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The 1918 U.S. Congressional Hearings on Peyote
Lee D. Baker
Duke University

During the winter of 1918, the United States was mired in the war to end all wars, but the tide was slowly turning to favor the Allies. While most citizens were considering President Woodrow Wilson's plans for peace, outlined in his famous “Fourteen Points” speech, certain politicians, anthropologists, and American Indian intellectuals were focused on the Congressional Hearings on Peyote. This debate provides one of the most dramatic examples of clashing political interests concerning the expression of American Indian culture during the first part of the twentieth century. The hearings were convened by the House Committee on Indian Affairs on February 21, 1918, and were widely publicized and reported. The committee’s transcripts remain an important part of anthropology's historical record.

Freedom, justice, liberty, and equality— the ostensive virtues of democracy— are powerful goals set by scholars, activists, lawyers, and politicians to make the United States a more perfect union. Unlike equality or justice, religious freedom is such an unambiguous and fundamental value for so many Americans that it has rarely been evoked in struggles for equality. Even though bitter anti-Catholic and anti-Semitic movements have plagued the United States, the federal government never considered abrogating the First Amendment for Catholics and Jews. But Indians were treated differently. The First Amendment states that, “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof,” but in 1883, Congress passed the “Indian Religious Crimes Code,” which virtually outlawed all customary dances, ceremonies, and religious rites. Part of the government’s efforts to promote Indian assimilation, the code called for the imprisonment of practitioners and instructed bureau agents to focus their efforts on the “medicine men.” (Irwin 1997:35) Not least because the peyote cactus can induce hallucinations or visions, the so-called peyote cult was a religious practice that generated a particularly high-level of controversy, persecution, and suspicion.

There are several reasons why the peyote hearings of 1918 are a fecund site to analyze the early-twentieth century controversy over American Indian culture and policy in the United States. First, the most important players involved in these issues testified at the hearings. Zitkala-Sa (also known as Gertrude Bonnin), Charles Eastman, Francis La Flesche, James Mooney, and the august General Richard H. Pratt each articulated his or her own particular views; in testifying, each both responded to questions posed by members of the congressional committee and tried to discredit the other witnesses. The hearings also marked an important turning point in the overall shift in policy from assimilation to conservation, and many of the so-called Indian progressives were split over the issue, revealing important fault lines and competing visions for the future. Finally, mudslinging and name-calling revealed the role ethnology played in the high-stakes game of ethnographic authentication.

James Mooney (1861-1921) was a white Smithsonian ethnologist who was deeply committed to the rights and well-being of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache groups he studied. He argued at the hearings “that the use of this plant is not an ordinary habit, but that it is confined almost entirely and strictly to the religious ceremony, excepting that it is
frequently employed also for medicinal purposes.” (Peyote Hearings 1918:69) In making this argument, Mooney challenged the authority of Zitkala-Sa (1876-1938), a Yankton Lakota and secretary-treasurer of the Society of American Indians (SAI). She provided compelling testimony at the hearings against any use of peyote. Mooney, who supported the ceremonial and medicinal uses of peyote, went on the offensive, attacking her credibility by challenging her authenticity.

Zitkala-Sa launched a media campaign to coincide with the hearings, and it worked. The Washington Times gave the hearings front-page coverage and ran a story that was essentially an interview of Zitkala-Sa detailing the ill “effects of mind poison.” Accompanying the story was an image of Zitkala-Sa. Holding up a copy of the paper, Mooney explained to members of Congress that Zitkala-Sa “claims to be a Sioux woman,” but she was wearing “a woman’s dress from a southern tribe, as shown by the long fringes; the belt is a Navajo man’s belt; the fan is a peyote man’s fan carried only by men usually in the peyote ceremony.” (PH 1918:63) Ostensibly, her gender bending and mixing of different tribal elements in her clothing undermined her credibility and thus her claim to speak in the best interests of her people. As Mooney reminded the members of Congress, “an Indian delegate from a sectarian body or alleged uplift organization is not a delegate for his tribe.” (PH 1918:149) Mooney implied that only the scientific eye of a seasoned ethnologist could identify improper claims.

For his part, Richard Pratt argued that Mooney was wrong to promote “these nightly orgies that have been described so graphically by the Bureau of Ethnology itself.” (PH 1918:144) He challenged the scientific authority of ethnographic inquiry and implied that it was not the Indians but white anthropologists who were responsible for the growing use of Peyote. In a heated exchange between Pratt and Mooney, Pratt addressed Mooney directly: “You ethnologists egg on, frequent, illustrate, and exaggerate at the public expense, and so give the Indian race and their civilization a black eye in the public esteem. It was well established at the time of the ghost-dance craze among the Indians that white men were its promoters if not its originators. That this peyote craze is under the same impulse is evident from what appears in this evidence.” (PH 1918:147)

Zitkala-Sa did not address Pratt or Mooney directly, but chose to appeal to the conscience of committee members. Calling “peyote, [the] twin brother of alcohol, and first cousin to habit forming drugs,” she pleaded, “Mr. Chairman, were the life of your loved one threatened by a pernicious drug, would you care a straw what the ethnologists had written about the drug; how many years they had studied the drug? No; because the civilized man has studied for centuries other habit-forming drugs; but that study does not warrant anyone giving it to another in the name of religion today.” (PH 1918:164, 165)

The esteemed physician and Dartmouth graduate, Charles Eastman, took a different approach. He explained that the use of peyote “is not an Indian idea nor is it an Indian practice. It is more like what happened a few years ago during the ghost-dance craze, which, as we all know, was gotten up by irresponsible, reckless, and unprincipled people who thought that under the conditions the Indians were suffering from something like that would go, and they would get some personal benefit out of it.” (PH 1918:139) For Eastman, the use of peyote should be banned because it was not an Indian practice, but Francis La Fleshe
supported its use as a sacrament. La Flesche was Omaha and an anthropologist who was elected in 1912 as Vice-president of the American Anthropological Association (Hoxie 2001:180). Like Eastman and Zitkala-Sa, La Flesche was a member of the SAI at the time of the peyote hearings, but the three disagreed. According to La Flesche, the use of peyote was part of a new accommodating religion that helped Indians to avoid liquor and uplifted the race. La Flesche argued, “the Indians who have taken the new religion strive to live upright, moral lives, and I think their morality can be favorably compared with that of any community of a like number in this country.” (PH 1918:114).

At first blush, the arguments for and against the use of peyote may seem like a dizzying array of contradictory statements and rhetorical jockeying. Upon closer inspection, one can identify the logic that bolstered each participant’s political position. Several issues came up repeatedly: regional specificity, gender, the ghost-dance, ethnology, civilization, sex, and morality. Each participant in these hearings had his or her own history and political commitments born out of, and in response to, the assimilation policies promulgated by state and federal governments. The peyote hearings demonstrate that the history of anthropology is a discourse that is inextricable from American-Indian intellectual history as well as the history of progressive-era reformers.
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PITH HELMET CORNER: AN OCCASIONAL COLUMN ON EPHEMERA RELATED TO THE HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY
Robert Gordon
University of Vermont

One of the unintended consequences of anthropology has been the way it has stimulated the creativity of a wide variety of poets ranging from established ones like W. H. Auden to lowly villagers. Not only are they sometimes amusing and entertaining, but they also offer insight into relationships between anthropologists and the wider community.
While occasionally anthropologists will be satirized in novels such as David Lodge's *Paradise News* and David Parkin's *Krippendorf's Tribe*, the use of doggerel to try to make satirical statements about anthropology has a longer history. Properly contextualized, such statements provide important clues about how anthropologists were perceived.

Anthropologists have also used this medium. Perhaps the best, indeed classic, example is the late Peter Lawrence, Professor of Social Anthropology at Sydney University and author of *Road Belong Cargo*, who composed an epic poem, *Don Juan in Melanesia*, a 64 stanza 'rubbishing' of ahistoricism which was originally published in an Australian literary magazine, *Quadrant*, and later republished in book form with illustrations and introduction by James McAuley by Queensland University Press. Should there be sufficient reader interest we will try to get rights to republish this forgotten classic.

Offered here are a some doggerel collected over the years with the plea that if any readers know of other examples of historical doggerel they please submit them to HAN. My own collection is restricted to examples from Africa and Oceania. Are examples of such doggerel found in other geographic areas or is it a form of social commentary restricted to areas where a large number of "settlers" or "expatriates" are found?

Radcliffe-Brown

To be sung to the tune of *Burlington Bertie*

My name's Radcliffe-Brown
I'm the talk of the town
And I know all about ancient tools
I've been to Malaya
I've met Todalaya
And I can tell morons from fools.
My smile is sardonic
My brushback is chronic
The ladies all think that my voice is harmonic.
I'm Rad, Rad, I've gone to the bad
All monogamous tribes I'll abhor
I've ten wives in Tonga
Had I been there longer
I might have had twenty five more.

(Source: Ken Maddock, "Songs of Famous Men," *The Australian Journal of Anthropology* 3 (1990):19-21. Maddock collected the song from Mary Patterson, who in turn was given it by Ian Hogbin, one of Radcliffe-Brown's students in Sydney).

Anthropophagology

In lovely Hawaii, where the sea and the sky
(And the girls) are attractive and kind,
A coterie small, anthropologists all,
Assembled to talk themselves blind.
"Though the world may deride," one orator cried,
"And scientists gurgle with mirth,
Yet at last here we are in our own Seminar
   And WE KNOW we’re the salt of the earth.”

The others applauded. Reporters recorded
   The speech and were hungry for more.
But they waited in vain; no one spouted again,
   So they all went to sleep on the floor.
And the president said, as he scratched his bald head
   And removed a sea-slug from his ear,
“The meeting’s a wow! It’s all clear to me now.
   We’re the salt of the Ocean. Hear, hear!”

Still the conference sat, and its members grew up
   And took all the pleasure they could.
They had lobsters for tea; and between you and me
   They ate very much more than they should.
They lay on the beach with a girl side by side
   And they dallied and dithered and dozed
Till young Clarence one morning, without a warning,
   Spoke thus e’er the conference closed:

“As regards education, the nativization
   Of civilised custom must hold,
Native culture must live; nor must cannibals give
   Up their habits because they are told.
Let the head-hunters thrive, and their customs survive
   As the basis of solid advance.
I’m all for sensation; and civilisation.
   Don’t give our great science a chance.”

They gave him a cheer and they bought him a beer,
   And they put him to bed on the beach
With his head in the sand and some Aspirin in hand
   And a large block of ice within reach.
When they waked him at dawn he sat up with a yawn
   And reached for the pants by his bed.
But they shouted, “Go slow! You are nativized now!”
   And they gave him a sulu instead.

They dressed him in that and a panama hat
   And a pair of tan shoes for his feet.
And they shipped him “with care” on a second class fare
   To Papua’s peaceful retreat.
As he sat in his camp in a pestilent swamp
   Some two hundred miles up the Fly,
In deep meditation on nativization,
   A cannibal party came by.
Young Clarence cried “Halt! If you’ve pepper and salt
And some dishes and cutlery too,
I’ll show you the way to eat man. And I’d say
I know far more about it than you.”
So he started a class, the fatuous ass,
Good manners with custom combining,
And recited the rules to those cannibal ghouls
Till he’d taught them the whole art of dining.

“Now A is for appetite. B is for belch (please
don’t do it so close in my ear),
And C for the corpse, and D for the dish,
And E for the strict etiquette that I wish
To instill into ev’ry one here.

“F is for fingers, but also for fork; G the gravy
you drink without noise.
H for the habits I teach ev’ry day,
I for the innards the cook throws away,
And J for the joint’s juicy joys.

“K is the knuckle-bone, nutty to gnaw; L for
liver, and M is for meat.
And N for the napkin you always should use
And O for the orgies I’ll never refuse;
P for the pain if you once over-eat.”

So, the alphabet through, he instructed his crew
Of crude but ambitious man-eaters
Till they’d learned such a lot they neglected the pot
And grew thin as the hungry mosquitos.
Then the chief took a stand with a club in his hand
Facing poor little Clarence. “The fact is,
I’ve a concept,” said he. “It’s a new one to me,
And I’m going to put it in practice.

“Now A is for anger as well as for art; and B
is for brain soft and sweet.
And C is for club and for cranium, too,
And D’s for a dinner with which we could do,
And E is for esculent; that must mean you -
And we’re all wanting something to eat.”

The speaker stopped there; but his murderous stare
Caused Clarence to gasp and to shiver.
Then he shouted, “My hat! You must never do that!”
And he flung himself into the river.
As he swam with the stream he awoke from his dream
To the facts of his own situation;
And he cried: "I for one have quite finally done
With the concept of nativization."

(Source: Pacific Islands Monthly September 18, 1937: 64. The song was "inspired by certain aspects of the report of the conference on Native Education held last year in Honolulu.")
Could the author be Felix Keesing, W. C. Groves, or F. E. Williams?

(to be sung to the tune of British Grenadiers)

Con brio Americano, prejudissimo, Unescissimo
Some talk of race relations, and some of politics,
Of labour and migrations, of his'ry, lice and ticks,
Investments, trends of amity
And patterns of behaviour
Let none treat us with levity
For we are out to save 'yer.

When seated in our library-chairs
We’re filled with righteous thought’tho,
We shoulder continental cares
Tell settlers what we ought to,
We’ll jargonise and analyse
Frustrations and fixations,
Neuroses, angst and stereotypes
In structured integration.

Strange cultures rise from notes and graphs
Through Freud’s and Jung’s perception
Despite your Ego’s dirty laughs
We’ll change you to perfection,
We’ve read Bukharin, Kant and Marx
And even Toymbee’s stories
And our dialectical sparks
Will make explode the Tories.

Rhodesians hear our sage advice
On cross-acculturation,
On inter-racial kinship ties
And folk-way elongation,
On new conceptual frame works high
We’ll bake our cakes of custom,
And with a socializing sigh
We’ll then proceed to bust’em.

Our research tools are sharp and gleam
With verified statistics,
Our intellectual combat team
Has practiced its heuristics
From value judgements we are free,
We only work scientific
For all-round liberty
And Ph.d.s pontific.

(Originally published in the Northern Rhodesian Journal, 1959).

The Marxist-Leninist Song
Sung to the tune of the Major-General's Song from Gilbert and Sullivan's "Pirates of Penzance"

I am the very model of a modern Marxist-Leninist.
I'm anti-war, and anti-God and very anti-feminist;
My thinking's dialectical, my wisdom's undebateable,
When I negate negations they're undoubtedly negatable.
And yet I'm no ascetic - I'm always full of bonhomie
When lecturing to classes on the primitive economy;
And comrades all agree that they have never heard a smarter cuss
Explain the basic reasons for the slave revolt of Spartacus

(Chorus)
Explain the basic reasons, etc.

I'm fierce and unrelenting when I'm extirpating heresies
Yet patient and forgiving to the comrade who his error sees;
In short, as a propagandist, agitator and polemicist
I am the very model of a modern Marxist-Leninist.

(Chorus)
In short, as a propagandist, agitator and polemicist etc.
I am the very model of a modern Marxist-Leninist.

My love of Party history comes very close to mania.
I teem with information on the Bund in Lithuania.
My speech on the Decembrists is replete with fun and pleasantry.
I know the different stages in collectivising peasantry.
With Russian Social-Democrats I'm always glad to clench a fist
(While carefully distinguishing the Bolshevist and Menshevik);
But when I'm confronted with a regular Bukharinite
I get a rise in temperature (both centigrade and Fahrenheit).

(Chorus)
He gets a rise in temperature, etc.

I know what Lenin said about the concept of the deity,
And why it's very dangerous to worship spontaneity.
In short, as a propagandist, agitator and polemicist
I am the very model of a modern Marxist-Leninist.

(Chorus)
In short, as a propagandist, agitator and polemicist
I am the very model of a modern Marxist-Leninist.

In fact when I begin to try to fight against bureaucracy
To criticise myself a bit, and practice more democracy,
And bringing Marx's teachings up to date I'm much more wary at,
And when I've done with phrases like "impoverished proletariat";
When I've learned that workers think that nothing can be sillier,
Than "monolithic unity" and biased Russophilia -
Then people will exclaim: "Hurrah! He's not a stupid sap at all!
A better Marxist-Leninist has never studied Capital!"

(Chorus)
A better Marxist-Leninist has never studied Capital! etc

My policies and theories have an air of unreality
Because I am a victim of the cult of personality
But still, as propagandist, agitator and polemicist
I am the very model of a modern Marxist-Leninist.

(Chorus)
But still, as propagandist, agitator and polemicist
I am the very model of a modern Marxist-Leninist.

(Recorded by Dan O'Meara at the University of Dar Es Salaam in the early 1970s)

HISTORIES OF THE HUMAN SCIENCES: DIFFERENT DISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVES
Joy Rohde
University of Pennsylvania

On May 6, scholars convened at the University of Pennsylvania to attend the day-long conference, "Histories of the Human Sciences: Different Disciplinary Perspectives." Conference organizer Henrika Kuklick began the day by welcoming participants and thanking the Department of the History and Sociology of Science for sponsoring the event. The conference brought together historians and practicing social scientists united by their interest in the history of the human sciences. Three paper sessions and a final roundtable provoked ample and stimulating discussion and pointed to new directions in the field.

The conference's first session assembled practitioners of psychology, economics and anthropology. University of Illinois anthropologist Matti Bunzl provided an excellent
example of the way that the history of social science can inform contemporary debates among anthropologists. Troubled by the disappearance of anthropology from the public sphere, Bunzl argued that postmodern anthropology's avoidance of generalization—characterized at its most extreme by the disavowal of the culture concept itself as an "essentialized abstraction"—has made the discipline irrelevant to public debate by producing an unwieldy body of descriptive knowledge. Bunzl suggested that anthropologists reconsider the approach of the interwar Boasian cultural anthropologists, who invoked the culture concept as a useful abstraction endowed with analytical utility to seek a middle ground between generalization and specificity. Although aware of George Stocking's injunction against 'presentist' history, Bunzl illustrated the value of nuanced disciplinary histories for practitioners and historians alike.

Bunzl's co-panelists, Wesleyan University psychologist Jill Morawski and University of Notre Dame economist Philip Mirowski, took historicist approaches toward their disciplines. Morawski extended her examination of reflexivity in psychology through an artful history of experimental psychology's concern about the relationship between the subject and subjectivity during the Cold War. Mirroring postwar American culture, psychologists were suspicious of the veracity and autonomy of both the experimental subject and the experimenter, bogging researchers down for a time in unproductive ruminations on the nature of reality itself. Mirowski, in his characteristically provocative style, attacked the commonplace claim that economists have successfully developed an economics of knowledge, for his historical study shows that they have never reconciled the concept of "information" with the neoliberal model of the marketplace. In a lively discussion following the papers, conference participants pointed out that economics has been much more successful than other human sciences in attracting funding and prestige. This panel suggested to a number of audience members that the most successful human science was the one that did not fret over the epistemic details, but instead charged ahead unhindered by reflexivity.

The day's second session gave historians a turn at the podium. John Carson, Director of the Program in Science, Technology and Society at the University of Michigan, introduced his new research project on the history of psychological expertise in the courts. Carson argued that medical practitioners in the nineteenth century courtroom were engaged in "a double act of bodily fashioning." At the same time as they had to appear to be laying bare transparent and self-evident facts to the jury, expert witnesses had to "manipulate their evidence" to demonstrate the mental soundness or unsoundness of the individual in question without appearing to be manufacturing her behavior. University of California at Santa Barbara historian Alice O'Connor, best known for her highly acclaimed Poverty Knowledge, explored the tight links between conservative philanthropies and the rise of conservative think tanks in the 1970s through a history of the Manhattan Institute. O'Connor demonstrated that New York's urban crisis served as a "crucible" for galvanizing the new activism of the American Right and creating a counter-intelligentsia. The Institute, despite the superficiality of the knowledge it produced, was highly successful in its mission to position itself as "outside of and against the academy." While Left-liberal social scientists agonized about the relationship between knowledge and power, O'Connor argued that the Institute's thinkers showed "a total willingness to use knowledge as an instrument of power." The final contribution to the panel by Leila Zenderland, Professor of American Studies at California State University at Fullerton, called participants' attention to a tradition
of Yiddish language social research developed in Lithuania during the 1930s. Zenderland highlighted the different answers to the question "Knowledge for What?" raised by American social scientist Robert Lynd and Eastern European Jewish researchers, especially Max Weinreich. While Lynd argued that knowledge should be used for social transformation, Weinreich viewed social science as a tool to protect the minds of stigmatized despised social groups like Eastern European Jews from the mental and psychological damage of prejudice.

The conference's final paper session brought the perspectives of scholars from literature departments to bear on the history of the human sciences. Susan Hegeman of the University of Florida argued that the culture concept gained popularity in the 1960s because it accommodated the uneasy similarities and differences shared by participants in the various rights movements of the 1960s. Hegeman hypothesized that cultural studies has declined in importance because the problems that led to the "cultural turn" seem less pressing, as concerns about globalization have replaced interest in identity politics. Temple University's Peter Logan presented his research on the construction of fetishism by European colonizers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Positing that fetishism is based in a triangular relationship between fetish, fetishist, and critic (often an anthropologist or psychologist), Logan demonstrated that fetishism was an invention of Europe, not of the colonial periphery. Finally, Barbara Hermstein Smith of Duke University and Brown University presented a fascinating history of psychological research into millenarian movements in the 1950s. Drawing on the theory of cognitive conservatism—the idea that people are generally unlikely to change their beliefs simply because they are confronted with facts to the contrary—she debunked the "secularization thesis"—the idea that as science progresses, religion loses its importance and following. While all of these interesting contributions appear at first glance to be disparate, John Carson pointed out that each paper illustrated different approaches that the human science disciplines have taken to contradiction—the contradictions of belief and fact in the case of millenarians and the scientists who studied them; the contradictions of primitive and civilized man in the case of fetishism; and the contradictions of similarity and difference in cultural theory.

The final section of the conference presented Princeton's Elizabeth Lunbeck and Helen Tilley (who bravely agreed to fill the shoes of George Stocking, who was unavoidably prevented from attending as he had originally planned), and new University of Pennsylvania faculty member John Tresch with the hefty task of reflecting on the day's many intellectual contributions. Lunbeck posited that we have in fact returned to the middle ground between similarity and difference, positivism and postmodernism, to which Bunzl aspired. Tresch pointed out that by bringing together the histories of anthropology, sociology, psychology, and economics in a single conference, participants gained a sense of the different ways that disciplines have dealt with the challenge of reflexivity, the variety of social locations in which social science operates, and the relative efficacies of the different sciences. And Tilley, a historian of medicine and science in Africa, reminded participants of the importance of non-Western traditions in the human sciences. She challenged the audience to ask: how much does place matter to the human science disciplines and to our histories of them? Is geographic movement a detriment to a discipline's status? Is a discipline that renders place invisible more successful than one that does not?
In all, the conference left participants with a number of exciting challenges. Tilley’s comments and the papers by Zenderland and O’Connor suggested that historians of the human sciences might be well-served by moving away from canonical texts and elite academics towards other sites of knowledge production. Bunzl and Hegeman’s contributions indicate that it is time that historians of the human sciences explore in more detail the impact of postmodern thought on the human sciences and social theory. And finally, discussions of the multiple registers of power that inhere in knowledge suggested to all participants that we interrogate our own relationship to the loci of power in twenty-first century America.

**RECENT DISSERTATIONS**


**RECENT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

[Occasionally, readers call our attention to errors in the entries, usually of a minor typographical character. Under the pressure of getting HAN out, some proofreading errors occasionally slip by. For these we offer a blanket apology, but will not normally attempt corrections. We call attention to the listings in the Bulletin of the History of Archaeology, the entries in the annual bibliographies of Isis, and those in the Bulletin d’information de la SFHSH (Société française pour l’histoire des sciences de l’homme)—each of which takes information from HAN, as we do from them. We welcome and encourage bibliographic suggestions from our readers.]


Etnofoor 18(2). 2005. Dutch Masters. (Interviews with seven anthropologists, all retired professors from the University of Amsterdam, including André Köbben, Matthew Schoffeleers, Jeremy Boissevain, Jan Breman, Bonno Thoden van Velzen, Anton Blok, and Johannes Fabian.)


ANNOUNCEMENTS

**New Journal—After Culture: Emergent Anthropologies.** The first issue of the new peer-reviewed journal, *After Culture: Emergent Anthropologies* is scheduled for release in September 2006, and thereafter will be published semiannually (in March and September). The journal will be made available free through the internet (URL forthcoming). It will include articles that focus on the interactions between nature, culture, and society, articles in the general thematic areas of science and technology studies, and critical studies of medical knowledge and practice. Contributors to the journal are encouraged to employ any form of rigorous theoretical and methodological approaches, not limited to ethnography, historiography and textual analysis. For more information, contact Matthew Wolf-Meyer, Managing Editor, at after.culture@gmail.com. Further information can be found at http://www.tc.umn.edu/~wolf0358/afterculture.htm.

**New Journal—Carnets Leiris.** Once a year, *Carnets Leiris* will publish critical essays by either renowned scholars or well-read individuals, in French or another language, addressing any aspect of Michel Leiris' life and work, both literary and ethnographic. The publication of the first issue is planned for the end of 2006 or the beginning of 2007. There is no deadline to submit a brief article proposition, although final articles will be due by September 2006. For more information, contact Sébastien Côté at sebastiencote@videotron.ca. Furthermore, the editors are looking for dedicated readers of Leiris' work who could be part of the journal's editorial or advisory board. For most of the communications between collaborators, it will be possible for advisors and editors to correspond exclusively via email. In order to support the journal project, an Association des Lecteurs de Michel Leiris will soon be created. Everyone interested in participating, whether or not she has experience in the field, is welcomed. For more information, visit the website at http://www.michel-leiris.com.

**New Ethnohistory Website.** This spring, the American Society for Ethnohistory launched a new website at http://ethnohistory.org, which contains information on the history and governance of the society, the annual conferences, the journal *Ethnohistory*, awards, and teaching. It is designed by Vincent Roman and Angie Thaxon of Delamain IT, with assistance from ASE Secretary-Treasurer Carolyn Podruchny. ASE is grateful to Wil Meya who designed and maintained the previous site for five years, to the American Indian Studies Research Institute who sponsored the previous site, and to the University of Indiana who provided hosted the previous site.
UPCOMING PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS

Abolition of the Slave Trade in 1807. The University of York is organizing an international bicentenary conference looking at the meaning and impact across the Atlantic world of the formal abolition of the slave trade in 1807. The conference will be held from 12-14 April 2007 at King’s Manor, University of York. The city of York was one of the political arenas in which the abolitionist William Wilberforce fought for the cause, and the department of history has long been associated with pioneering scholarship on the history of slavery and black studies in the UK. Scholars new and established, and from all disciplines, are invited to contribute to Abolitions, 1807-2007 on these themes:

Africa and abolition
The European slave powers and the legacy of slavery and abolition (Denmark, France, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, UK)
The Caribbean and abolition
Depicting slavery and antislavery: satire, caricature, portrait and landscape painting, theatre writing
Slavery and anti-slavery: poetry, memoirs, auto/biography, the novel
The first centenary of abolition: 1907
Slave cities: Liverpool, Bristol, Glasgow, Nantes, Bordeaux, Charleston, New Orleans, Copenhagen, Rotterdam, Cartagena
The legacy of abolition in the modern anti-slavery movement
Heritage studies and anti-slavery
Anti-slavery memorials
Postgraduate bursaries to support the cost of attending the conference will be available. To offer a paper to the conference, send a 250 word proposal and current CV by 31 July 2006 to Professor Miles Taylor (mt504@york.ac.uk). For more information, visit the website at http://www-users.york.ac.uk/~hist35/abolitions/.

Social Medicine, Medical Geography, and Health Care for Indigenous Populations: “Ethnic Pathology” in Germany, Russia, Latin America, and Beyond. An international workshop will be held 24-26 November 2006 at Justus-Liebig-Universität Gießen, Germany. The workshop will gather scholars from various countries and disciplines to analyze the concept of “ethnic pathology,” developed by the German-Peruvian pathologist, bacteriologist and social hygienist Max Kuczynski. Interested scholars are encouraged to submit abstracts (300 words) by 31 July 2006. For more information, visit http://www.bshs.org.uk/news/displayrecord.php?eventID=1337.

“For the Life of the Flesh is in the Blood”: A Conference on the Significance of Blood in Jewish History and Culture. The Center for Jewish Studies at the University of Florida, Gainesville is sponsoring this conference, which will meet at the University February 17-19, 2007. The conference will explore the relationship between Jews and blood from different disciplinary and methodological perspectives. The conference organizers are especially interested in submissions about relatively unexplored themes, which might include: new work on limpieza de sangre, blood and Jewish folk practices and beliefs, and blood and healing, to name just a few examples. The conference will result in a published volume, and participants should be committed to submitting publishable versions of their essays no later than June 30, 2007. Send an abstract or conference proposal (no more than two double-spaced pages) and a C.V. by 20 August 2006 to Professor Mitchell Hart, Department of
Beyond Deconstruction—Engaging Colonial Knowledge. A small group of scholars, including Megan Vaughan, James Leach, and Richard Drayton, will hold a workshop entitled Beyond Deconstruction, 15-16 September 2006 at King’s College, University of Cambridge. Representations of foreign peoples by colonial authorities have long been taken at face value as veracious and balanced accounts of distant places. In recent decades, however, scholars have criticized this Eurocentric understanding of what the Asian, African, or American indigenous worlds were about. Other critics have attested that colonial knowledge represents nothing more than an inverse image of Western cultural values. This workshop is an attempt to reach an alternative to the methodological problems of colonial knowledge. How can we engage with colonial knowledge? What use can we make of it? The workshop aims to go beyond the dichotomy of colonial and post-colonial approaches, for while the critique of colonial knowledge can constitute a point of departure, it is not an end in itself. It is anticipated that the workshop will lead to publication as a book or a special issue of a journal. For more information, contact the organizers: Kim A. Wagner at kaw32.cam.ac.uk, and Ricardo Roque, mar2@cam.ac.uk.

Race and Ethnicity in the Nineteenth Century. The Nineteenth-Century Studies Association invites submissions of papers and panel proposals that explore all aspects of race and ethnicity in the 19th century, from all disciplinary and interdisciplinary perspectives. Topics might connect race and ethnicity with social identity or social control; with land use, ecology, city planning or industrialism; with immigration and emigration patterns; with aesthetics or the sciences; with gender and sexuality. The conference organizers encourage the broadest interpretation of the topic, and the widest application to cultural phenomena. Submit a one page abstract of a 20 minute paper, with author and title in heading, and a one page vita by 1 November 2006. Send materials or inquiries to Drew Hubbell at Hubbell@susqu.edu. For more information, visit the website at http://www.msu.edu/~floyd/ncsa/.

2006 Annual Meeting of the American Society for Ethnohistory. The Department of Anthropology at the College of William and Mary, in partnership with the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation and the Jamestown-Yorktown Foundation will host the 2006 Meeting of the American Society for Ethnohistory, 1-5 November 2006 at the Williamsburg Hospitality House in Williamsburg, Virginia. The theme of this year’s conference, in anticipation of the 400th anniversary of the founding of Jamestown, gives special emphasis to the ways in which natives and newcomers engaged with one another through culturally mediated performance, and to the processes by which ethnohistorians interpret these encounters. For more information on the conference program, visit http://ethnohistory.org.

2006 Annual Meeting of the History of Science Society. The History of Science Society, the Society for Social Studies of Science, and the Philosophy of Science Association will hold their joint meeting in Vancouver, British Columbia 2-5 November 2006. For the meeting program, registration, and other information, visit www.hssonline.org.
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