

vant and useful for lgbtq language research. Roger Lancaster (George Mason) will join me in coordinating a plenary session (and possibly a second session of volunteered papers) that will focus on current research exploring relationships between lgbtq languages and political economy in North Atlantic and other locations. Anyone wanting to join the Lavender Languages email list or send ideas, suggestions of suitable participants or submissions for presentations should contact Bill Leap at wlm@american.edu. (Details on past Lavender Languages events were still available at www.american.edu/lavenderlanguages at the time we went to press.)

Paradoxes of Public Silence

By Elizabeth Spreng

Public language involves not only what is said but also what is not said. Silence is integral to language. Although it is difficult to assign ownership to silence, it nevertheless still structures the patterns of units such as words and sentences while simultaneously expressing individuality and emotional emphasis. Determining ownership of a silence presents a theoretical dilemma. A speaker can create silence with a shocking utterance or can pause in conversational turn-taking to produce a silence. An audience, especially in public discourses, can own the silence of their individual response or as the response of intended recipients. The properties of silence elude quantification other than their duration, frequency or placement in speech patterns. The contrast between silence and nonsilence has been a focus of my research in the interview between Barbara Walters and Monica Lewinsky.

Public policy and language intersected during the investigation and subsequent impeachment of President Bill Clinton, where silences powerfully affected the discourse. Monica Lewinsky's interview with Barbara Walters in Mar 1999 about her relationship with Bill Clinton represents a microcosm of the scandal and a source of linguistic data. However, public speech events often involve backstage participants in the actual interaction. The interview was a media-constructed speech event that included the Office of Independent Council and political figures as participants because despite their absence and silence these participants affected the dissemination of Lewinsky's narrative.

Four aspects of silence are salient in the interview. First, Lewinsky broke her silence by telling her story. Lewinsky presented her narrative publicly, although the contents were constricted by her agreements with Starr's office and ABC News. Lewinsky's narrative represents a contrast to stereotypes of women's talk that assume that women should remain silent about their relationships with men, especially powerful men. Second, Lewinsky disclosed a secret during the interview, bringing out of private silence information that was previously unknown to the American public: her abortion during the time of her relationship with Clinton. Even though Lewinsky states that Clinton was not the father,

the disclosure of her choices about reproductive freedom demonstrates another type of broken silence. She revealed a very personal and controversial secret to the American public but did not include many details. In one way it seems as if the secret was revealed not by Lewinsky but by Walters, who first mentioned Lewinsky's abortion in a studio commentary section before questioning Lewinsky about it. Third, Lewinsky's speech patterns show powerful manipulations of silence during the interview. Silence patterns characterize an individual's speech style, and changes in those patterns make certain silences more noticeable than others. In spoken interaction silence can serve as a discourse marker. Lewinsky often used longer pauses in turn-taking in her speech during the formal public interview. At times, the interview appeared more conversational, thus silence was used to change her speech style. Fourth, Linda Tripp's tapes (referred to and played in the Walters/Lewinsky interview) demonstrate a different type of broken silence. What was at first a private conversation (at least to Lewinsky) became public and was described as gossip, a negative type of women's talk that society attempts to suppress. Participants are supposed to remain silent about their gossip, and Tripp did not. Lewinsky's telephone conversations were not supposed to become public knowledge, yet Tripp's tapes allowed their talk to become public and hence critical in the investigation and trial. Private conversations lost their sacred silence when publicized during the trial and discussed in the interview.

Silence rings out in the Walters/Lewinsky interview. It acquires a presence in the public discourse of the Clinton/Lewinsky scandal, which contrasts strongly with cultural expectations of women's talk. Sex and silence represent an intertwined metadiscourse. Americans rarely talk about their intimate interactions in formal conversations, but Lewinsky does in her interview with Walters. Silence and nonsilence also become powerful linguistic tools used by both Walters and Lewinsky during their interview. Silence operates in at least the four ways listed above within the public discourse of the Walters/Lewinsky interview to link power, gender role constructions, reproductive freedom and individual usage.

Useful Addresses

Susan Gal, SLA President, Dept of Anthro, U Chicago, 1126 E 59th St, Chicago, IL 60637-1539; s-gal@uchicago.edu.

Alessandro Duranti, Journal of Linguistic Anthropology editor, Dept of Anthro, UCLA, CA 90095-1553; aduranti@ucla.edu.

Laura Miller, SLA Program Organizer, Dept of Sociology & Anthro, Loyola U, 6525 North Sheridan Rd, Chicago, IL 60626; tel 773/508-3469, fax 508-7099, lmille2@luc.edu.

Cyndi Dunn, SLA column coeditor, Dept of Soc-Anthro-Crim, U Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, IA 50614-0513; 319/273-6251, Cyndi.Dunn@uni.edu.

Richard J Senghas, SLA column coeditor and LINGANTH list administrator, Dept of Anthro/Linguistics, Sonoma State U, 1801 E Cotati Ave, Rohnert Park, CA 94928-3609; tel 707/664-2312, fax 664-3920, richard.senghas@sonoma.edu, owner-linganth@ats.rochester.edu (for all LINGANTH list business).



Society for Medical Anthropology

FRED BLOOM AND ANN MILES, CO-CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

Dual Degree Programs in Anthropology and Public Health

By Jeannine Coreil (U of S Florida)

Responding to the growing interest in interdisciplinary training combining social science and public health, the U of South Florida announces new graduate programs leading to dual degrees in applied anthropology and public health. Students may dually enroll in two master's degrees (MA/MPH) or combine doctoral and master's level education. The program builds on long-term collaboration in teaching and research between the Department of Anthropology and the College of Public Health. USF employs 10 full-time medical anthropologists involved in cross-disciplinary anthropological/public health scholarly work (Linda Whiteford, Michael Angrosino, Roberta Baer, David Himmelgreen, Nancy Romero-Daza, Jeannine Coreil, Carol Bryant Neil Henderson, Jay Sokolovsky and Maria Vesperi). The focus of this program is applied; its goal is to provide graduates with real world training as well as the academic skills to contribute to the resolution of contemporary health problems.

The dual master's degree program allows students to pursue a concurrent program of study leading to both the Master of Arts (MA) degree in Applied Anthropology and the Master of Public Health (MPH) degree in one of eight concentration areas within public health: epidemiology, environmental health, tropical and infectious diseases, health education, maternal and child health, international health management, health policies and programs and health care organizations and management.

Students interested in pursuing a doctorate plus master's degree have two choices: they may obtain a PhD in Applied Anthropology with an MPH in a public health concentration, or they may obtain a PhD in Public Health with an MA in Applied Anthropology. For the doctoral/master's combination, students develop individual programs of study in consultation with an interdisciplinary academic advisory committee.

For both the dual master's and doctoral/master's programs, similar principles of curriculum design are followed. Students must be accepted independently by both programs, coursework involves approved substitutions and requirements for field placements (internships), and final proj-