system behind these, which goes back to far earlier times and has ramifications that tie together this entire book. Finally, Patricia McAnany and Satoru Murata (ch. 21) take readers through the history of cacao in Belize, especially its reinvigoration by the Green and Black Chocolate Company, whose fair-trade-certified, wonderfully flavorful chocolate bars may be familiar to readers who frequent well-stocked markets.

Cacao thus emerges as a plant at the very heart of Mesoamerican indigenous life—central to religion, art, daily life, economy, and the whole business of living. Mesoamericans of pre-Columbian times, and many indigenous ones from then to the present, have a total personal involvement in cacao that rivals the involvement of French and Italians in wine. (One can even make an alcoholic drink from the pulp around the beans, but it seems not to have been very important, if indeed it was used at all, in Mesoamerica; it is more a South American delicacy.)

With minor exceptions (Gasco on Soconusco, McAnany and Murata on Belize), this book does not cover modern commercial production and consumption. Part of the reason is that there is very little to cover. Mexico, especially Tabasco, still produces significant amounts, and it is trying to develop the industry in other states, from Chiapas to Guerrero. Mexico’s chocolate industry suffered from neglect and poor quality control for decades. Today, quality is rapidly improving, and production of organically grown chocolate is becoming locally significant. A major problem is that the wonderful old criollo strains are gone or nearly gone; salvage is under way where they still occur (Ogata, Gasco, McAnany, and Murata report on this). Much of the cacao now produced is run-of-the-mill stuff, and commercial chocolate tends to be heavily cut with sugar and other substances. The world market for high-quality chocolate and organically grown products is changing this, but diseases, high production costs, climate change, and other factors cause difficulties. Meanwhile, Africa has such a huge lead in production of standard-grade chocolate that catching up is hopeless under present political-economic conditions. Côte d’Ivoire, which produces much of the world’s chocolate, notoriously keeps its costs low by using child slave labor. Ironically, many of the great chocolate companies began as Quaker firms that wished to find a product not produced by slaves. The rebirth of chocolate in Mesoamerica and the development of a true quality industry worldwide must await the coming of major reforms in labor conditions, worldwide pricing, and quality standard-setting.

Trying to find something to criticize in this book is a difficult task. There are some lapses of the pen; the only one worth remark is citing “mid-twentieth-century” uses of chocolate to Bishop Landa (p. 239). Typos and such are virtually nonexistent, let alone errors of fact.

One slight problem concerns transcriptions. This book, like many recent books on or related to Maya archaeology, mixes Mayan transcription systems. Traditional Spanish colonial systems and the modern uniform system in use since the late 1980s are hopelessly mixed, not only in the book as a whole but often in the same paragraph or even in the same word. We find hmen'ob as the plural of “healer”; it should be either hmenoodb (traditional) or hmenoolob (new). Similarly, “k’ax” for “forest” should be either kax or k’aaax.

Worse is the ridiculous ethnonym usage, followed herein, of the Project for the Documentation of the Languages of Meso-America. It overcorrects Spanish words into pseudo-phonetic spellings. Yucatec becomes “Yukatek,” Huasteco becomes “Wasteko,” and so on. Yet these are Spanish geographical terms not native words. “Yucatec” is a wondrously confused Spanish mix-up of languages, “Huasteco/a” a Nahuaism for the Tampico area. Neither is an ethnonym. The “Yukatek” of this book are the original Maya, the people who actually call themselves that (more accurately, Maayaj). They use the word “Yucateco/a” not for themselves alone but for any person residing in the Yucatan Peninsula. The “Wasteko” of this book are actually the Teenek, called “Huastec Maya” in much of the English-language literature; again, they would use “Huasteco/a” in its proper sense, for any person inhabiting the Huasteca. Other examples could be mentioned. Consistency is impossible because the terms are spelled the right way (Spanish does have a standardized spelling system) when they are being used in their normal-world sense as geographic terms. It is only when they are (wrong) ethnonyms that they are spelled neologistically. I humbly request that these terms remain in their correct Spanish forms. Probably we should use actual ethnonyms—Maayaj, Teenek, and so forth—to talk about linguistic groups. After all, we have gotten used to referring correctly to the Purhepecha (instead of “Tarascans”) and Raramuri (instead of “Tarahumara”).

Other than this trivial point, the book is a model of ethnobiology and Mesoamerican studies. It deserves to be read by all specialists in those areas.
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Ethnography Goes to Market


JOHN F. SHERRY JR.
University of Notre Dame

I begin this review with a personal disclosure, as an alert to the bias informing my remarks. Like most readers of this
essay, I am at once an enthusiastic participant in and conscientious objector to contemporary consumer culture. An applied anthropologist, I have spent the past quarter-century as a business school professor, teaching aspiring, neophyte, veteran, and executive managers not only how to understand the cultural ecology of marketing but also how ethically to exploit and effectively to defy marketing’s technology of influence. I have been an active consultant across a range of industries and countries during this time as well. My research interests include consumer behavior, spectacle, placeways, and creativity.

While I have found both my academic and consulting work at times to be as frustrating as rewarding, they have almost always been mutually illuminating on many dimensions. Sometimes the luxury of time trumps the luxury of access and funding, sometimes not; sometimes the latter can beget the former, sometimes vice versa. Experience gained in one venue is applied in the next, such that long-term immersion in related phenomena, multisite ethnography, and rapid ethnographic assessment conspire to shape the diagnostic research that characterizes proprietary projects and catalyzes the academic ones. I view ethnography as an elastic enterprise.

As a professor, a consultant, and a disciplinary interloper, I strive to be aware of the teachable moment, that opportunity to bring theory and method to bear on a relevant issue that has previously bedeviled or altogether eluded my client, whether sophomore or CEO. Ethnography easily reveals this moment in environments long dominated by operations research, economics, or psychology and limned by statistics, focus groups, or aesthetic intuition. But early in my career, persuasive solutions demanded opportunistic personal intervention or creative thought experiments, either handily enough discounted as anecdotal or speculative by skeptical audiences. Hoary examples from our discipline’s early embrace of and episodic flirtation with industry, their timeless relevance apparently belied by copyright date, failed to generalize for new generations of managers. Effective recruitment or conversion has awaited the proliferation of teachable texts, of exemplars of relevant research revealing or resolving commercial issues of the kind comprising the proceedings to which I now turn.

This volume emerges from the second annual Ethnographic Praxis in Industry Conference, a gathering of practitioners and academics whose applied focus on business has become the site of so much accommodation and resistance in our discipline in recent decades. The book roughly reflects the conference structure, which explored the theme of “transitions,” as it impinges increasingly on industrial ethnographers and their clients, in cultural, social, and quotidian perspective. The conference, a strategically brief affair that celebrates the current status of ethnography as the methodological darling of the market research industry broadly construed, is even more a ritual performance of nascent communal identity. As both diction and acronym attest—a heroic brah name with learned resonance—the sweep of the conference is grand and the scope of its proceedings wide. With industry organizers and National Association for the Practice of Anthropology (NAPA) backing, the book captures something of the excitement of the event and speaks both to producers as well as consumers of ethnographic work.

Like any proceedings volume, this one is both blessed and cursed by its format. For one-stop shopping in a strange bazaar, it is a useful—if selective—guide. Rushed to print for a market for whom freshness dating and shelf life are critical considerations, the packaging dents and dings of typographical error seem less annoying (even when chapters are misnumbered) than they might in a traditional monograph. The contents themselves are fully blown, in all senses of the metaphor, yet even the weakest do not miss entirely, as they often contain a nugget of insight that helps the reader grasp the contours of the field. With some exceptions, shorter chapters provoke without satisfying while longer ones provide just enough empirical, theoretical, or stylistic incremental advance to convince the reader of the promise of the enterprise. The inclusion of abstracts from workshops and posters intrigues and tantalizes even further and gives the reader a sense of the breadth of coverage even a circumscribed topic elicits from these practical researchers. No index is appended to the volume, which inhibits surgical striking in an era of time famine. Perhaps the most valuable aspect of the format is the roster of biosketches, which includes e-mail addresses of contributors, who are thus sure to be petitioned for papers, advice, network access, and job interviews as a result. Lamentably (and inexplicably for a savvy set of entrepreneurs with such an audacious brand), the pedestrian cover art is a missed opportunity to promote the field, even if the logos of corporate sponsors are banished to the back.

While the contents are parsed across topical, procedural, and institutional issues, many of the chapters are an engaging mélange of shrouded discovery (an artifact of the “proprietary shackles,” in Reichenbach and Maish’s evocative phrasing, that solely and often inappropriately limit the diffusion of current, relevant examples into the literature), methodological advice, philosophical meditation, and paean to serendipity. The all-too-brief keynote chapter by Grant McCracken, perennial paladin of this postmodern profession, sets the tone for much of what is to follow. Chiding the field for its surfeit of charlatans, he advocates a 19th-century solution to a 21st-century problem: in lieu of certification, legitimate practitioners would deposit the “extra data” from proprietary studies (i.e., ancillary discoveries not compromising clients) into blog-based “Notes and Queries,” accessible by all on the Internet. This retrowiki remedy for Gresham’s Law is vintage McCracken: acerbic, ironic, and elegant. The balance of the empirical and methodological chapters strives to meet these touchstones of insight, authenticity, and managerial relevance, while substantive chapters on disciplinary development favor issues of legitimacy. Surprisingly, McCracken’s considerable body of scholarly work is not invoked by contributors, despite its relevance to most of
their pursuits. My readers will hear a variant of this lament again.

Topical chapters are set in a variety of research contexts: healthcare, design, online shopping and dating, pharmaceauticals, forecasting, financial services, personal computers, domestic objects, telematics, space, and place. The weakest chapters fail to capture conditions like the lived experience of illness or the many sophisticated precedents for and nuances of the cultural biography of goods. Midrange contributions produce unsurprising findings and uninspired applications of basic research. The strongest chapters deliver the most ethnographic detail, insightfully interpreted and creatively translated into managerial applications. John Wendel and Lisa Hardy succinctly and comprehensively describe the promises and perils of clinical trials. Rachel Jones provides a detailed folk phenomenology of illness that is rife with practical applications. Nimmi Rangaswamy and Kentaro Toyama explore the promise of information and communication technology in rural India in glocal perspective. Jones and Martin Ortlieb accomplish the trifecta of thick empirical description, rich theoretical interpretation, and creative actionable application in their study of emplacement of courtship rituals in cyberspace, resulting in what is perhaps the volume's signature topical contribution.

Methodological chapters are more disappointing than their empirical counterparts. Some studies employ no ethnography at all but, rather, report on focus groups, home visits, interviews, and surveys. Others merely advocate the standard battery of procedures in the ethnographic toolkit. A few introduce some useful wrinkles (e.g., proxy assessment, employment of nonethnographers, negotiation of informed consent) that may be unfamiliar to students but that are common fieldwork practices. Of particular interest is the chapter by Ken Anderson and Rogério de Paula, which is a wonderful little confessional tale of a sequence of experiences every anthropologist has enjoyed: the “always on” sensation of no downtime in our profession that encourages us toward emergent design, lateral thinking, and the embrace of serendipity that often results in insight.

The chapters devoted to institution building and disciplinary reflection are the ones I found to be most rewarding. These chapters perhaps best reflect the face work and corridor talk that I imagine to be the lifeblood of any fledging professional conference. The transcription of the panel discussion between luminaries Jeannette Blomberg, Tim Malefyt, and Lisa Robinson, as moderated by Tracey Lovejoy, is the most cogent presentation of the state of the field to be found in the book. It is at once a humorous, enlightening, and inspiring catalog of the field’s achievements and prospects. Jones’s chapter on the utility of experience models in ethnographic design research is a useful entree into one of the most exciting current business frontiers. One of my favorite chapters in the volume is Nina Wakeford’s provocative, counterintuitive defense of PowerPoint, which she mounts via ethnographic analysis of “thick PowerPoint events” to illuminate the culture-building effect of one of our most pervasive rituals. Paired with Elizabeth Tunstall’s poetic musings on communications channels, we get a rare glimpse into our own professional behaviors. My other favorite chapter is an eloquent meditation on ethical impulses and the rejection rate is respectable, so the editors are beyond reproach for not assembling the book that might have been compiled. Many of the usual suspects contributed to the volume, and those that did not may well participate in future efforts, given the hectic pace and unpredictable rhythms of business life. What concerns me more, judging from the citation bases of the articles, is the absence of awareness—or, possibly, the disregard for the relevance of—the enormous amount of ethnographic work that is generated beyond the pale even of these badlands of the anthropological literature, on the part of the authors. Quite a few ethnographers dwell in unexpected villages and produce accounts of behaviors of interest not only to businesspeople but also to scholars of contemporary consumption, contributing to a comprehensive understanding of marketplace behavior. There are more noses under the tent than this volume would suggest and more still to be invited.

Interested readers—and, especially, those students whose careers will inevitably hinge on their ability either to practice ethnography in applied settings or broker cultural theory and ethnographic methods to professional school clients—should familiarize themselves with the many anthropological contributions to literatures in marketing (including advertising), management, and finance that have been made over the last several decades. A cursory inventory of resources would include books for primary insight and rich source material (e.g., McCracken 2005; Sherry 1995; Sunderland and Denny 2007; Zaloom 2006); articles in academic journals (e.g., Journal of Consumer Research; Journal of Consumer Culture; Consumption Markets & Culture; and Journal of Marketing); and conference proceedings (e.g., from the Association for Consumer Research, the Consumer Culture Theory group, and the Marketing Science Institute, whose 2006 Business Insights from Consumer Culture [Avery 2006] conference summary will be of particular interest). As long as our efforts are confined to silos, the goal of identity, community, and discipline building is restricted to fits-and-starts (re)development, and the impact that applied ethnography stands to make on business and social science fields is blunted. No matter our worksite, we all like to talk shop: it is in our anthropological genes. I would just like to foster broader cooler conversation.
Because of its relatively heavier emphasis on theory and method than on ethnographic detail, the EPIC volume will be of more interest to ethnographers in conventional social science departments than to those either in industry or business schools. As a secondary text in courses in research methods, in economic and applied social science, or as a recommended reading in introductory courses seeking to give students a sense of the practical value of their discipline, this book will find good use. Perhaps its true value lies in its artifactual, iconic status as a totemic contribution to the movement from which it has arisen and that it currently embodies. It marks more than the “liminal moment” its editors modestly claim for its disciplinary matrix. It is another entry in a growing library of indications that we have long traversed that commercial threshold with practical consequence and theoretical aplomb. Expect our next wave of entrepreneurial researchers to prod the subcultures of acronymia to coalesce and to reveal the impact our studies of production, consumption, distribution, and divestiture (and all their attendant nuances) will continue to have on all five fields of anthropology.
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Going Global: Let Past Serve Future?


THOMAS H. MCGOVERN
City University of New York, Hunter College

The Archaeology of Global Change is an important volume both for its well-organized contents and for what it's title implies for the future of archaeology. Archaeologists have long been doing cross-disciplinary, multidisciplinary, and interdisciplinary research. We have been investigating coupled natural and human systems, modeling human ecodynamics, and expressing concern about long-term human impacts on environment long before any of these research strategies became buzzwords in the funding community. Since at least the 1930s (and in some areas since the 1890s), archaeologists have closely cooperated with geologists, soil scientists, biologists, climatologists, and a host of other natural and physical scientists on a regular basis. Many of us today identify ourselves as zooarchaeologists, geoarchaeologists, or archaeobotanists, and a host of isotopic and ancient biomolecular approaches are rapidly transforming our understanding of the human past. While the naive scientific worship of white coats and the uncritical affection for simplistic physics-based models of the early processual years has worn thin under postprocessual critique, most modern archaeologists of any theoretical persuasion are today very comfortable working with hard scientists and are very at home in multidisciplinary teams in the field or lab.

Most archaeologists are also concerned global citizens, and like other anthropologists they have been increasingly active in finding ways to apply their expertise and data sets to current issues of human–environmental interaction now commonly subsumed under the term global change. Carole Crumley's influential 1994 edited volume Historical Ecology included a “Santa Fe Statement,” representing a clear early declaration that no sustainable future was possible without a well-understood past. Archaeologists have correctly recognized the importance of providing a long-term perspective to current landscape and resource management efforts that are typically suffering from the limitations of short observational series. (For example, the unsuccessful managers of the North Atlantic cod fisheries began their data sets with 1903 as a pristine baseline, despite hundreds of years of prior impact, with disastrous results both for cod and humans.) Archaeologists have also been very successful in getting funded by the U.S. National Science Foundation and related agencies, not only through Dr. Yellen's long-standing archaeology program within Social Behavioral and Economic (SBE) directorate but also in the new large-scale, cross-cutting special competitions like Biocomplexity in the Environment (BE) and the new Human and Social Dynamics (HSD) programs, which are designed to cut across normal academic disciplinary boundaries, sponsor large-scale integration of social and natural science approaches and data sets, and produce syntheses that have direct bearing on modern real-world problems. Some NSF budget figures may provide some perspective on the current and potential impact of these programs on the conduct of archaeology in the United States (all budgetary information from NSF website, http://nsf.gov/awardsearch). Dr. Yellen's longstanding program within SBE has been essentially flat-funded for many years with a total budget around $4.5–5.0 million, with most supported projects totaling less than $150,000 and a practical maximum project total funding cap of around $250,000. However, during the 2000–05 Biocomplexity (BE) competition, six archaeological projects were successful in landing over $4.6 million in total, with some individual projects collecting sums equal to half of the entire SBE