

tions. We found that khat fields planted near the park prior to 2000 rarely cut into forests. More recent observations (2007–09) have revealed that although national park enforcement has prevented much cutting, some does occur on the periphery of the protected area.

With regard to khat's effects on consumers, this study reveals the political nature of drug classifications. Perceptions of khat's psychotropic effects differ radically depending on the historical period evaluated, the country and the identity of the evaluator. One early, European account in the 1700s praised khat's euphoriant effects, whereas ones in the colonial era labeled it a debilitating scourge. In Yemen, khat chewing is often portrayed in the media as a barrier to development, but a rather quaint, folkloric practice; whereas in Somalia it is often presented as violence-inducing. Despite widespread consumer reports of its mild effects, the World Health Organization has classified khat's active property, cathinone, along with heroine and LSD, as a "Schedule I" drug—with high abuse potential and no accepted medical use. Khat users in Madagascar consider it a mild stimulant, whereas educated professionals there often see it as posing a much greater danger to mental health and productivity.

The third question about effects of legality on livelihoods and overall health brings together political ecology and critical medical anthropology. In Madagascar, Khat is not marked by violence or attempted repression, but its status also sits at the legal/illegal margin. Technically legal, it is better understood as quasi-legal given the state's tentative tolerance and general silence about its existence. This prevents khat growers from receiving the formal attention of agricultural extension services that could provide better irrigation and sustainable farming methods.

As a health issue, khat presents a complex picture that includes local consumption as well as production. There is a lack of convincing evidence of khat's negative health effects on consumers—especially relative to other socially-acceptable recreational substances (such as tobacco and alcohol). Frequent purchasing of khat can pinch household budgets, however, reducing access to food and healthcare, but an extensive questionnaire ($n=155$) conducted in 2007 suggested that this is not as common a problem as oft-reputed. On the other hand, what is unambiguously clear about khat in Madagascar is that it has become increasingly critical to the survival and even flourishing of many small-scale farmers and traders in the north. It provides a livelihood to those on the fringes of national and global economic development schemes, with the potential of increasing access to healthcare and nutrition for farmers and traders.

This study of khat also points to larger questions about how people on the global margins develop their own means of survival outside of the formal economy and the purview of the state, and about the general role of the quasi-legal production of stimulants that has replaced conventional resource production in other parts of the world (a point made by Krech et al in *The Encyclopedia of World History* 2003). This challenges environmental

anthropologists to inquire into the impact of these adaptations of the physical environment, questioning whether or not they result in increased resource degradation and a benefit or loss to the well-being of human communities.

To submit an article for this column or to suggest a column idea, email Terre Satterfield at satterfd@interchange.ubc.ca.

Archeology Division

JAMES M SKIBO, CONTRIBUTING EDITOR

In previous columns William Longacre and Namita Sugandhi addressed the question, "What would archaeology be without anthropology?" This month, Michael Smith and Philip Arnold answer the question, "Does archaeology need anthropology?" We have just scratched the surface of this important topic, but we hope the discussion will continue on the AAA blog. Visit <http://blog.aaanet.org> after January 5 to submit your comments.

Archaeology Is Archaeology

By Michael E Smith (Arizona State U)

Archaeology is best viewed as a comparative historical social science discipline of its own, rather than as a "subdiscipline" of something larger. If one starts with the assumption that "four-field anthropology" is some kind of useful entity, then it is easy to argue that archaeology should be part of the mix. But if one starts by seeking the most productive intellectual context for archaeology, the argument for an affiliation with anthropology is less compelling.

Just how useful is four-field anthropology? In "Anthropology, Sociology, and Other Dubious Disciplines," Wallerstein argued that "the social construction of the disciplines as intellectual arenas that was made in the 19th century has outlived its usefulness and is today a major obstacle to serious intellectual work" (*Current Anthropology* 44). This critique applies equally to four-field anthropology. To what extent does archaeology really need socio-cultural anthropology or physical anthropology? Although trained as a four-field anthropologist, over the years sociocultural anthropology has become less useful to my research, while work in other disciplines has become increasingly relevant. In comparative research on the Aztec empire, I've found better theory in political science, and better comparative data in history, than I have in socio-cultural anthropology.

Recently, my work on comparative urbanism has had little in common with urban anthropology. On the other hand, I have found a wealth of useful data and theory in such fields as geography, planning and urban history, and a real interest in ancient cities among scholars in these fields. Urban anthropology once had a broad perspective, but today that field consists almost entirely of ahistorical ethnographies of the effects of globalization in cities, with virtually no concern for deep history or comparison. The relevant professional

society is now called the Society for Urban, National, and Transnational/Global Anthropology.



In the end, archaeology really does need anthropology, but then we also need history, economics, geology, linguistics, sociology, botany, planning, engineering, political science, geography, ecology, etc. Archaeology is archaeology, and our intellectual horizons are artificially limited when we think of archaeology as only a "subdiscipline" of anthropology.

Archaeology Is Anthropology

By Philip Arnold (Loyola U)

Words matter. So perhaps it is not surprising that American archaeology (hereafter just "archaeology") chafes under its "subdisciplinary" hair-shirt. After all, the implication of "subdiscipline" is of something below or beneath. Of lesser value. Inferior. Like most of you, I reject that sentiment. Archaeology is neither below, nor inferior to, anthropology. It is simply a central facet of anthropological inquiry. And it matters little if we recognize three other facets or three hundred. Archaeology is not poorer for their presence.

History matters. Archaeology in America developed out of anthropological interests. Without anthropology, archaeology is mostly a hodge-podge of techniques; a means to an end. A stand-alone archaeology may boast a battery of techniques, but minus other domains of understanding that achievement teeters on what Deetz has called "sterile methodological virtuosity."

Anthropology encapsulates the study of humanity across space and through time. What better context in which to contemplate data derived from prior human conditions? But context is not itself an answer; it simply encourages more relevant questions. So of course archaeology exploits additional spheres of knowledge. Such practice does not make it less anthropological. Just the opposite—it affirms archaeology's anthropological foundations.

Words and history matter. So go ahead and jettison the phrase "subdiscipline." Use "codiscipline" if you want. Or drop the pesky prefix altogether. But let's not fool ourselves that archaeology is best seen as something separate from anthropology. A go-it-alone archaeology is neither practical nor preferable. Archaeology that attempts to answer the questions of past human conditions is anthropological. And that's what really matters.

Send news, notices and comments to James M Skibo, 4640 Anthropology Program, Illinois State University, Normal, IL 71790-4640; tel 309/438-7397; jmskibo@ilstu.edu.

Association of Black Anthropologists

SHAKA MCGLOTTEN, CONTRIBUTING EDITOR

This April ABA will co-host a spring conference with the Society for the Anthropology of North America (SANA). The conference theme is