I. IN THIS ISSUE

1982-83 ASAO Board Members; ASAO Monograph Series update; Mike Lieber's address to the membership during the 11th Annual Meeting in Hilton Head, South Carolina; preliminary information on the program for the 12th Annual Meeting.

II. NEWLY ELECTED BOARD MEMBERS

The three candidates receiving the highest amount of votes for membership to the ASAO Board of Directors were: Jane Goodale (Bryn Mawr); Martha Ward (University of New Orleans), and Glenn Petersen (Baruch). Each of these newly elected Board members will serve a two-year term.

III. OTHER BOARD CHANGES

Mike Lieber has announced his resignation from the ASAO Board of Directors. In a letter to all Board members Mike stated that "For both professional and family reasons, I find it necessary to resign from the Board. With field work facing me this summer and a (continued)
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February 20th deadline for getting the report to the typesetters, I simply will have no time to devote to Association matters. I do not think it proper or fair to ASAO to remain as a non-working member of the Board. I think that we can all be pleased with the considerable accomplishments of the past year, and I am pleased with the composition of the new Board."

In an action approved by all Board members, Denise O'Brien (Temple) has agreed to fill the remaining year of Lieber's term. O'Brien received the fourth highest total of votes during the recent election for the three vacancies on the ASAO Board. Presently, the Board is undergoing the process of electing a new chairperson and the results will be announced in the next issue of the Newsletter.

IV. 1983 ASAO ANNUAL MEETING LOCATION

The exact location of the 1983 ASAO Annual Meeting site has not yet been determined. Vern Carroll, the Annual Meetings Coordinator, is still working on finalizing the site location and the program as well. More information on the meeting site will be highlighted in the fall Newsletter. Consequently, there will not be a complete report on the total program in this edition of the Newsletter. However, since the meeting arrangements have not yet been finalized, all members who wish to organize a session should contact Vern Carroll immediately at the following address: Department of Anthropology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109.

At this time, a few session organizers have requested that the following information be listed in this edition of the Newsletter:

A) The informal session on Drugs and Interpersonal Relationships in Oceania, which met in Hilton Head, is scheduled to reconvene in 1984 (not 1983) as a working session. Anyone with information and ideas on the place and importance of tobacco, kava, betel, marijuana, etc. within Pacific interpersonal relations is invited to join the session by contacting Lamont Lindstrom, Dept. of Anthropology/Sociology, Southwestern at Memphis, 2000 North Parkway, Memphis, TN 38112.

B) Karl G. Heider is organizing a working session on The Rashomon Effect in Oceanic Ethnography: The Problem of Contradiction and Replicability. This session will look at what happens when different people, usually ethnographers, come up with different findings after studying the same cultures. In accounting for these apparent contradictions, it is necessary to state important things about the culture as well as about ethnography.

Participants must send their proposed titles to Karl no later than October 15, 1982. If the session is approved by the Annual Meetings Coordinator, draft papers must be distributed to all participants by January 15, 1983. Karl has prepared a paper which introduces and outlines the problem, and would be happy to send a copy to any potential participant. Anyone who is interested in participating in this session should contact Karl Heider, Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208.

C) 'Straightening Out' and 'Putting Right Again' Contexts: Talk and Social Inference is a proposed working session for the 1983 Annual Meeting. This session will focus on cultural contexts in which individual actions are
discussed and evaluated for their meaning in cultural terms and their significance for the community. Participants will look at how meaning is negotiated through such processes as inference, and the styles of speaking in their contexts. For the sake of comparative analysis, participants should use, as much as possible, discourse materials in the form of transcripts or detailed observational accounts. Interested persons are encouraged to contact Karen Watson-Gegeo with a brief description of the contexts from which they will draw their observations and the kind of data they have. Karen Watson-Gegeo, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, 13 Appian Way, Cambridge, MA 02138.

D) Richard Feinberg is proposing a working session on The Significance of Laughter in Oceania. Last March at Hilton Head, a number of participants met in an informal session to discuss the problem of laughter directed at victims of misfortune. They reported this phenomenon in Micronesia, Polynesia, and New Guinea. In all cases described, this was a frequent occurrence, evidently involving a great deal of emotional energy on the part of both the "audience" and those at whom the laughter was directed. Sometimes, these events were quite dramatic and often they proved highly unsettling to the researcher who witnessed them.

The goal of the working session is to provide the fullest possible descriptive account, primarily on an anecdotal level, of when the people we have studied are likely to laugh at others, the response of those who have become the objects of laughter, and the people's account of why they behave as they do. This should help us to see the gaps in our ethnographic knowledge of this potentially revealing phenomenon, and in this way, perhaps, serve as a guide to future research; it should also make it possible for us to start to formulate some serious hypotheses as to the significance of this kind of laughter in Oceanic cultures. Anyone wishing to participate in this forthcoming working session, please contact Rick Feinberg, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Kent State University, Kent, OH 44242.

V. ASAO BOARD MEMBER HONORED

Denise O'Brien, associate professor of anthropology at Temple University, is one of 50 outstanding young American professionals chosen for Class III of the W.K. Kellogg Foundation's National Fellowship Program. O'Brien joined Temple University in 1967 after serving as an acting assistant professor at the University of California, Davis. Denise earned her doctorate in anthropology from Yale University and is the author of books on topics ranging from kinship patterns in Highlands New Guinea to the sexual stratification of Southern Bantu societies.

The Fellowship Program, initiated in 1980, is aimed at helping the nation expand its vital pool of capable leaders. The program is structured to increase individuals' skills and insights into areas outside their chosen disciplines so they can deal more creatively and effectively with society's problems. Each Kellogg National Fellow receives a three-year grant of up to $30,000 to pursue a professionally broadening self-designed plan of study. Participation in Foundation-designed seminars that focus on issues facing leaders in domestic and international settings is also required. Workshops, travel experiences, and consultations add to the program's scope. Fellows were selected on the basis of recommendations from their institution's or agency's chief executive officer, and their own individual credentials, skills, interests, and demonstrated leadership potential.
VI. MOORE REQUESTS FROM PACIFIC LIBRARIANS

Following the publication, in the spring Newsletter, of two letters from Pacific librarians calling for papers on the Pacific which could be added to their respective collections, the letter below was received:

"We are a regular subscriber to your ASAO Newsletter. We shared the same interests with the University of the South Pacific and the University of Papua New Guinea, in wishing to obtain conference papers and other related materials on Pacific Islands, contributed and presented by ASAO participants. We are, specifically, interested in materials dealing with the islands of Micronesia.

Please include us on your consideration list of institutions interested in obtaining ASAO conference papers and other related materials. We look forward to hearing from you."

Daiko D. Syne, Library Director
Micronesia/Pacific Collection
Community College of Micronesia
P.O. Box 159
Ponape State, F.S.M. 96941

VII. FROM THE MONOGRAPH SERIES EDITOR

ASAO Monograph No. 9, MIDDLEMEN AND BROKERS IN OCEANIA, edited by William L. Rodman and Dorothy Ayers Counts, was published by the University of Michigan Press in May 1982. The book is ix + 307 pages and sells for $16.50. It may be ordered from: The University of Michigan Press, 839 Greene Street, P.O. Box 1104, Ann Arbor, MI 48106. The book's contents are as follows:

Chapter 1 Introduction. William L. Rodman and Dorothy Counts.
Chapter 2 The Government is the District Officer: An Historical Analysis of District Officers as Middlemen in the British Solomon Islands Protectorate, 1893-1943. James A. Boutilier.
Chapter 4 Legitimacy of Elected Officials as Middlemen in a Colonial System. Daniel T. Hughes and Debra Connelly.
Chapter 5 A Question of Legitimacy: Middlemen, Power and Change in Northwest New Britain. Dorothy Ayers Counts.
Chapter 7 Will Success Spoil a Middleman? The Case of Etapang, Central Vanuatu. Jean-Marc Philibert.
Chapter 8 Equatorial Acquiescence: Village Council and Pelenu in Western Samoa. Paul Shankman.
Chapter 9 Mai of the Manga: Man in the Middle. Susan M. Pflanz-Cook and Edwin A. Cook.
Chapter 10 Bridges, Metaphors and Theories: A Commentary. Marc J. Swartz.

NOTE: Please see page 14 for the ASAO Monograph Series library acquisition "tear-off" order form.
As authorized by the ASAO Executive Board at the 11th Annual Meeting in Hilton Head, South Carolina, Mac Marshall and Ivan Brady have contacted three members of ASAO to serve as the new ASAO Editorial Advisory Board. The three persons are: Richard Feinberg, Deborah Gewertz, and Nancy McDowell.

The members of the Editorial Advisory Board will work in conjunction with the Monograph Series Editor and the Special Publications Editor (who are automatically members of the Editorial Advisory Board) on various tasks and policy matters relating to the ASAO publications. Board members will assist in refereeing manuscripts submitted to the Series and will help in establishing editorial policy guidelines. Occasionally, they may also be asked to engage in the editing of parts of manuscripts that have been accepted into the ASAO Series.

VIII. BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTES


B. ASAO members are reminded that the first publication in the ASAO Special Publication Series is now in its second printing (in less than one year!). This notable work, by Marshall Sahlins, is entitled HISTORICAL METAPHORS AND MYTHICAL REALITIES: STRUCTURE IN THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE SANDWICH ISLANDS KINGDOM and is available from the University of Michigan Press, P.O. Box 1104, Ann Arbor, MI 48106, U.S.A. Make sure your library has at least one copy.

IX. CALL FOR ACCOUNTABILITY

ASAO members may find interesting the following two articles which appeared in the April 9th edition of The Times of Papua New Guinea:

1) All Foreign Researchers Must Go Through IPNGS - All foreign researchers coming into Papua New Guinea have to go through the Institute of Papua New Guinea Studies (IPNGS) in Port Moresby. The institution or organisation responsible for sending them to PNG must apply to IPNGS setting out what sorts of things they want research on, what for and where. The applications and proposals are then sent to the provinces concerned; to the university departments and any organisation in PNG responsible for the type of research. It is also necessary that applications and proposals be sent to the migration department to approve research visas to be sent out.

A foreign researcher has to be affiliated with an institution or organisation. For example, if a Japanese researcher wants to study land use in Enga, the body he is affiliated with has to send an application and a proposal for research to the IPNGS, which sends copies to Enga Provincial government, migration department, UPNG geography department and UNITECH land utilisation department. The researcher has to wait for an approval before making travel arrangements to enter PNG.
Due to stringent procedures in Papua New Guinea, the 30 day tourist visa would not possibly be helpful to researchers. Also researchers have to use libraries in the country and they can be able to do so only on condition that they have a letter of recommendation from their affiliated organisations back home. The Director of the Institute of Applied Social and Economic Research (IASER), Mr. Richard Jackson, said he would welcome Mr. Samana's ruling only if it was a temporary ban to allow the provincial government to set its research priorities correct. "It won't be good if researchers were banned altogether," he said. "I'd appreciate the ruling if it is a temporary ban while they work out their list of areas where research can be carried out." Whether research is done by university members or foreigners, it is difficult without a list of worthwhile priorities, he added.

One problem that is faced at present, is the procedure through which researchers have to go. They have a problem of not knowing what to do with their findings. Mr. Jackson suggested that there should be two depositories, a national one in Port Moresby containing copies of research done in PNG, and others in provinces to file copies of research work done in those particular provinces. At the present some organisations insist that copies be sent to them, and eventually the research findings are scattered everywhere. Some researchers go through problems or get sick or tired and decide to leave before the end of their research while others say they are going to write up their findings outside PNG. To discourage this attitude, Mr. Jackson said organisations or institutions responsible for sending the researchers in the first place should be penalized.

Talks are going on at present between IASER and IPNGS to establish a national body to act as a penalizing agent. This body's main task would be to refuse entry of researchers from institutions or organizations who had not performed well previously. This means that if a researcher from a foreign body did not complete or failed to comply with Papua New Guinea conditions then the next researcher from that same body would be refused entry by the penalizing agent.

2) _Samana Remains Firm on Ban Decision_ - Morobe Premier, Mr. Utula Samana, last week rejected the application of an American anthropologist to study in the province. Mr. Samana said that as head of the provincial division of policy planning and research, he would reject all further applications by foreign researchers until a provincial research committee existed to establish that their research was relevant to the province's needs. There have been cases of academic exploitation in the past he said. "We must safeguard our national and provincial interests and check that research was geared towards the people's development."

Mr. Samana said that Morobe intended to develop its own laws to cover research, down to the community government levels to safeguard people's interests. The provincial research committee, he said, would have representatives of institutions such as Unitech and the Wau Ecology Institute and would judge and assess research applications against the priorities of the province. It would also safeguard that national academics were given ample opportunities. While Mr. Samana's stand is in line with a general tightening by provincial governments on research, his new ruling affected an anthropologist who had already arrived in the country with a research visa valid for work in Morobe Province...
X. FROM THE EDITOR

All session organizers for the 12th Annual Meeting are reminded to contact Vern Carroll to firmly establish their schedule for next year's program. Vern must have this material so he can include it in the next issue of the Newsletter.

NEWSLETTER EDITION          MATERIALS MUST BE RECEIVED BY
Fall 1982                    October 8, 1982
Winter 1983                  January 7, 1983

XI. CHAIRMAN'S ADDRESS TO THE 11th ANNUAL MEETING

What follows is the complete text of the address presented by Michael Lieber to the ASAO membership during the Hilton Head meeting on March 4, 1982.
ASAO in the Supply Side: Age of Thrilling Up

There is a certain amount of presumption in scheduling an address from the chair. It's something that ASAO hasn't done before, not making it our habit to indulge in periodic identity searches and ritual breast beating that are common coin in social science organisations. Yet, the Board of Directors this year is faced with some hard policy decisions—meeting sites, the disposal of the Distinguished Lecturer, and the future of the ASAO Monograph Series. These issues require an integrative approach so that they make intellectual and organisational sense taken together. We are, thus, presented with both the opportunity and the necessity of reviewing and reflecting on these things most important in our sixteen year history. It is necessary because we have to keep very explicit the intellectual basis for ordering our priorities in our decision making. What I want to do tonight is to share with you a set of observations and thoughts that are, as you will see, intensely personal. Other Board members agree with them to a greater or lesser extent. I offer them for your consideration and invite your response.

ASAO began with a vision shared by a few scholars. The vision was clear in its general goal—creating, through co-operative writing out of our data and the patterns that they form, a new kind of comparative anthropology. What that comparative anthropology would look like in the end was not clear to any of us. It could not possibly have been other than vague for good reason. What we had in mind was a trial-and-error process that would proceed in roughly three stages.

In stage one, we would organise our data around a particular topic, circulate our papers for comment and individual analysis, rewrite if there was time, and then meet together for consideration of what issues appeared in our data. This would initiate the second stage.

In stage two, the discussion would proceed with a single goal in mind. We would generate through discussing our data a set of empirical generalisations that appeared to accurately characterise patterns of form and processes that related our ethnographic cases together as similar and different. These induced patterns would allow each of the participants to reissue his own data to answer the following questions:

(a) Are there data left out of my paper that are relevant when my group is compared with other groups?

(b) Are my data distinctly different from those in the other papers so that they form a pattern that contrasts with another pattern?

(c) Alternatively, are my data similar enough to those in the other papers such that such cases would be seen as a variation of some more general pattern? If so, then what, exactly, are the variations that characterise my case?

In the third stage, we would rewrite our papers to answer these questions so that inferences based on them could be worked out to explain the patterns that emerged. These inferences themselves form a pattern. The critical property of these inferences is that they be adequate to specify the dimensions along which particular ethnographic instances could be expected to vary.

Through this three stage process, we hope to develop a kind of cultural comparison that would do four things. First, we would cooperatively derive "units" of comparison from our data rather than from static categories for ordering "units" to be compared (as in Nusseck). Jean O'Brien, for example, is able to use data on adoption in Oceania to substantiate sociological hypotheses only by ignoring native distinctions between adoption and fosterage (and their entailments) and by ignoring native methods of defining kinsmen. Our units of comparison, then, are here, not theirs. By way of contrast, Brady et al. were very careful to index and carefully label the different sorts of "transactions" that Oceania peoples engage in, allowing analysis of culturally comparable "units."

Second, for each group described, we would give as complete an ethnographic account of our focal topic as possible such that the form of the "unit" being compared is explained by specifying the cultural, sociological, and ecological constraints that are seen to shape it. Vern Carroll's and Eric Schuchman's chapters in Exiles and Migrants in Oceania are two superb examples that come to mind. Thus, comparison includes not only particular forms, but also their contexts. By this means, both the dimensions of similarity and difference and the relations among these dimensions become specified.

Third, the choice of theoretical perspective is left up to each contributor for ordering his or her own data. This has the advantage of making the criteria for inclusion and exclusion of data explicit at the outset. It also provides initial generalisations for discussion in the form of competing, complementary, and/or disparate hypotheses whose utility can be evaluated at each stage of the discussion.

Fourth, given that any discussion would swing between theoretical and ethnographic levels, what would turn out to be the most useful theoretical frameworks for comparison would be arrived at inductively. This means that the richness of ethnographic detail need not get lost in the generalising process, since the generalisation is referable back to the data at any point in the discussion. The handling of the anomalous case is particularly useful in keeping the inductive
process honest.

If we could manage to do all these things, the result would be that we could begin to specify just what we mean by "cultural difference" and "cultural similarity."

I've tried to be as explicit as possible in articulating this vision. If it appears to be somewhat naive, then I submit that it is not a sort of naïveté that any of us need be different about. I remain personally totally committed to it and totally convinced that we can realize it. What is important is that we now be explicit about how we've been naïve and how we can realize the vision more realistically. I say this now because this vision is the reference point from which I evaluate our experience with our discussion formats and the ASAO Monograph Series. These are, after all, the contexts in which our vision is realized or not realized. This is where comparison happens or it doesn't. I offer my observations on our most central machinery in candor, for I think that we need to be candid with one another about the most important thing that we do. I mean offense to no one, and I think you all know that.

We were fortunate to discover early on that the symposium format was not adequate to handle all of the kinds of discussion in which members were interested. Bob McIntyre, for example, invented the informal sessions to survey the extent of interest in a particular topic. This was quickly expanded to include surveying what sort of data was available and because the ideal tool for selecting what would be symposia and what wouldn't. The working sessions, originally introduced to differentiate between groups that qualified for more or less time and space at meeting, was found to have a great deal of flexibility. It is, for example, ideal for groups that want to get their papers in shape for joint publication in a journal, such as JPC. The symposium format remains such as it was originally devised, except that we have become a bit more realistic as to what we can expect from them. We used to think of a symposium as successful or not in terms of whether or not an ASAO volume resulted from them. This was naïve. First of all, some symposia were really just long informal sessions. Secondly, there are various levels at which a symposium can be successful, particularly to the extent that it informs individuals about their own data and their comparative implications. Thirdly, not every topic is as inherently interesting or productive as every other, and you don't know until you've tried. Finally and most importantly, we must remember that a symposium is a trial-and-error procedure. There is no successful model in our field for doing what we're trying to do. There is also no guarantee that a strategy that worked well in one symposium will work in another. We've been doing what Harry Silverman calls "testing out."

We've learned a few things from the testing out process that are worth thinking about. First of all, we've learned that frustration levels are practically nil in informal sessions but rise through working sessions to excruciating levels in symposia. One need not look far for the reason. We're all very uncomfortable presenting our data orally and answering questions about it—what I call the "performance-response" model. We're trained in that model from kindergarten on. But when precirculated papers ablate the necessity for oral presentations to begin a symposium, it's as if we've entered a minefield. We can't even guess how to begin, what can be safely said and what can't, how attempts at generalization ought to be handled, how people will respond to a trial balloon, and the like. We seem to have developed a tendency to play it safe, and the safety results in a mainly negative tone whereby generalizations are met with silence or quick contradiction or complete generalization. We are not much given to venturing beyond the confines of our own data. The resistance to working over generalizations has remained high, but it is variously expressed. In some cases, talk stays at a theoretical level, in others at an anecdotal level, but with great resistance to connecting the two. Perhaps the most predictable response to an attempt at generalization of pattern across cases is "My people don't do it that way." This can cut off the development of a generalization faster than any known antifreeze, precisely because it gets the talk back to the performance-response level and keeps it there. Any recovery is temporary. It seems that the more time is allotted to discussion of empirical generalizations, the less likely it is that there will emerge any coherent way. Sometimes we get lucky, and a discussion manages to pull it out at the last minute. Murray Chapman and David Schneider did this for the Relocation Symposium when it was on the verge of falling apart. Sometimes even a Murray Chapman or a Shelley Errington can penetrate the wall of resistance. This experience is so common that one wonders how we've ever gotten any volumes at all. We also got lucky with our volume editors. Carroll, Lumegarde, Brady, Boutilier, Counts, Marshall, et. al. are a very determined, dedicated lot. Yet every one of our published volumes shows the scar of our intellectual briar patch in one way or another.

I'm painting a dismal picture here, but not an unfair one, I think. On the other hand, we have well worked out procedures for helping one another to elicit relevant material from our data sets. We have in fact firmly established the first stage of the vision. We also need to remember that, to some extent, the frustrations we encounter in establishing stage two are inevitable. We will have to live with the
until we work out strategies that seem to be reliable in producing integrative generalizations in discussion. I would say in general that we will probably need to rely on the trial balloon method of introducing generalizations that need refining through discussion. If we can manage to eliminate the negativity of responses, which is as much an expression of discomfort as anything else, we can reduce the frustration level to the point where it is possible to work variations off the trial balloon procedure. Thereafter we may develop alternatives to it. This shouldn't be all that difficult for two reasons.

For one thing, we've managed to construct a working context over the years that has been routinely one of earnest, gentle will and intellectual and personal concern. We have, for example, managed to eliminate from our interpersonal dealings such invidious distinctions as graduate student/professional, junior rank/junior rank, star/drone, politically in/politically out. We've managed to preclude the status sneaking and fracturing so characteristic of AAA meetings. The best part of it is that we've done all of this not so much from moral or political conviction as from sheer practicality. This stuff just gets in the way of our work and our fun. This ambience, remember, had already developed before any of us ever became aware of it. It evolved as a natural outcome of the cooperation our sessions demanded and the shared excitement and frustrations that they generated. With this sort of solid base of interaction, is it such a large step for us to trust one another when we get to the hard part?

The second reason for optimism is that we have in fact learned a few things about running symposia from our testing out experience. I offer the following suggestions for facilitating comparative discussion in symposia.

1. Symposia and working sessions should be preceded by an informal session in a prior year. Informal sessions, with their short oral presentations help participants in reviewing their own data for comparative relevance and deciding what to include in their papers. This considerably improves the quality of symposium papers.

2. The session organizer should either tape the informal session or take very good notes. He or she can then call from them a list of items of data that are relevant to the topic and ought to appear in all the papers. This list should be sent to contributors as soon after the conclusion session as possible. A good model for this kind of list is Brad Shore's outline of items for the Rensselaer symposium. Had participants seriously used it to assemble their data, there would have been immediate critical points of comparison in the papers at the outset of discussions.

3. Once the symposium papers have been pre-circulated (a sine ase non for any for any symposium) a preliminary agenda for discussion should be circulated. The agenda should include a list of what appear to be the critical empirical issues that emerge from an initial comparison of the papers (thus, the necessity for contributors meeting pre-circulation deadlines). The list should not exceed 6 or 7 topics. Working out an agenda at the opening of a symposium may serve the interests of democracy but it also tends to result in an impossibly long list of items for discussion, ensuring demoralization at the outset. This does not mean that the prepared agenda need be rigid or non-negotiable, however. The discussion that ensues over why one item ought to replace another would serve beautifully to kick off productive talk.

4. One or two discussants ought to be carefully selected, recruited, and committed before paper pre-circulation deadlines. If there is more than one discussant, each should be carefully selected for a particular skill or task. The agenda should be worked out by the organizer and discussant(s) together. The conference organizer need not be obliged to take on the role of chairperson for the discussion. If he or she is contributing a paper, it is better that another who is not a contributor be selected as chairperson. The chairperson and discussant(s) are primarily responsible for maintaining the flow and direction of the discussions, and each needs to take a particular task or set of tasks as his or her primary role.

5. There are five kinds of tasks that must be handled in any symposium if the discussion is to proceed productively.

(a) Monitoring the direction of discussion

The discussant and chairperson have to act like a thermostat, monitoring the trajectory of discussion once a general point has been introduced. Talk tends to move up and down over levels of abstraction initially, finally settling at the ethnographic level. Participants may have to be reminded of the original point, at least to the extent of determining whether or not it is interesting enough to work on. If it is not, then the discussant or chairperson needs to insist (gently but firmly) that the ethnographic material being currently discussed be generalized to make it relevant to some comparative issue that is clearly germane to the symposium.

(b) Controlling scattergunning

This is another monitoring task. It often happens that once a general point is being worked out with reference to some specific data, the development of
the point is interrupted by the introduction of another generalisation that is relevant to the case being discussed. Even when the new point is important and interesting, it does redirect the discussion. But if the entire discussion is paced in this way, no general patterns can be induced, since no point ever gets fully developed. This is called \textit{scattergunning}, the group version of free association. It can be managed by following the direction of the new point to see if it gets fully developed. If there is closure or if a third point is introduced without closure of the second, participants need to have the scattergun pattern pointed out to them. The original point should be brought up and participants asked to relate it to the second point or to continue developing it and then relate it or to explicitly drop it.

(c) Managing blockages and impasses

It is the chair's job to manage blockages and impasses in the discussion. In a long hiatus, people get uncomfortable, and the chair needs to ascertain whether it is the issue or the participants that are exhausted. If it is the issue, then the chairperson should ask the participants to summarise their understanding of the issue and its importance and then move on to the next item on the agenda. If it is the participants who are exhausted, then a coffee break is in order. At reconvening, the discussion needs to be resumed with a summary of the current state of the issue under discussion before continuing. In the case of impasses or unresolvable conflict, it helps to have the protagonists summarise their positions and make sure that the conflict is a real issue.

(d) Managing the ritual protest

"My people don't do it that way," can either cut off the development of empirical generalisation or reformulate it in very creative ways. Which effect results depends on whether the protest is part of a career management strategy or an intellectual commitment to honest, rigorous induction. Since it is hardly to a career manager's entrepreneurial self-interest to have his or her folk appear to be a variation on some general pattern (unless he or she can claim to have discovered the pattern), the ritual protest is an invitation to be invited to perform. There inevitably follows a pattern of denials that any generalisation offered in response to relate the abstractive claims to other cases really does one's own data justice. By the time participants get tired or realise that they've been enticed, the original point is lost and valuable time wasted. The dorsal pattern is the giveaway, and it may or may not help for the discussant or chair to intervene and ask the performer to either relate the abstractive data to the general point or to propose another pattern at the same order of abstraction. If that doesn't work, then one is just stuck with it.

On the other hand, the anomalous case offered in good faith can lead to significant confrontations between our data and our basic assumptions about them. The anomalous experience on Penapa played this role in the Relocated communities symposium. The fact that their community fails apart on Penapa and yet still considers itself a community formed a reconsideration of the idea of community and the meaning of living together, which in turn refocused several other issues.

We are, thus, in a situation like that of the Kapuasmarangi, who may have to resort to incest just to find out who their relatives really are. The anomalous case has to be followed up for better or worse. In either case, the chair must insist that a second generalisation be developed in contrast to the one being challenged by the case. This puts a lot of pressure on the chair and the discussant, but in the case of a bad penny, I'm sure we're smart enough to figure out some reasonably subtle, time-efficient garbage disposal system.

(e) Updating

If possible, it would be useful for the discussant to begin every session after the first one by summarising the preceding session's discussion. This brief update would include the generalisations taken up, the point to which each was pursued, and the directions in which each appears to lead. This gives participants a chance to check which directions to follow and in what order.

Under utopian conditions a symposium discussion would be a metagologue in which the process of discussion would also be part of the discussion. Given that we know too little about the conditions under which metalogues occur to be able to predict them, it seems wise to delegate the monitoring process to specialists. The chairperson and discussant need to be chosen with those minimal tasks in mind.

It would help matters if we would realise that in one symposium meeting, we cannot expect to do much more than tease out what seems to be the most important empirical issues and how they appear to be patterned. That's more than plenty. Hopefully, part of that process will involve pushing back the boundary between the sayable and the unmentionable. As Ivan Brady and Mark Silverman have pointed out to us, part of the discussion process ought to be questioning one another.
about how we knew what we knew. We ask the natives to talk about that all the time. There is no reason why we can't demand that of ourselves. Once the issues, both empirical and epistemological, are clear, then the group has thrice choosers—people can collectively decide that the issues don't really warrant further consideration; that the papers will be rewritten for joint publication in a journal; or that papers will be rewritten for publication as an ASAO Monograph.

This brings us, then, to the problem of ASAO Monographs. Like our symposia, the series has taken the necessary first steps toward the kind of comparative anthropology we seek. Taken volume by volume, however, the monographs are frankly uneven in the quality of their individual papers and in the extent to which comparative issues suggested by the data are seriously grappled with. The problems of chapter quality control can be handled bureaucratically. What concerns us most is the comparative aspect of the volumes. Surely, assembling a set of ethnographic papers on the same topic is a minimal necessary first step toward doing comparison. But just having a dozen papers from a dozen Oceanic societies on an adoption or land tenure, etc., doesn't automatically mean that you're doing comparative anthropology. Try an experiment for yourselves. Read through the first seven published ASAO volumes and see how many of the chapters (other than the intro and conclusion chapters) have any serious mention of any of the other chapters in the same volume. Damned few. One gets the impression that none of the volume's authors found anything of relevance in or had ever seen or heard of the other papers in the same volume. Why is this? Is the task of comparison just the individual author's job but someone else's? Not far, most of us seem to have assumed that it is the volume editor's job or that of his delegated agent to be comparative in print. Why do we assume that? Is it not critical, most frustrating, and the most intellectually rewarding of all tasks to be tactfully left as the residuum of administrative conveniences? What possible intellectual justification can be found for this? And how well has this assumption served us when we implemented it? Taking the conclusion chapters of the first seven volumes, how many of them seriously consider the substantive issues that emerge in the ethnographic chapters, clearly delineate the patterns that they form, and then try to account for the patterns (as we say we're trying to do)? How many of the conclusion chapters bring the data in the volume together to make any non-trivial point, ethnographic or theoretical, that integrates the volume? I distinguish this sort of conclusion from one in which the author purveys some prior position to which parts of some or all of the chapters are relevant. Where is the comparative anthropology that we say we're doing?

Last anyone think I'm casting aspersions or assigning blame to volume editors, let me hasten to say that I think they—we—have labored under a set of assumptions, and unexamined assumptions, that vitiate them (us) with an impossible task. Instead of dumping a dozen or more papers on one person and demanding that he or she lave sense out of them individually and then make sense out of their collectively, why don't we try something a bit more intellectually justifiable and humane. At the point at which the volume editor is satisfied with the rewritten versions of the ethnographic chapters and has some idea of how they hang together, then let the editor recrude the symposium to finish the job of comparison. Besides recirculating the papers, the editor will devise the agenda, perhaps in the form of a draft of a conclusion chapter or an outline of the patterns that seem to emerge and the sorts of inferences that might explain them. This can be done with the discussant, perhaps (ideally the chairperson and discussant of the original symposium will be writing the intro and conclusion sections). Then the participants would take on the third stage of constructing explanatory inferences as a group. Look at it this way, after all that work, why should only one person get to do the most exciting part? Not only would such a discussion have the potential for considerably improving the quality of the conclusion section, but it would give each author the opportunity of modifying his or her own position and paper if need be. It would also considerably speed up the writing of the introduction and conclusion chapters. Incidentally, this procedure would also, however haltingly, finally realize our vision.

Let's face it—it takes a long time to get a symposium volume out. It should if it's done right. For those with immediate career pressures, a commitment to an ASAO volume can be a disadvantage. Joint publication in JFS is faster, and individually in a journal is faster yet. Even if one is not under great pressure, it is frustrating to wait for years knowing that one's paper may or may not make the light of day depending on how busy a volume editor is. The volume editor, on the other hand, has to be a referee between a school, an area, a theme, and a manuscript. He or she knows that when the labor is done and the volume finally out, it won't be considered a "real book" by one's colleagues when promotion time comes around. Why, then, would any of us want to go through that hassle? For that matter, why does ASAO, with a miniscule budget, a taped-together organization, and with little prospect of offering its members great career rewards in the near future continue to attract people who want to organize symposia and do monographs? The reason is, I believe, both intellectual and emotional.

We continue to share the vision of what we could do, sharing not as a collectivity but as individuals. Each of us has individually felt the excitement of
pursuing a problem with others and seeing it begin to make sense. We've felt the exhilaration that comes when someone else's data suddenly recontextualizes one of our own field problems that had been so enigmatic. We've felt it, and we like it. There is nothing inherently wonderful about ASAO. It's a context in which certain things happen according to certain procedures. We created the context, and we maintain it or change it as we see fit. It's what we do in the context that is wonderful or frustrating. We can be proud of our accomplishments over the last sixteen years and soberly determined to finish what we've begun. We do it for ourselves after all. We take care of our career concerns; we get our stuff out. We're all part time in ASAO. But we keep coming back.

So, it seems to me that if the Monograph Series is worth continuing at all, it is so because it does for us what no journal article or book can do. It can fulfill our comparative vision. We can develop a comparative anthropology the way it ought to be done, whatever that might turn out to be. So if we're going to take on that base a second time, why not go all the way with it and finish the job? It takes so long from start to finish anyway that we might as well. You know ahead of time that it will be a long haul, and it won't make a big dent in your vita. But don't you ever get the feeling like—To hell with the promotions committee; this one's for me! It's that sort of feeling that went into the creation of a context that could translate the feeling into a working reality—the vision, with all its frustrations and the profoundest of rewards. With the firm working base that we already have, and with some care and attention, we can take the next steps and make it work. We have the people to do it. We have the data to do it. We have the context in which to do it. So why not? Let's do it.

POSTSCRIPT

Subsequent to the delivery of this address, there was a good deal of informal discussion around the disadvantages for junior people with tenure pressures of participating in an ASAO volume. This would particularly be the case if the proposal to reconsider the symposium were followed. By lengthening the time between the first symposium meeting and final publication, we would be, for all practical purposes, excluding many, if not most, people with tenure pressures from the comparative process. Jane Goodall and Bunk Schieffelin subsequently came up with a very creative solution to this dilemma, which they intend to try out as an experiment in their symposium on Ethnohistory in Oceania. Based on discussions in this year's informal session, participants will address a set of common issues in a set of substantive papers, which will be submitted for joint publication in a journal. On the basis of symposium discussions, participants will narrow down to one issue of those addressed in the original papers. New papers will be written addressing this issue and having the advantage of the first substantive papers to refer to, each of the second set of papers will be specifically comparative in its context, the volume as a whole being directed toward comparative theoretical problems in ethnohistory, history, and historiography. Once the second set of papers have been written and circulated, the symposium will be reconvened to deal with those matters. The resulting volume would, of course, be qualitatively different from any of the previous ASAO volumes, yet it would still be based on the substantive ethnography that the series demands. The experiment makes a good deal of practical and intellectual sense and its implications should be intriguing as it unfolds.
XII. ASAO MONOGRAPH SERIES REQUEST FORM

Mac Marshall, has suggested that the following "tear-off" be included in this edition of the Newsletter hoping that it might encourage members to have their libraries order any or all copies of the Monograph Series.

+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Acquisitions Librarian

FROM: (Name; Department)

I recommend that our library acquire the following Series and that we place a standing order for future volumes as they appear.

ASAO MONOGRAPH SERIES

Nos. 1-5 available from the University Press of Hawaii, 2840 Kolowalu Street, Honolulu, Hawaii, 96822.

Nos. 6-8 available from UMI Monographs, Box 1467, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 48106.

No. 9 available from the University of Michigan Press, 839 Greene Street, P.O. Box 1104, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 48106.

___ No. 1. Carroll, Vern (ed.) ADOPTION IN EASTERN OCEANIA
___ No. 2. Lundsgaarde, Henry (ed.) LAND TENURE IN OCEANIA
___ No. 3. Carroll, Vern (ed.) PACIFIC ATOLL POPULATIONS
___ No. 4. Brady, Ivan (ed.) TRANSACTIONS IN KINSHIP
___ No. 5. Lieber, Michael (ed.) EXILES AND MIGRANTS IN OCEANIA
___ No. 6. Boutilier, James et al. (ed.) MISSION, CHURCH, AND SECT IN OCEANIA
___ No. 7. Rodman, Margaret & Matthew Cooper (eds.) THE PACIFICATION IN MELANESIA
___ No. 8. Marshall, Mac (ed.) SIBLINGSHIP IN OCEANIA
___ No. 9. Rodman, William and Dorothy Counts (eds.) MIDDLEMEN AND BROKERS IN OCEANIA