; Nash 1970: 101-104).

Such a role for women creates a dilemma for some of them. They are forced to balance equality, which denies a difference between men and women, and the biological limitation of motherhood, which does recognize such a difference. For men being a parent and having a career are complimentary roles, whereas for women they are conflicting. Thus, professional women are at a disadvantage in the public sphere in that they have to protect their roles as carriers of morality and their professional standings. Men protect only the latter because they are not seen as the upholders of morality. Where a successful man may be applauded for his ability, a successful woman may have to protect her character from suggestions of immorality (cf. Potter 1964). These two conflicting roles for women have been merged because Americans have not yet resolved this dilemma, and to question one is to question the other. Professional women will be quick to protect either one, for each protects the other. In the first conflict described in Chapter Four, the conservative B woman returned the insult to defend her moral character and to cast doubt on the other's. And in the second conflict, the conservative B woman feigned submissiveness and made others recognize her position. Throughout the men were passive in the conflict

because their social status was not at stake; they were all conservatives or swingers based on their life style, which needed no defense, only acceptance.

In the United State there are two general classes, the respectables and the undesirables. The respectable class is, of course, pivotal. These people consider themselves to be "good", "model citizens", or "middle class", a reference to a life style ideal not a so-called socio-economic class. The respectables collectively characterize the undesirables as people who drink and are drunk in public, have spontaneous brawls, are unwilling to work, act with sexual license, and have trouble with police. The respectables impute to themselves no such character flaws and ally themselves with American mainstream morality as they define it. Undesirables frequently do not use corresponding labels, probably because they are not concerned with keeping the boundaries (Hannerz 1969: 34-35).

This dichotomy is not a description of what people's lives are like; it is a statement about two opposing poles in a moral continuum. It is easier to label others as respectable or not. These labels reflect only orientation in life style; they are approximations of peoples' ways of life and refer to only the regularities not variances. This continuum can be filled in with other terms, some of which are respectable-oriented and some undesirable-oriented (Hannerz 1969: 36-37). The two categories, conservative and swinger, are respectable-oriented.

The swingers did not fit into the undesirable category because they

were only slightly deviant. Undesirables are those who make the "bad" life a way of life: these are the tramps, street-corner people, and hardened criminals in American society. The presence of undesirables shames and offends respectables because they represent the failure of not only the idea of a utopian society but also that of the cultured individual. Prejudice in America is not a matter of the close-minded obstinately defending their rights but of the openminded cultured persons who are prejudiced against those who do not broaden or expand their horizons, that is, conform. Undesirables would not be welcome in an archeological field camp.

In the same sense, shopping malls in the United States are designed to attract the respectables of the society and segregate the undesirables. Malls are characterized by their lack of such stigmatized people. There is a homogeneity of "normal people" (respectable-looking and properly behaved persons) within the mall situation. However, even in malls people make distinctions; they make "deviant mountains out of deviant molehills". Or, stated another way "...anybody who doesn't do things like we do, we think those are weird" (Jacobs 1984: 15, 111). The difference between conservatives and swingers is one of weirdness. Swingers were undesirable-like because of the circumscribed field school situation.

Unlike the undesirables who are relatively unconcerned with keeping social boundaries, the swingers did have labels for the conservatives and vice versa. These labels centered around the loose/tight metaphor, with swingers being loose and conservatives being tight. And this

metaphor reflects a general distinction and ambivalence within the respectable class because Americans have no absolute idea of what the good life is--they are ambivalent about the meaning of it (Shi 1985: 277). Thus, those pursuing the good life in one way will consider as weird those going about it another way. And again, there are two ways to go about attaining the good life--that is, there are two definable poles of a continuum. On the one hand, the good life is lived through conspicuous frugality and aestheticism and on the other, conspicuous material consumption. Living the good life is an attitude and people can portray whatever attitude is deemed appropriate for a situation.

Both ways of life may appear arrogant if taken to the extreme: the frugal, in their reservedness, can appear prudish; and the conspicuously consumptive, in their boastfulness, decadent. Both extremes were present in the field camp. The fact that the project was during summer vacation and Program A was relatively informal, allowed people to relax, even in an intense way. The behavior of the swingers was not inappropriate. What was inappropriate was not relaxing to some extent. During Program B, which was relatively formal and a vacation, people were not sure of how they should act, so most B people maintained their normal life style, and in doing this, appeared prudish to the decadent vacationers.

The conflict was one group's not letting another relax in their propriety by stigmatizing them as respectable, before they, in turn, could be stigmatized. Ambiguity existed because both classes in camp were pivotal, with the swingers having had the advantage because the

bulk of them, as staff and A participants, had precedence in camp. The alliance, in protecting its own established life style, rejected the incoming group as team members, and instead, treated them as respected guests. Few people straddled the two groups. In general, the alliance forfeited the friendships that the B people could have given to acknowledge their status. The B people, in receiving ambivalent responses to their offers of friendship were not able to reject the alliance without losing the status given to them. In the United States, friendship requires a suspension of status and role between people; and to be rejected in friendship is to be put in one's place. Thus, the B people responded by labeling the others as swingers for surely they would not have labeled themselves in such a derogatory way.

The conflict in camp occurred in the initial year of Program B and everyone recognized this. As much as people were frustrated and resentful they enjoyed the work, food, and setting. Two B conservative women even expressed a desire to return the next year. I do not know if they did but one of the conservative B men returned in 1985 as camp manager. Reportedly, he did his job quite well. Another man mentioned to me that the "problems" of the field school were insignificant and could be resolved. These people recognized that change was not easy and that it was worthy of pursuit if it were seen as progress and the fulfillment of goals.

The ambiguous social structure within the camp during Program B was the result of a structural change in the archeological project. This change can be looked at in two ways, one localized and one more

abstract. In a local sense, the change from Program A to Program B changed the status and role relations within camp: Program A was characterized as a relation between staff and nonstigmatized people (who were primarily students) whereas Program B was a relation between staff and stigmatized people (professionals in the social studies field). When some of these nonstigmatized people, students, stayed in camp for Program B they were merged with the stigmatized people, the professionals. This merger conflicted with the ideal conceptions of status in American society. The professionals would have been normally considered to be culturally more developed, that is better educated than the students. The students had acquired some status in the local setting. Thus both were developed, and were considered successfully equal. As the staff and A participants had precedence in camp they allied against the stigmatized newcomers and manifested this alliance by characterizing the others as respectable. This characterization reenforced the alliance because they were resisting a change in their life style which they expected to come about. The B people, feeling that they had been slighted by being merged together with A people and having received ambivalent responses to their offers of friendship, expressed their frustration in terms of class labels. These moral taxonomies, swingers and conservatives, were multivocalic, expressing simultaneously the conflict between acquired and ascribed status, the contrast between the two programs, and the difference in behavior between the older and younger people in camp.

On a more abstract level, the structural change in the project was

a directional one not recurrent. Recurrent changes are those consistent with the continuity of the existing order; they are not changes in form but substance. Directional changes reflect alterations in the formal structure of a preexisting order. These two kinds of change are also referred to as reproduction and transformation (cf. Leach 1954, Vogt 1960, and Sahlins 1981). The directional change was the addition of Program B to the project. From 1980 to 1983 the project consisted only of Program A. For the years 1984, 1985, and 1986, the project consisted of Programs A and B. But, it appears that Program A is being phased out. The years 1981 through 1983 were the highpoint of Program A as they consisted of three sessions each. Only two sessions were offered in 1984 and 1985, and in 1986, only one. Such a change is, of course, dependent on whether the grant for Program B is renewed. If it is, Program A will probably not be continued.

This structural change was the result of a paradigm shift (cf. Wallace 1972), not in a theoretical or methodological sense but in intent, concern. On the whole, the project has had three concerns: the first has been to do archeology; the second has been to give people field experience; and the third has been to make the public more aware of archeology. While both programs have addressed these concerns, Program A has emphasized the first two in that it has utilized labor more effectively in getting work done: Program B has emphasized the first and third concerns in that it has minimized excavation in favor of teaching teachers about archeology. These were then expected to incorporate an archeological perspective into their lectures. If

archeology in the United States is ultimately dependent on the public for financing, then field schools such as Program A, which are the norm in Archeology and cater mostly to students, are less effective in making the public aware of what archeology is all about. Program B is more effective in doing this and is, then, innovative.

Program B was aimed at a third concern which A did not address. This concern was an elaboration on the third, creating public awareness of Archeology. The explicit invitation to history and social studies people for them to become involved in an archeological project was one attempt to resolve a long-standing problem within Anthropology; that is, what is the relationship between Anthropology and History? Anthropologists and historians have rarely worked well together even though much of their subject matter is the same. This lack of close cooperation is even more evident in areas where the two disciplines overlap, Ethnohistory and Historical Archeology.

In a recent article aimed at historical archeologists, Deagan and Scardaville (1985) discussed three problems that have hindered archeologists and historians from working well together. The first is that archeologists have been criticized by historians for misusing the documentary data base. The second is that historians have not been aware of the anthropological concerns and needs of archeologists. And the third problem is that the integration of archeological and historical data has been hindered by the compartmentalized working structure, which is not designed to promote interdisciplinary harmony. These problems are practicalities due to the mutual ignorance of the

other discipline by practitioners of both. The main intent of Program B has been to resolve some of these problems.

But there is a fourth problem that is not a practicality but rather is a paradigmatic conflict due to how each of these disciplines functions in American society. Although both Anthropology and History have the description of the human condition as one of their functions, they contrast in their other important function, that of interpretation. Anthropology is a cultural critique for ourselves; its interpretive function is to use knowledge of other cultures to examine the assumptions of our own (Marcus and Fischer 1986). The interpretive function of History is to perpetuate the assumptions of our society; it is a cultural validation not critique. In fulfilling these functions, anthropologists use the concept of culture in the broad sense and historians use it in the narrow sense.

For example, to anthropologists sacred shrines are to be studied when possible. But for historians, such shrines symbolize the greatness of a society. And whereas anthropologists have a romantic, adventurous, image within the general public, historians do not. When archeologists excavate national shrines and create much publicity in doing so, these shrines become profaned, made undignified. And historians become resentful that monuments of the human condition are cheapened. Such has been the case with the Custer National Battlefield in Montana, where archeologists have excavated and much sensationalizing of the battle was done by news journalists (c.f. Utley 1986).

The goal of Program B was to help historians and anthropologists

overcome such possible resentments. The open forum where the complaint was made that the swingers were running the camp, ended on a point that should have been made explicit throughout the program, but was not: that is, what is the relationship between Historical Archeology and History. Historical Archeology is a relatively new subfield of Anthropology; its main American society was only chartered in the 1960's whereas History has been around for a very long time. And so, the swingers were running the camp in only one sense; that is, members of a new, developing subfield were training members of an old, well established discipline about the new subfield. And this unique training situation was beneficial more to the archeologists than to the participants of Program B, who were primarily historians. If historians would validate the critical function of Anthropology, they would be helping to change the romantic image of Anthropology within the general public to one of seriousness. When the general public recognizes the seriousness of Anthropology, especially Archeology, then this discipline will have become developed. Program B might be best characterized, then, as "Archeology is good to think."

MORAL FIBER

The conflict in camp was the result of an ambiguous social structure and this was expressed in class terms. These moral taxonomies indicated that the boundaries were not clearly defined between those who were in charge of the camp and those who were not. While some staff were clearly in charge, others appeared not to be so; while some participants were clearly only that, others could easily have taken charge if the need arose. This was a continuum of groups in camp based on obligation: the staff power bloc, the nonpowerful staff, the A participants, the younger B people, and the older B people. The ambiguity was that the staff power bloc and the older B people had more in common in terms of age and culturedness than they had with the groups they were contractually associated with. The two poles did not merge because people were fulfilling their contracts; the middle groups merged because they did not let their contracts restrain them from making friends. And people endured this situation because by doing so they were bettering themselves by developing their moral fiber, the strength of character by which people fulfill their obligations.

The search for culture may be a recent fad in American world view, and, the experimentation with alternative life styles may lead people to readjust their traditional values of respectability. But some basic values have not changed and may be the basis of such current fads. The egalitarian belief has always been offset by another, progress. A society of equals is a stagnant, boring one, and progress implies that

some members will be left behind. For Americans equality is a legal right; it is something people have, not are, as they better themselves by being openminded, expanding their horizons, and transcending trivia; it is something to be bypassed when possible and confronted when it is a means to betterment. And so, the camp was not one of saints, for that would have been boring.

People attend archeological field schools for various personal reasons but we can generalize their reasons into one: it is an escape from the normal routine of the year. If these people learn something about life or archeology then their time has not been wasted. The Old Timer recognized this, for he did not require field reports from his undergraduates who earned independent credits from him; they got their credits because they showed up and stuck it out, endured. And, of course, enduring means "killing time". When I was note taking in 1983 I was told to emphasize the boring aspect of field work. What I have done is describe some things which happen when people get bored. If the project allowed people to escape from their normal lives then socializing, evaluating, and gossiping were ways to pass the time when they were free of the obligations of the project.

The tension between the community's subgroups occurred within an unusual situation. The organization and intent of Program B brought people of specific statuses together and rearranged those statuses such that expectations of some American norms were not met. These expectations were not met because there were various interpretations by all the people in camp of how successful people should behave and be

treated. The situation was a special training one. Professionals from one field were training professionals from another about the former. The main trainees were, then, temporary students with high status. To confuse the situation, students, people of lower status, participated as trainees too. The situation was analogous to a military special training situation where a sergeant or an officer trains a group composed of privates and officers about some specialty. However, in the military situation the officer-trainees assume some form of command during the off-hours of the training period. In this archeological field camp B participants had no such responsibilities during their free time. So, even though their participation in Program B was a verification of their status, it was not verified during their free time.

Group B was, then, hard to identify with because those people were in limbo, simple anomie, which "refers to the state of confusion in a group or society which is subject to conflict [within its] value-system resulting in some degree of uneasiness and a sense of separation from the group" (Merton 1957: 163). No one was sure how the B group fit in and so its members had little sense of ingroup solidarity. In contrast, the A group members were in a state much like liminality. They were threshold people, upwardly mobile, and ideally without status (c.f. Turner 1969). They knew that they fit in and had much ingroup solidarity.

In terms of class, the staff power bloc identified with the swingers because those younger people were threshold people developing themselves. Liminality is a state that most Americans experience and

the older people in camp had already done so. The swinger life style was not emulated by the conservatives because liminality is ideally a state of freedom from obligation, social position. The conservatives had their social positions to consider whereas the swingers could forget their own temporarily. The problem was that the swingers could not forget the statuses of the conservatives and vice versa. That is, the swingers met the obligations of the project because it was an excuse for them to forget the obligations of their normal lives. For the conservatives, the project was an extension of their normal lives and by meeting the obligations of the project they were meeting the obligations of their profession; the irony for them was that they were on vacation.

It seems fitting to conclude this report with a camp song, popular in 1981 and revived somewhat in 1984. The earlier analogy with camp life being like mall-life was no coincidence. And so, if the Old Timer will overlook one last transgression on his project, the "Shopping Mall".

Hey now, I'm gonna give my baby a call
I'm gonna meet her down at the brand new shopping mall.
Ain't got no job, no way to pay my rent
but I keep on shopping till I squander my last cent.

Come on now baby, try on these discount shoes
for \$2.92 you can lose those shopping mall blues.
Well your dad don't like me but your momma thinks I'm swell
I'd stop for dinner but your house had a funny smell.

I'm gonna wash in the fountain, use the public telephone
this shoppin' mall's gonna be my brand new home.
It's got ample parking, but I don't like Doughnut Shack
I don't use no dishes when you're eating from a paper sack.

So don't turn me in cuz I hang around all day long
if there weren't no fools there sure wouldn't be no . . .

(The Cheap Suit Serenaders, #3, 1978).

APPENDIX

Robert Murphy has discussed the ethnographic dilemma, which he calls a classic double bind: "It is the dialectics of reducing people to objects while trying to achieve understanding of them and of converting ourselves into instruments while struggling to maintain our identities" (Murphy 1980: 11). In other words, one must deal with the conflict between ascriptions about oneself and the change in these, if any, due to acquired knowledge of others. However, as the ethnographer of this archeological project, I did not confront this problem.

There are two reasons for this: the first is a matter of ideology, and the second, a matter of categorization. It would be convenient to state that I was ignorant of the problem, but I could not have gotten away with it. While doing the field work in 1983 I was asked twice about how I was going to be objective. I replied that I do not believe in it. I reject the objective/subjective concept that is so fundamental to Western ideology not because the ideal of objectivity cannot be practiced but because of the animistic aspect that is inherent in it. My concern has been in trying to understand why people believe such mental, essence-related topics not perpetrating them. And so, I did not to not turn myself into an instrument or my subjects into objects.

Secondly, I did not undergo an identity crisis while in the field: culture shock was not a problem either. I never questioned who I was or what I was doing. Moreover, it was comforting to listen to the Old Timer explain to some A participants in 1983 who I was and what I was

doing. The staff, as anthropologists, did not question the validity of my project. At worst, they could have said it would cause tension and ask me not to do it. And now that it is done, they can question my observations and interpretations to alleviate any tension I may have caused.

The problem that confronted me was determining whom to observe. I had to define who the natives were. However, in doing this I had to realize that, while I was a novice ethnographer, I was no "greenhorn" native. I decided that, as I had committed myself to the project, then the natives would be those who had done likewise. As I had once participated in Program A then those participants would, too, be natives. In 1983 the A participants treated me as a staff member; to them my position in camp was ascribed. To the staff I had earned my position by having invested much time, money, and effort to the archeological project. Also, my standing as a graduate student in Anthropology allied me with most of them. Moreover, to understand Program A one could not ignore the people who ran it in the field. At the end of Program A in 1984 I debated whether or not I should stay for Program B because my initial plan was to write only about the A program. But by then it was obvious that the two programs contrasted in their organization and intent, so I decided to stay and take notes for comparison. Thus the B participants became natives too.

Obviously, my project held second place to that of the ongoing archeology. And the least obnoxious position for me to take was that of a participant observer. Working from a small personal budget, my field

techniques were simple, consisting of observation, casual conversation, and still photography. For the most part I followed people around and noted some of what they did, said, and when and under what circumstances these events occurred. As a standard procedure, I focused on what people said they were going to do and then waited to see if they followed through. I knew that the project had a schedule, so I waited and let things happen, and noted it when they did. Note pads, pens, a watch, and a camera were all that I used. I did not conduct formal interviews or a survey. In 1983 I handed out a questionnaire that 26 people filled out but I did not urge people to do so. I felt that the project was too short for me to be bothering people with time consuming tasks during their free time, so I mostly watched and listened. Thus, like a salvage archeologist, I collected as much information as possible and, then everyone went home.

Surely I could have presented the material differently. The defined community has been presented as having both unity and internal diversity. Further, I could have presented each subgroup in the same way. Therefore, by focusing on the community and the fractionation within it I have had to emphasize each subgroup's unity. This method is the same principle that Americans follow when making their social differentiations. Ultimately, I could have reduced the social structure into as many people as were there. By taking this question of scale into account I have avoided the interpersonal relationships that characterize the camp setting and American society in general. This report is, then, a poor substitute for the great-American-novel.

Thus I did not confront any ethnographic dilemma because I was the disinterested insider. My contact with these people has been limited to the field season. While I consider some of these people to be my friends, all involved were relative strangers to me and I to them. This point has been impressed on me on the few occasions when I have met some of them outside of the field context. If my position as the disinterested insider has led to bias, there are, at least, arguments for and against such a perspective (cf. Augilar 1981). I agree with Hennigh (1981), who believes that the insider can use his bias to make further insights and, perhaps, a more interesting study. Barret (1984: 30) has argued that the problem with being an insider is that one will have to assume a particular role and act according to the obligations and limitations of that role. I agree with this position too. Since the people under study were familiar with the role of the ethnographer and I had expressed my intention to be one, I had to meet this obligation. And finally, there is always Nash's point of view (1963), that anthropologists, due to their training, are always strangers in their own land.

REFERENCES

- Augilar, John
1981 "Insider research: An ethnography of debate" In Donald A. Messerschmidt (ed.), *Anthropologists at Home in North America*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 15-26.
- Beteille, Andre
1986 "Individualism and Equality." *Current Anthropologist* 27: 121-134.
- Barret, Richard A.
1984 *Culture and Conduct: An excursion in Anthropology*. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Bohannan, Paul
1963 *Social Anthropology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.
- Buber, Martin
1949 *Paths in Utopia*. Boston: Beacon.
- Butler, William B.
1976 "Archeology and Prohibition". *Plains Anthropologist* 21-71: 67-72.
- Deagan, Kathleen and Michael Scardaville
1985 "Archeology and History on Historic Hispanic Sites: Impediments and solutions." *Historical Archeology* 19: 32-37.
- Fabian, Johannes
1983 *Time and the Other: How Anthropology makes it object*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Fallers, Lloyd A.
1973 *Inequality: Social stratification reconsidered*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Flannery, Kent
1982 "The Golden Marshalltown: A parable for the Archeology of the 1980's". *American Anthropologist* 84(2): 265-278.
- Freeman, Derek
1984 *Margaret Mead and Samoa: The making and unmaking of an anthropological myth*. London: Penguin Books.
- Gorer, Geoffrey
1964 *The American People: A study in national character*. Revised edition. New York: Norton.

- Hannerz, Ulf
 1969 *Soulside: Inquiries into ghetto culture and community*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hennigh, Lawrence
 1981 "The Anthropologist as Key Informant: Inside a rural Oregon town". In Donald A. Messerschmidt (ed.), *Anthropologists at Home in North America*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 121-132.
- Hymes, Dell (ed.)
 1974 *Reinventing Anthropology*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Jacobs, Jerry
 1974 *Fun City: An ethnographic study of a retirement community*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.
 1984 *The Mall: An attempted escape from everyday life*. Prospect Heights: Waveland Press.
- Leach, Edmund R.
 1954 *Political Systems of Highland Burma*. London: Beacon.
- Marcus, George E. and Michael M. J. Fischer
 1986 *Anthropology as Culture Critique: An experimental moment in the human sciences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Merton, Robert K.
 1957 *Social Theory and Social Structure*. Revised edition. New York: The Free Press.
- Murphy, Robert
 1980 *The Dialectics of Social Life: Alarms and excursions in anthropological theory*. New York: Columbia University Press Morningside Edition.
- Nadel, S. F.
 1957 *The Theory of Social Structure*. New York: Free Press.
- Nash, Dennison
 1963 "The Ethnologist as Stranger: An essay in the sociology of knowledge". *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 19: 149-167.
 1970 *A Community in Limbo*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Potter, David M.
 1964 "American Women and the American Character" In John A. Hague (ed.), *American Character and Culture: Some twentieth century perspectives*. Deland: Everatt Press, pp. 65-84.

Sahlins, Marshal

1981 Historical Metaphors and Mythical Realities. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Sellers, Mary

1973 "The Secret Notebook for the Practicing Archeologist: With preliminary notes towards an ethno-science of Archeology". Plains Anthropologist 18-60: 140-148.

Shi, David E.

1985 The Simple Life: Plain living and high thinking in American culture. New York: Oxford University Press.

Spradley, James P.

1970 You Owe Yourself a Drunk: An ethnography of urban nomads. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co.

1980 Participant Observation. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.

Turner, Victor W.

1969 The Ritual Process: Structure and anti-structure. New York: Aldine.

Utley, Robert M.

1986 "On Digging up Custer Battlefield." Montana: The Magazine of Western History 36(2): 80-82.

Varenne, Herve

1977 Americans Together: Structured diversity in a midwestern town. New York: Teachers College Press.

Vogt, Evon Z.

1960 "On the Concepts of Structure and Process in Cultural Anthropology". American Anthropologist 62: 18-33.

Wallace, Anthony F. C.

1972 "Paradigmatic Process in Culture Change". American Anthropologist 74: 467-478.

Wilkinson, Rupert

1983 "American Character Revisited." Journal of American Studies 17(2): 165-187.