

Guest editorial by Antonius
C.G.M. Robben

Antonius C.G.M. Robben 1
*Anthropology and the Iraq war:
An uncomfortable engagement*

Marshall D. Sahlins 3
*The teach-ins: Anti-war protest
in the Old Stoned Age*

Samantha Hurn 6
Here be dragons? No, big cats!: Predator
symbolism in rural West Wales

Rebecca Cassidy 12
The horse, the Kyrgyz horse and the
'Kyrgyz horse'

Helen Lambert 16
Evidentiary truths?: The evidence of
anthropology through the anthropology
of medical evidence

Petra Rethmann 21
Post-communist ironies in an East
German hotel

COMMENT
Chagossians refused right to return
home

Laura Jeffery 24
A sequel to Vine (AT 24[4])

Kalman Applbaum 24
Free markets and the unfettered
imagination of value: A response to Hart-
Ortiz and Gudeman (AT24[6])

NEWS 29 CALENDAR 30 CLASSIFIED 31

Six years ago, US and British forces invaded Iraq and toppled the brutal regime of Saddam Hussein, only to unleash the human tragedy of a country facing a very uncertain future, under foreign occupation and devastated by insurgency.¹ How have anthropologists engaged with this issue?

The annual meetings of the American Anthropological Association (AAA), the world's largest gathering of anthropologists, are a good measure of active professional interests in Iraq. Of the 1800 panels (11,000 papers) between 2006-2008, only one has dealt directly with the Iraq War.² Why have anthropologists been so reluctant to engage with the immense tragedy and waste of resources by our governments in this war?

* * *

One reason is that any independent discussion of Iraq and the war has been overshadowed at AAA meetings by security-led demands on our services: over these years, a handful of sessions (plus some off-programme) have focused on controversial intelligence-gathering schemes such as the Human Terrain Teams. Such schemes aim to resolve long-standing insurgency problems by embedding anthropologists in combat units in Iraq and Afghanistan. This issue was covered in the media *ad nauseam*, mostly disingenuously portraying the project as a contribution anthropologists are morally obliged to make to 'save lives', implying that anthropologists who speak out against such schemes are the ones responsible for death and destruction. Such use of anthropology follows on from the statement by General Petraeus (2006: 51), the chief commander of US troops in Iraq in 2007-2008 and one of the architects of the revised counter-insurgency field manual, that 'the people are, in many respects, the decisive terrain'. However, this ill-conceived scheme is today in tatters as Pentagon sources admit.

When the CIA posted a job advertisement on the AAA website and in the wake of the concerns raised over the Pat Roberts Intelligence Scholars Program (PRISP), the AAA's executive board responded in November 2005 by creating a commission to investigate the perils and opportunities of such employment (Goodman 2006). The commission's final report sat on the fence in concluding that professional engagement of anthropologists with the US military and secret services takes diverse forms and should not be considered unethical on principle, despite the potential risks to the people studied, the discipline, its practitioners and the academic community.

The commission did, however, express concern about anthropologists being deployed in Human Terrain Teams in Iraq and Afghanistan (AAA Commission 2007: 46). This worry has led to an internal struggle over changes proposed to the 1998 Ethics Code, which were finally accepted at the last Business Meeting as non-binding, since the resolution had not been submitted to the Board 30 days in advance as required under the Association's rules. Setha Low is currently forming a small sub-committee that will rewrite the AAA Ethics Code over the next two years, and make recommendations to be voted on by the entire membership.

That there is widespread popular opposition to the Iraq war among anthropologists is suggested by the overwhelming support Roberto González and Kanhong Lin received for the resolutions they proposed during the November 2006 AAA General Business Meeting to condemn the invasion of Iraq and the use of anthropological knowledge in torture. The Network of Concerned

Director of the RAI: Hilary Callan
Editor: Gustaaf Houtman
Editorial Consultant: Sean Kingston
Sub-Editor: Rachel Gomme
Design Consultant: Peter Jones, Stuart Russell
Production Consultant: Dominique Remars
Editorial Panel: Robert Foley, Alma Gottlieb, Karl Heider, Michael Herzfeld, Solomon Katz, John Knight, Jeremy MacClancy, Danny Miller, Howard Morphy, Monique Borgerhoff Mulder, Stephen O. Murray, Judith Okely, Jarich Oosten, Nigel Rapport, Nancy Scheper-Hughes, Masakazu Tanaka, Christina Toren, Patty Jo Watson
Editorial address: Please read Notes to Contributors before making submissions (www.therai.org/anthrotoday.html). Correspondence (except subscriptions, changes of address etc) via anthropologytoday@gmail.com and at.edmgr.com to: The Editor, ANTHROPOLOGY TODAY, Royal Anthropological Institute, 50 Fitzroy Street, London W1T 5BT, UK, tel. +44 20 7387 0455, fax +44 20 7388 8817.

Copy dates: 15th of even months

Publisher: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 9600 Garsington Road, Oxford OX4 2DQ, UK, phone: +44 1865 776868, fax: +44 1865 714591. Blackwell Publishing Ltd is now part of John Wiley & Sons.

Disclaimer: The Publisher, RAI and Editors cannot be held responsible for errors or any consequences arising from the use of information contained in this journal; the views and opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect those of the Publisher, RAI and Editors, neither does the publication of advertisements constitute any endorsement by the Publisher, RAI and Editors of the products advertised.

Information for subscribers: Six issues of bimonthly ANTHROPOLOGY TODAY are mailed free of charge per annum to Fellows and Members of the Royal Anthropological Institute (registered charity no. 246269). Rates for 2009: Member: €30, £23, or US\$45. Single copy: £9

UK, or \$21 overseas plus VAT where applicable. Visit www.therai.org.uk/joining/index.html.

Institutional subscriptions for 2009: Premium Institutional: £79 (UK/rest of world except N America), US\$133 (N America). Includes online access to the current and all available previous year electronic issues. Visit www.blackwellpublishing.com.

Back issues: Single issues from current and recent volumes available at the current single issue price from Blackwell Publishing Journals. Earlier issues may be obtained from Swets & Zeitlinger, Back Sets, Heereweg 347, PO Box 810, 2160 Lisse, The Netherlands.

Periodical ID: ANTHROPOLOGY TODAY (0268-540X) is published bimonthly. US mailing agent: Mercury Airfreight International Inc., 365 Blair Road, Avenel, NJ 07001, USA. Periodical postage paid at Rahway NJ. Postmaster: send all address changes to ANTHROPOLOGY TODAY, Journal Customer Services, John Wiley & Sons Inc., 350 Main St., Malden, MA 02148-5020.

Journal Customer Services: For ordering information, claims and any enquiry concerning membership/fellowship please contact the RAI offices on admin@therai.org.uk or +44 20 7387 0455. For institutional subscriptions contact: UK (customerservices@oxon.blackwellpublishing.com; Tel: +44 1865 778315); USA (subscrip@bos.blackwellpublishing.com; Tel: +1 781 388 8206 or 1 800 835 6770); Asia (customerservices@blackwellpublishing.com; Tel: +65 6511 8000). Visit www.blackwell-synergy.com for full-text searches and register for e-mail alerts.

Advertising: Managed from atadverts@gmail.com. 2009: Full page: £548.88. 1/2 page £296.79. 1/3 page col. £203.66. 1/2 col. £103.07, plus VAT if applicable. Repeat discounts. Copy date: 7th of odd months. www.therai.org.uk/pubs/advertising.html.

© RAI 2009. Printed in Singapore by COS Printers Pte Ltd.

Antonius C.G.M. Robben is Senior Professor of Anthropology at Utrecht University, and past President of the Netherlands Society of Anthropology. His latest book was Political violence and trauma in Argentina (2007). He has been awarded the Tector Prize for Excellence in Anticipatory Anthropology by the AAA. His email is t.robben@uu.nl.

1. By 10 December 2008 the war had cost the lives of anywhere between 89,600 and 1.2 million Iraqis, forced over two million people to flee abroad, and killed 4,209 US and 177 British troops. (Source: Iraq Body Count, Iraq Coalition Casualty Count, and Opinion Research Business websites.)

2. Entries for 'Iraq' and 'Iraq war' appeared in the topic index for the first time in 2008, with one panel and one film screening scheduled in the same time slot. Between 2006 and 2008, 13 individual papers about Iraq were given. An additional five panels dealt with US domestic security and surveillance related to the 'war on terror', four with the involvement of anthropologists in the military. Finally, there was at least one unscheduled Q&A session about Human Terrain Teams in 2008.

3. <http://concerned.anthropologists.googlepages.com>; accessed 10 Dec. 2008.

AAA Commission on the Engagement of Anthropology with the US Security and Intelligence Communities (AAA Commission) 2007. 'Final report'. http://www.aaanet.org/pdf/FINAL_Report_Complete.pdf; accessed 17 Dec. 2007.

American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) 2003. *Freedom under fire: Dissent in post-9/11 America*. New York: ACLU.

González, R.J. 2008. 'Human Terrain': Past, present and future applications. *Anthropology Today* 24(1): 21-26.

Goodman, A. 2006. Engaging with national security. *Anthropology News* 47(February): 63.

Lustock, I.S. 2006. *Trapped in the war on terror*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lutz, C. 2008. Selling ourselves? The perils of Pentagon funding for anthropology. *Anthropology Today* 24(5): 1-3.

McFate, M. 2007. Building bridges or burning heretics? *Anthropology Today* 23(3): 21.

Members of the Network of Concerned Anthropologists 2007. The Network of Concerned Anthropologists pledges to boycott counterinsurgency. *Anthropology News* 48(December): 4-5.

Petraeus, D.H. 2006. Learning

Anthropologists that subsequently emerged in 2007 has successfully called on anthropologists to sign its pledge not to 'engage in research and other activities that contribute to counter-insurgency operations in Iraq or in related theaters in the "war on terror"' with well over a thousand signatures.³ Fierce exchanges have unfolded in *Anthropology News* and ANTHROPOLOGY TODAY since then between proponents and critics of closer engagement between anthropology and the military (e.g. González 2008, McFate 2007, Members of the Network of Concerned Anthropologists 2007, Selmeski 2007).

* * *

We have been far too timid on the issue of the Iraq war. Rather than tackling the issue head-on, we have dealt with it on the back foot, as an issue of ethical concerns about our professional conduct in military and intelligence matters. What of the broader issues concerning Iraq under occupation and the plight of its peoples? Given the immense human and material cost of this war, why has this not been at the forefront of our professional focus?

Unlike during the Vietnam War, where military authorities also tried to involve anthropologists, personal engagement by the academic community with the military and the Iraq war is different today. The Iraq war is being fought by a professional military whose soldiers are volunteers drawn from the poorest segments of US society, unlike the Vietnam War where the troops were mainly conscripts from more diverse backgrounds. Even though many male college students received deferments, they were always aware that they might be drafted if the war dragged on. Students and faculty were therefore affected directly by the war, and joined hands in sit-ins, teach-ins and street protests. The Iraq war has certainly moved people emotionally, but such feelings have not translated into political protests, other than several mass demonstrations prior to the invasion, in part because the lives of the students and the children of faculty members are not directly at stake as they were during the Vietnam War.

Political awareness and mobilization was also different in the 1960s. The protests against the Vietnam War erupted in the mid-1960s and became mass actions after the 1968 Tet offensive by Viet Cong guerillas and North Vietnamese troops against US and South Vietnamese forces. They followed upon the successful civil rights movement, which culminated in the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act, under which African-Americans were given their democratic rights and racial segregation was outlawed. The political energy of this movement was mobilized against the unpopular US military presence in Indo-China. The grassroots protest movements of the 1990s – anti-globalism, feminism, gay rights – did not quite gain the national clout of the 1960s civil rights movement.

The mainstream American media tend to collapse the Iraq war into actions deemed necessary to maintain national security in the wake of the assault on New York and Washington on 11 September 2001. After 9/11 Congress passed the Patriot Act and the Bush-Cheney administration proceeded to intimidate American citizens, on the one hand by maintaining the country in a constant state of anxiety through an elevated threat condition that suggested the likelihood of a terrorist attack (Lustick 2006), and on the other enforcing civil docility with intrusive surveillance methods. Library records are monitored, covert searches of people's homes and offices conducted, FBI agents stationed on campuses, and the FBI used its Carnivore system to track telephone conversations, email messages and internet browsing (ACLU 2003, Welch 2004). As during the protests against the Vietnam War, students and staff have been questioned, intimidated, arrested and prosecuted for protesting against the US government.

Combined with elevated defence spending at universities, this climate contributes to a reluctance on the part of everyone, not just anthropologists, to speak out against the Iraq war. There is fear for jobs and tenure review. Nevertheless, just as during the Vietnam era, comparatively few anthropologists are working for the military today, probably less than a dozen. Counter-insurgency fieldwork during the Vietnam War and the aborted Project Camelot caused such scandal at the time that anthropologists continue to be wary of becoming entangled in any new military adventures. The Minerva Research Initiative, launched in 2008 by the US Department of Defense to study topics of national security interest, conjures up images of the Vietnam War era, but on an unprecedented scale (Lutz 2008).

What is disconcerting is how the AAA appoints the members of the Commission on the Engagement of Anthropology with the US Security and Intelligence Communities on the basis of 'balancing' interests between individuals employed in intelligence-gathering capacity and independent anthropologists engaged in bona fide academic activity. Why should this commission include members from the security establishment at all? Surely, if anthropology is to strive to remain an independent academic discipline, it must insist on populating these important bodies with independent anthropologists free of any personal involvement in such matters. To seek to balance security interests in such bodies is a recipe for disaster. Panels at the AAA's conferences also tend to have a culture of aiming for such balance.

Could the reason for this balancing act be that the AAA has been busy ingratiating itself as a professional organization with the powers-that-be in Washington? To this end, in the last two decades the AAA has been holding its annual meetings every other year in DC, has stationed a person in Washington to report on public policy, and has strengthened its connections with Congress and the US government.

A number of anthropologists – including William Beeman, Roberto González, Hugh Gusterson, Catherine Lutz, David Price and Marshall Sahlins – have courageously and publicly spoken of their concerns about the situation in Iraq at AAA meetings. However, media coverage has tended to dismiss their ethical concerns as anti-military and unpatriotic. They deserve a hearing.

* * *

Of course, the fact that ethnographic research is difficult in Iraq might well be a factor in why we see so few panels dedicated to independent research on the country. Few socio-cultural anthropologists have done independent fieldwork in Iraq since 2003. I know of one student who discontinued her research after several life-threatening experiences. However, Iraq is not an undifferentiated war zone, and anthropologists may well be able to enter less dangerous provinces, cities and neighbourhoods, and draw on pre-war fieldwork relations in relative safety. Still, the limitations on prolonged fieldwork and risks to research participants are considerable, a state of affairs that is not helped by the cloud of suspicion hanging over specialist anthropologists in this region, linked as they are with a discipline that is making far too many concessions to unaccountable government and private military contractors.

We must find ways to engage issues concerning Iraq objectively and independently, without being railroaded into a partisan security agenda. Now that we have blogs and online communities such as Facebook, teach-ins and university protests are no longer the only instruments of opposition. And even if fieldwork is difficult, we can surely weigh up and analyse the fragmentary information available and draw on a comparative anthropology of

counterinsurgency: Observations from soldiering in Iraq. *Military Review* October: 45-55. Selmeski, B.R. 2007. Who are the security anthropologists? *Anthropology News* 48(May): 11-12. Welch, M. 2006. *Scapegoats of September 11th: Hate crimes and state crimes in the war on terror*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

violence and social suffering to help make sense of current events in Iraq. Anthropologists such as Nadjie Al-Ali, Keith Brown, Steven Caton, Matthew Gutmann, Allen Feldman and Catherine Lutz have done so.

The incoming Obama administration seeks to withdraw combat troops from Iraq. However, this will likely mean redeployment of troops and an escalation of the war in Afghanistan and Pakistan. The adversarial and partisan agendas of Minerva and the Human Terrain initiatives must not be the central focus of our professional engagement at our annual conferences, for they are recipes for creating security-speak elites with an

interest in perpetuating war rather than finding solutions. We must now strive to engage and disseminate our own independent anthropological studies of the military campaigns undertaken as part of the global 'war on terror'. The teach-in remains a relevant option today, especially now that we have social networking sites such as Facebook to help. ●

The teach-ins: Anti-war protest in the Old Stoned Age

Guest editorial by Marshall D. Sahlins

Marshall D. Sahlins is Charles F. Grey Distinguished Service Professor of Anthropology Emeritus at Chicago University. Sahlins is also Executive Publisher of Prickley Paradigm Press, which has published a number of essays on issues of public concern, the two most recent essays being *American counter-insurgency: Human science and the Human Terrain* by Roberto J. González and *The counter-counter-insurgency manual by members of the Network of Concerned Anthropologists* (due to appear in April 2009). His email is m-sahlins@uchicago.edu.

In the 60s, Marshall Sahlins is credited with coining the imaginative idea of the teach-in which, unlike the strike, is a constructive process whereby we bring all our knowledge of a critical issue of public concern to the university, with the aim of generating publicity and action. Anthropology, because of its expertise in foreign communities, may be perceived as a useful tool by policy makers in the war on terror. But there is another side to anthropology, which is for each practitioner to feel the pulse of and act in concert

The rough music of the counterculture

From the mid-1950s to the early 1960s, Elvis Presley, rock-and-roll and the Beatles erupted on the US scene like a national charivari, except that this cacophony of the American youth signified a disavowal rather than a defence of the conventional morality. People of a certain age can remember when there was only one 'popular music', universally appreciated by young and old alike. In the decade following World War II, we all tuned our radios on Saturday nights to 'Your Hit Parade', following the ratings of the ten best-selling records almost as faithfully as we followed the baseball and football standings. Joseph Epstein reminisces:

In the America of the 1940s and 1950s, when I was growing up, popular music was everywhere; and it was not of interest only to the young, as popular music is today. Singers were great heroes, bandleaders famous personages. At a neighborhood delicatessen in Rogers Park called Ashkenaz, there was a sandwich call the Lou Breese, named after the bandleader at the Chicago Theater. (Epstein 1999: 41)

Well before the wise Epstein, Plato and Confucius warned that departure from the established musical norms signified the beginning of a social discord (dis-chord?) that could only end in the corruption of the state. Both sages developed a political philosophy of music – which seems underappreciated today – whose positive complement was the Orpheus-like notion that distinct and emotionally appropriate musical forms, especially as accompaniments of ceremony, could tame the savage beasts. But the guardians of Plato's *Republic* must then be on watch against 'lawlessness in music', for though it begins in innovations that seem harmless, it gradually penetrates the character and pursuits of men, issuing forth to attack their business dealings, 'and from these relations it proceeds against the laws and constitution with wanton license [...] till it finally overthrows all things public and private' (*Republic* IV, 424d-e; cf. Confucius, *Book of rites*, Book XVII).

with public opinion in both foreign communities and in our own, quite independently from government. The teach-in became a powerful instrument in this sense, helping to transform public opinion and eventually helping to change government policy on the Vietnam war. Here, Sahlins sketches a vignette from the past, ending up on a question relevant to all of us: do anthropologists still have the will and ability to inform public opinion independently from the arm of government on issues that matter today? Ed.

Just so Adam Garfinkle, in his dyspeptic study of the anti-Vietnam war movement, writes of the musical preamble:

The music of the 1950s had a brash, rebellious side to it, and it was political at least in the sense it defined an early generation gap. When Elvis Presley shook his hips and pouted out his music, teens swooned and their parents blanched. Once popular music acquired such an image, it was a fairly short step to the increasingly politicized lyrics of the 1960s, which spread antiwar and antiauthority messages far and wide. (1995: 42-43)

We are talking about the beginnings of a generational counterculture – which, I will argue, was a condition of the possibility of a massive anti-war movement. Beside music, another such sign was the change in college students' dress and hair styles. Until the 60s, students had maintained the appearance of bourgeois adults-in-training, which they now began to subvert by affecting the utilitarian clothing of the working class. Donning blue jeans, they marked a binary opposition to the parents-that-be that was worthy of Lévi-Strauss the books as well as the pants.

There is no space here to describe the multifarious counterculture of the 60s. Instead I will reprise a common anthropological pedagogy of the same era by simply listing some characteristic culture traits of the Old Stoned Age: the sexual revolution, verbal obscenity in public places, marijuana, LSD, beatniks, long hair, folk rock, acid rock, Bob Dylan, Joan Baez, Jerry Rubin, 'let's rap' college classes, back-to-nature, Black Panthers, hippies, etc., etc. (For a revelatory odyssey through the counterculture, see Stone 2007.) Sociologists tell us that 'youth' as a differentiated social category – vaguely situated between late adolescence and the people over 30 not to be trusted – emerged in this context of generational opposition and cultural critique. Ironically, the anti-bourgeois sentiments of the youth were then objectified and magnified by an

aggressive capitalism eager to open a new market niche by commodifying the countercultural lifestyle.

The hotspots of the cultural rebellion were on the east and west coasts, primarily New York and San Francisco. Engaged in a kind of Batesonian schismogenesis, Greenwich Village and the Haight competed to outdo each other in countercultural eccentricities. The map of the counterculture thus resembled the New Yorker's map of US culture in general, marked by the trend-setting cities rising on the east and west coasts and a vast flat landscape of nothing inbetween. Yet it was in the peripheral centre of the country, in Ann Arbor, Michigan, on 24 March 1965, that the first teach-in was held – thus launching the counterculture into the national political life. Later Carl Oglesby, the president of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), would recall 'the stroke of genius out there in Michigan that put debate on the map for the whole academic community' (quoted in Wells 1994: 24). Oglesby didn't mention that SDS also effectively came from 'out there' (with the Port Huron Statement). It may have been a cultural hinterland, but being 'out there' afforded Michigan 'the privilege of historic backwardness' (as Trotsky put it). Relatively uncommitted to the existing forms of dissent, the anti-war activists at Michigan were free to surpass them.

The political and the countercultural

Initially, they were rebels without a cause. The counterculture was not political, not a mass movement mobilized around a programme of civil action. True, the cultural rebels were pacifist by sentiment and pro-civil rights by sympathy. Moreover, they thought they could change the world – but they did not organize to do so. Probably they thought they could change the world because they were changing the self, which would be the same solipsist reason they didn't make it a political project. In 1965, Ken Kesey told the crowd at a Berkeley rally that they ought to turn their backs on the war and say 'fuck it'.

Until the teach-ins of 1965, then, political activism and the counterculture were running on separate tracks, in terms of both generational participation and actionable causes. The left and left-liberals of the older generation were largely focused on nuclear disarmament and pacifism. There were some Vietnam War protests in the tried-and-true forms of rallies, vigils and petitions, but they attracted little popular support and less media attention.

The civil rights movement, however, did actively engage some college students: the Student National Co-ordinating Committee (SNCC), of course, and also SDS, whose first 'new left' efforts were devoted to community organizing in northern cities. Besides mobilizing students politically, the civil rights struggle offered exemplary tactics, particularly the sit-ins, that were later adapted to the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley as well as the teach-in at Ann Arbor.

Adding to this developing structure of the conjuncture was a certain pre-political consciousness among the university professoriate, induced by their academic experience of the Cold War. Since Sputnik especially, considerations of national security had been influencing the character of research and coursework from nuclear physics to the social sciences and humanities. For geo-political reasons the discipline of history, for example, until then virtually limited to the European and American pasts, was progressively globalized by a variety of 'exotic' histories; by contrast anthropology, until then cosmopolitan, was increasingly parochialized – it was useless to try to get a Fulbright for the Fiji Islands.

The newly-established area studies programmes likewise reflected the strategic interests of the state, as did a growing number of foreign language courses subsidized

by the Department of Defense. Reverberations were felt through the humanities, if only in the way of push-back, for as a general rule the further the discipline from the positive sciences, the more the relation to the Cold War took the dialectical form of offing the power. Although at the time of the teach-ins, the activist professors were criticized for politicizing the university, it is worth noting that for years the university, heavily funded by government, had been politicizing the professors. Many of the theoretical consequences in the human sciences are still with us – notably 'power functionalism', the explanation of all manner of cultural forms and historical processes by reference to their power-effects. The Cold War having been insinuated into every cranny of the academy and practically every subject matter, thus putting power everywhere on the intellectual agenda, Foucault was an idea whose time had come.

By the spring of 1965, the time of the teach-in had come, and with it the joining of anti-war politics to countercultural dissent. As Carl Oglesby observed, the old left had failed to understand the relation between political and cultural rebellion. 'Our approach was to make the connection happen,' he said, 'to bring the cultural and the political into the most intimate interplay' (quoted in Farber 1988: 12). ('Intimate interplay' – make love, not war: Oglesby, a poet, knew how to turn an iconic phrase.) In connecting with the counterculture, the teach-in movement thus gained the mass, energy and scale of the anti-establishment generation.

Perhaps the class struggle of the young was only middle-class struggle, but they comprised the one critically-disposed demographic of the 1960s. Within weeks of the first teach-in at Michigan, there were over 100 such events in colleges and universities across the country, culminating in mid-May with an all-day National Teach-In in Washington, DC. The Washington teach-in was covered in part by American and foreign TV networks and in whole by the Public Broadcasting Service, as well as being broadcast by radio to over 200 campus stations. Beyond anything that traditional politics had accomplished, the teach-ins *nationalized* the anti-war protest. They raised a latent anti-war consciousness to an extent that no received form of protest had been able to do.

The invention of the teach-in

The problem here is how the general correlations of social forces and political causes are realized in a particular form through contingent events involving specific actors. The move from structure to history entails a double reduction: a reduction in temporality from the longer term to the conjuncture, and a reduction in the determination of the acting subjects from collective social agents and forces to the particular persons who instantiate them.

It is only a measure of the obscurity of 'out there in Michigan' that 30 years after the event Adam Garfinkle could still write: 'No one knows who came up with the word "teach-in"' (1995: 72). In fact, a Senate Judiciary subcommittee on national security already knew who came up with the name by October 1965, when an accurate description of the event appeared in a footnote on page 32 of their report *The anti-Vietnam agitation and the teach-in movement: The problem of Communist infiltration and exploitation*. The note reads:

The teach-in movement was born at the University of Michigan after heavy criticism of an original plan for a 1-day faculty 'work moratorium' to protest U.S. policies in Vietnam. The notion of a 'strike,' while sufficiently dramatic, was so controversial that it diverted attention away from the basic aim of the protest group. During a meeting on the night of March 17 they were batting around alternative ideas [...] when Anthropologist Sahllins suddenly interrupted the discussion: 'I've got it. They say we're neglecting our responsibilities as teachers. Let's



Fig. 1. A teach-in organized at the University of Michigan.

show them how responsible we feel. Instead of teaching out, we'll teach in – all night.'

That's just about how it happened (who was the informer?). But as an anthropologist I am compelled to reduce my role to something less than a footnote in history by speaking to the complex of circumstances and persons in play.

Prominent among the immediate circumstances was the developing competition in political activism between Ann Arbor and Berkeley – another schismogenesis. Cynics said at the time that the Michigan people had 'riot envy'. However, as the Senate subcommittee report implied, 'strike envy' might be a better term: a response to the massive demonstrations pulled off in December 1964 by the Free Speech Movement (FSM). The FSM had been initiated by the students reclaiming rights of free speech in and around the Berkeley campus. They demanded the freedom to advocate a variety of causes, civil rights prominent among them, but in contrast to Ann Arbor, the Vietnam war was not the main issue at Berkeley. Besides, in Ann Arbor the faculty took the lead – though mostly younger faculty, many without tenure.

Here something needs be said about the immediate political context of this faculty initiative. For many academics, the escalation of US involvement in Vietnam announced by President Johnson in February 1965 came as a personal as well as a political betrayal. They could take it personally because just three months before they had been campaigning to an unprecedented extent in the presidential election for the so-called peace candidate, Mr Johnson – and all the more urgently because his jingoist opponent Barry Goldwater was running on a pro-escalation platform. Now they found themselves double-crossed by

Operation Rolling Thunder, the massive bombing of North Vietnam. How then to respond? The small group that gathered at Ann Arbor initially called for a strike or moratorium for 24 March. We intended to cancel our classes and instead hold off-campus discussions on Vietnam.

The short version of what followed is that when opposition mounted among faculty colleagues and the university administration, not to mention the local newspapers and Governor George Romney, a few of us met one night to reconsider the strike tactic. Out popped the idea of 'teach-in' instead of 'teaching out.' This was definitely Lévi-Strauss the books, not the pants. Besides, one of our number, Fritjof Bergmann, had been giving us lessons on Hegel, and teach-in had the virtue of preserving the original 'teach-out' while negating and transcending it. Or perhaps it was a near-perfect synthesis of being in the system and out of it, of academic responsibility and civic dissent, liberalism and radicalism. Of course, 'teach-in' responded most immediately to the sit-ins of the civil rights movement, and more distantly to the great sit-down action of 1936-37 at the Ford plant in Flint, Michigan – the most celebrated strike in American labour history.

Aftermath/beginning

The academic competition continued when Berkeley trumped Ann Arbor with a teach-in of 30,000 in March, and Michigan overtopped that by organizing the National Teach-In – but by then, this regional schismogenesis was a minor sub-plot. In raising anti-war consciousness in the nation as a whole, far beyond the academic community, the teach-ins were an historic turning point in the politics of the Vietnam war. In principle, in a democracy where the people are sovereign and policy is referred to the ballot, raising consciousness is direct political action.

This liberal bias of the teach-in movement, however, was one of the too-many-reasons-to-recount-here why the academic community lost its leadership role as fast as it had gained it. Part of the problem was that as soon as the teach-in movement politicized the counterculture, the latter began to counterculturalize the politics. Hence the tension between the political and the carnival in the student left as it moved from liberal protest to radical resistance and campus violence, spinning off such factions along the way as the 'Up Against the Wall Motherfuckers' and the Weathermen.

Alienated by the left students' tactics, the largely liberal anti-war public reverted to traditional modes of protest, although the marches and demonstrations were now massive in scale, varied in social composition and increasingly joined by establishment politicians. A general strike or moratorium in October 1969 brought out more than a million people, and co-ordinated marches the following month involved 500,000 in Washington and 350,000 in San Francisco. Back to the old cultural map.

Why is there not the same anti-war agitation today? The absence of a national military draft is often given as the major reason. Certainly the draft lottery generated unrest about the war, though it might be noted that virtually all male college students in the 1960s got II-S deferments, and women were not conscripted. Among the other significant differences between then and now, consider only the striking fact that at present business courses constitute by far the most popular subject matter of the higher learning in America. Where the mobilization against the Vietnam war drew on a large cadre of already existing rebels without a cause, the Iraq War came upon us as a cause without the rebels. (That's James Dean the movie, crossed with Lévi-Strauss the books.) ●

Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws 1965. *The anti-Vietnam agitation and the teach-in movement: The problem of Communist infiltration and exploitation*. Staff Report. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

Epstein, J. 1999. *Narcissus leaves the pool: Familiar essays*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Farber, D. 1988. *Chicago '68*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Garfinkle, A. 1995. *Telltale hearts: The origins and impact of the Vietnam antiwar movement*. New York: St. Martin's.

Stone, R. 2007. *Prime green: Remembering the sixties*. New York: Harper

Wells, T. 1994. *The war within: America's battle over Vietnam*. Berkeley: University of California Press