Greetings. I trust and hope that all of you have had a successful couple of months since our last newsletter was distributed. I know for many of you who are academics the summer months have been a time for delving into projects, intense research, writing and rejuvenating.

I have found myself starting this letter to you on several occasions. I would see something or think of something that attracted my problem-solving attention as an applied social scientist and think to myself “Ohh, if only!” I have experienced this feeling almost nightly as I watch the Olympic Games and wish that the sports commentators had taken a course or two in anthropology or cross-cultural studies. There are times when the commentators present some very fascinating cultural information; however, they present it in such a way as to reduce it or even make fun of it. A number of examples come to mind, not all of them are food related, such as the exchange of business cards, not to point with chopsticks, and living conditions.

As I watch these sports journalists trying to understand another culture and present it to the American public, I am reminded of the importance of a liberal arts education and the role anthropology plays in it, as well as the value of participating in study abroad programs, learning a second language and gaining hands-on research experiences. As practitioners and those engaged in applied research we need to get our message out into other arenas and to other disciplines that we have much to offer in our cross-cultural understandings.

This summer I had an opportunity to read some very enlightening works that humbled me as well as reminding me that we as social scientists do not have all the answers nor do we have a monopoly on best practices in field work. So often, the success of a project or a program depends more on the commitment at all levels to the endeavor than on the amount of money that is available. In fact, sometimes the amount of money that is put into a project, or where that money comes from actually changes the focus of project to the donors’ needs rather than those of the community or the intended population.

One of the books I read this summer was by Sarah Chayes (2006), entitled “The Punishment of Virtue: Inside Afghanistan after the Taliban”. Chayes chronicles her experiences as a journalist and reporter in Afghanistan and describes what she learned on the ground by taking language and culture seriously as part of her fact finding approach to her media pieces. Her success as a reporter for NPR and other media outlets can be attributable not only to her good writing skills, but also to her commitment to the people and to understanding their culture and the story she was reporting. After completing her NPR assignment she stayed to take a position running a NGO aid organization, Afghans for Civil Society. Chayes is now involved in sustainable, economic development in Kandahar. She spends her time assisting Afghans in building a soap and body-oil business known as Arghand Cooperative [http://www.arghand.org]. Extracting essential oils from locally produced fruits and exporting the new product lines from Kandahar and Kabul to
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San Francisco, Massachusetts, Kansas City, Austin and Denver is transforming the participating rural communities. (For a brief summary of Chayes recent work with Afghan cooperatives, read her article in the December 2007 issue of Atlantic Monthly entitled “Scents and Sensibilities.”)

Chayes’ story made me think again about our work as academics. We never know who is going to be in our classes and what they may do with the information that they learn. One hopes that students will do more good than bad with their “use” of cross-culture differences and similarities and of course not all of our students will or should be anthropology majors. However, anthropological concepts, methods and theory can be used in many ways outside our discipline. I hope you will join me in championing this cause, for I believe that a greater degree of cultural awareness and tolerance would help the world become a better place for all of us.

Speaking of reaching out to others, I want to remind you that abstracts will be due on October 15th for the 2009 Annual Meeting in Santa Fe, New Mexico March 17-21. The theme for this annual meeting is “Global Challenge, Local Action: Ethical Engagement, Partnerships and Practice.” I encourage you to speak out to colleagues in other areas of work who might be able to contribute to the meetings or simply enjoy being there as an engaged listener.

For those you who, like me, will soon be beginning a new semester, I wish you a very productive one.

With best wishes,
Susan Andreatta

**Dr. Orlando Fals-Borda - 2008 Malinowski Award Winner Dies in Colombia**

We have just received word of the passing of Dr. Orlando Fals-Borda on August 12, 2008. Dr. Fals-Borda, a renowned sociologist from Colombia, was our most recent award winner and presented a brilliant, distinguished lecture during the 2008 SfAA Annual Meetings in Memphis. His lecture will be printed in a future volume of *Human Organization*. The Bogota newspaper, *El Espectador*, just a few days ago published an obituary-editorial praising Dr. Fals-Borda’s life work. Please visit their website to read it.

http://www.elespectador.com/opinion/editorial/articulo-orlando-fals-borda . [An article about his professional life will appear in the November SfAA Newsletter. - Editor]

---

**The Yin Yang of Anthropology and Design: Anthrodesigners and the Evolution of Anthropology and Design**

By Elizabeth (Dori ) Tunstall [Etunst@uic.edu]
University of Illinois at Chicago, School of Art and Design

Anthropology and design have long histories of encounter since their establishment as “modern” practices in the 19th century. *Notes and Queries on Anthropology*, published in 1899 had sections on the analysis of the production and consumption of material artifacts, which is the knowledge domain of design. Design Society for Applied Anthropology
requires a certain understanding of human biological and cultural variation to develop products and communications. Henry Dreyfuss reinforced this idea in his 1955 landmark book, *Designing for People*. Designers Charles and Ray Eames called for anthropology to be included in design curricula in the 1950s. Currently, the two fields are merging in the professional realm as more anthropologists find employment in marketing, design, and high technology and innovation fields. Based on my experiences as a design anthropologist, both in applied and academic settings, I am positioned in the liminal space between the two fields. This article represents my understanding of the similarities and differences of both fields as they deepen their engagement with one another in the context of globalization and digitalization.

**Yin Yang: Anthropology and Design’s Complementary Practices and Perspectives**

That is why the ancient scriptures say that from the One comes Two, because there must be duality for there to be existence. These two are called Yin and Yang. We need white to know black. We need space to see a line. Everything in life we know because of distinctions.

Two, Deng Ming-Dao

Having practiced Tai Chi for over 6 years, I’ve found that the Taoist concept of Yin Yang is one way in which one can approach differences without resorting to binary oppositions. Yin Yang are modalities of engagement with life. The Yin modality or energy is about yielding to the world around you. Go with the flow in order to cultivate the internal contemplation needed to better understand the world. When encountering force, you bend to the energy in order to neutralize its negative effects. One seeks to be small and insubstantial so as to minimize one’s negative impact on the world. The Yang modality or energy is about acting on the world around you. Crafting new flows in order to extend and advance the world. You are a force of external action, creating new energy to positive effect. One seeks to be big and substantial to open new possibility in the world.

Anthropology and design are the Yin Yang complementary modalities of the world. They represent the human potentialities for both action and understanding. Anthropology, by disciplinary history and personal passion, often operates in the Yin modality. One yields oneself to the cultural context, whether of a society, an institution, or a business to understand its energies and flows. Design, by disciplinary history and personal passion, operates in the Yang modality. Envisioning oneself as the creator of the future, one acts on a society, institution, or business to redirect its energies and flows. Yet, the ethos and skills of designers and anthropologists are not binary. Designers understand and anthropologists create, but there are differences in the relative amount of time, energy, and effort spent in each activity.

As designers and anthropologists engage with the complexity of the human condition, practitioners in the two fields need each other. Design provides the knowledge and passion for functional success in artifacts, messages, experiences, and systems that create new and positive human potentials. Anthropology provides the knowledge and understanding for contextual success in which the designs must operate avoid creating negative human potential. The complexity of the problems, contexts, and ethics in which professional designers and anthropologists are being forced to (and are choosing to) address, means that our separate skills are not enough anymore. We need to cultivate the skills for both Yin Yang modalities of engagement. It is imperative for the success of both disciplines in their intentions to be progressive forces for business, government, and society. It’s about being able to balance and combine both.

**Mutual Contexts of Design and Anthropology’s engagement**

Whatever comes to you, you must engage it somehow. You receive it, you may alter the circumstance and let it go, you may inject something of your own into it, or you may knowingly let it pass. Whatever you do, there is no need to be apathetic toward life. Engagement, Deng Ming-Dao

*Source: Society for Applied Anthropology*
It is only in the past 20 years that design and anthropology have deeply engaged with one another professionally. What has happened in the past 20 years to support this deeper engagement? The answers are digitization and globalization. The conversion of the world to bits and the new appreciation for one’s place in the world introduced new challenges to the professional anthropologist and design, opening the possibilities for anthropo-design collaborations.

Digital Design

According to Nicolas Negroponte, by 1995, the future had become about the world of bits as much as the world of atoms. The digitalization of information and communication technologies had a profound effect on the production and distribution of design and anthropological artifacts and knowledge. The popularization of AutoCAD in the 1980s, desktop computing with graphic user interfaces (GUI) in the 1990s, and the Internet itself in the 1990s brought about the mass digitalization of design. Loretta Staples describes how desktop publishing and laser printing “...supplanted professional typesetting and offset printing as the preferred, low-end, prepress and printing option.”

Peter Bil’ak in his overview of typography in the 1990s states, “The arrival of digital technology meant that typeface design was no longer the domain of specialists. Few people realized that the democratization of typography might also endanger the existence of professional designers.” Yet, the ubiquity of design tools of production led to new design outputs and design practitioners. The combination of these new digital tools and the digital platform of the Internet created new categories of design outputs on screens and interfaces and of web and interface designers to create them.

Digital Anthropology

Anthropology has always been savvy about technologies of recording. As far back as the 1880s, anthropologists such as Franz Boas and Alfred Cort Hadden were early adopters of still photography and film to enhance their ethnographic fieldwork. When digital versions of these technologies appeared, Anthropologists eagerly pleaded with the National Science Foundation to grant them the latest laptop computer, digital camera, and now iPod “recorder” for professional fieldwork. Maybe this techno-philia is because early fieldworkers are often in their early to mid-20s. Yet, some anthropologists have been less comfortable with digital technologies of distribution such as the Internet and cable television. This is because digital technologies of distribution challenge the core of the anthropologist’s expertise: the eyewitness and thus expert “merchant of the exotic”.

The rise of cheap flights, the Internet, and cable TV channels like the Discovery Channel removed the structural barriers that separated researchers from “natives,” and specialists from tourists. For example, in the analog days, a representation of life in Vanuatu came from the rigorous publications of books and articles by a “defined” external expert on the subject. Today, the Internet enables the people of Vanuatu to represent their own culture and life much easier and with wider distribution. Digital technologies accelerated the redistribution of power relations between the research and the “native” that was started in the 1980s by the challenges of native and halfie anthropologists. This digital extension has been labeled Anthropology 2.0, drawing from Bill O’Reilly’s description of Web 2.0. The goal of the Anthropology 2.0 movement is to make anthropological knowledge more open and accessible through information and communication technologies. Generationally, the discipline continues to be split between those who are comfortable or not with digitalization and what it means for professional anthropological expertise.

Globalization

David Harvey talks about the compression of time and space made possible through our digital technologies. Over one million people all over the world can watch the winning kick of the World Cup match through digital satellites beaming to TVs, PDAs, computers, and mobile phones. This makes some people think that digitalization caused globalization. But according to systems theorist, Immanuel Wallerstein, processes of globalization began around 1500. So it is rather that digitalization accelerated globalization’s reach and impact. How did it affect professional designers and anthropologists? Actually, in similar ways—both anthropological and design practices where traditionally framed by the focus on “locally-bounded” societies, whether the design societies of Chicago, New York, or West Coast design for designers or the remote native villages for anthropologists.

But after the 1980s, both designers and anthropologists began to focus on the dynamic flows of what Arjun Appadurai called “...ethnoscapes, mediascapes, technoscapes, financialscapes, and ideoscapes.” The American design, and to some extent anthropological, community responses to these cross-cultural flows of people, media, technology, money, and ideas was varied. There was a fear of economic and social disempowerment as it was perceived that the Chinese, Japanese, or Indians would take “American” jobs. In design, the fear was located in the offering of lower wages for the same quality of design work. In anthropology, it was experienced in the crisis of the formerly marginal post-colonial, minority, and female intellectuals taking positions of authority in generally white and male academic departments and businesses. But it also led to the embrace of the possibilities of difference and diversity.
It is this embrace of differences in human experience that has deepened the mutual engagement of anthropology and design. Professional designers have had to understand the differences in human experiences and draw upon anthropological knowledge to support that understanding. These new practices take the forms of Design 3.0, cross-cultural design, green design and sustainability, universal design, or socially relevant design. Professional anthropologists have had to more effectively communicate with humans who have different expressive experiences. They now draw upon “designerly ways of knowing” to support those communications through forms that are intuitive to different audiences, or at least more intuitive than ethnographic monographs, journal articles, and reports. These new practices take the forms of engaged anthropology, public anthropology, and Anthropology 2.0. All of these designerly and anthropology practices mark a greater engagement with positively affecting the life.

**Anthrodesigners and the evolution of anthropology and design**

*If we can combine the intellect and direct experience with our meditative mind, then there will be no barrier to the wordless perception of reality.*

Intelect, Deng Ming-Da

In the liminality of anthrodesigner hybridity, others and I have already begun to use the combined Yin Yang modalities of anthropology and design to be progressive forces for business, government, and society. As pioneered by places like Doblin, E-lab, Xerox Parc, Sapient, Sonic Rim, hybrid anthrodesigners successfully brought together deep human understanding and designerly creative action to change the practices of businesses. The humanizing effect of anthropology and the clarifying and prioritizing effect of design help businesses become more accountable to its customers, including the definition of who should not a business’s customers for ethical reasons. Changing the value basis of business from mere numbers to actionable human needs, wants, desires, expectations, design and anthropology combined their Yin Yang energies to create a more holistic picture of the return on human investment. A picture that continues to expand as business uses design and anthropology to understand, model, and adapt its effects on individuals, groups, communities, societies, and ecosystems.

My personal work is at the intersections of design and government. Previously with Design for Democracy, and now through the City Design Center at University of Illinois at Chicago, anthrodesigners like myself are changing the practices of governance by bringing the same accountability, humanization, and clarity through tangible visualization in business to government. Providing clear visual models of complex human processes and interactions, my work uses the Yin Yang energies of anthropology and design to translate the values of democracy into tangible experiences among diverse peoples. Anthropology provides the understanding of what those values are from the perspective of the people themselves. Design acts as the translator of those values into something that people can see, smell, hear, taste, and touch. The Yin Yang modalities of anthropology and design demonstrate that even a micro-artifact like a hospital bill can represent the entire macro-enterprise of an organization and people’s relationship to it. The tangibility of the values through artifacts enables an iteration process to achieve alignment between the values and peoples’ actual experiences.

Anthrodesigners are taking what they have learned from business and government and applying it to wider society. The work of anthrodesigners like “GreetingLine” and his Zimbabwe Institution for Vigital Arts or MP Ranjan’s work on craft production in India are showing how the Yin Yang of deep yielding to local and global cultural conditions can lead to actionable design innovations that are culturally, economically, technically, and environmentally appropriate.

In the most recent turn of institutionalization, students now journey this path of anthropology and design hybridity at the University of Illinois at Chicago, Wayne State University, the University of North Texas, the Institute of Design at IIT, Stanford D-School, and Savannah College of Art and Design. They’ve learned to combine anthropological knowledge with designerly ways of knowing to understand the ethical responsibilities of being a designer and an anthropologist today and tomorrow. Combining passion and wisdom, action and understanding, functional and contextual success, they are the future of design and anthropology. They represent the hybrid Yin Yang masters of this new world. From their thesis projects to their personal convictions, they are writing new disciplinary histories and futures for the design and anthropology fields. One that accentuates the creative redesigning of the world which is the hallmark of design, but seeks to use anthropology to ground the impact of their power in what is appropriate, ethical, and humanly sustainable.

**Notes**


The Identity of Anthropology and Communicating It Outward

By Judy Tso, MAA, ACC [jtso@umd.edu]
University of Maryland
Aha Solutions Unlimited®

Over the last eight years, I have given a workshop called “Promoting Your Anthropology Background in 30 Seconds or Less” at various anthropology conferences. The origination of this workshop stemmed from my experiences while earning a Masters degree in Applied Anthropology from the University of Maryland College Park.

Having come from a career in business and product development, I had worked closely with marketing managers and brand managers who were responsible for communicating a brand and maintaining consistent messaging to the public. It was clear that anthropology suffered from a lack of branding, a lack of intentional messaging and given our hyper information environment, when you fail to communicate a consistent message, you might as well be invisible. People hear the messages that come the loudest and the most frequently.

I was convinced and remain convinced that every anthropologist must have their 30 and 60 second message about what anthropology is as a field and knowledge base and what is the value that they can deliver based on their experience and expertise. I also remain convinced that because anthropology has little popular awareness today, it remains underutilized. We don’t have any famous anthropology celebrities in the age of celebrity and Hollywood culture. We don’t have a Margaret Mead. That means each of us as individuals and the collective associations such as the SFAA and AAA carry responsibility to promote the field.

Some will pull back from the idea of promotion, that it is somehow disdainful. My view is if you don’t feel proud to be an anthropologist and are not prepared to explain yourself and what you do, you can’t really expect anyone else to do it for you. So in terms of identity, as with all forms of identity formation, it helps if you think about what your identity is as an anthropologist and be prepared to communicate that. If you feel conflicted about explaining anthropology to others, I urge you to work through these conflicts to some type of resolution so you can do your share to communicate to the outside world. I personally am pleased with my background in anthropology and choose to view this as an asset.

There are those who will lament that no one understands anthropology and people mistake it for paleontology etc. but that simply is a negative attitude that protects the status quo. The world does not pay attention to the grumblers; the world follows those with a positive, inspiring vision.

So put your vision out there in a 30-second sound bite.

To come up with your 30-second elevator speech, write down a few simple sentences about how you define anthropology and then follow that up with what you provide as services or benefit. Practice your 30-second speech
with clients, students, neighbors, the postman, etc. Make sure your non-anthropologist friends understand you and ask them if they find your speech compelling or interesting. If not, rewrite it. It also helps to consider your audience and write different 30-second versions to match the interests of your different target audiences.

We anthropologists can be a wordy bunch so it is important to set your timer and see how long it takes. If you have gone over a minute, you have probably lost your audience. Reword, shorten it and practice again.

After your 30-second speech, if you find what you have said elicits interest from the other party, then by all means say more. It helps to practice your 30-second speech to the point that you can do it from memory and modify it on the fly. It should flow naturally and not sound rehearsed.

Finally I want to address the issue of holding firm to your identity in an environment where you are the only anthropologist or there are few anthropologists. This again comes back to your own sense of identity no matter the outer circumstances. Should you lose confidence in your own value and the value of anthropology then of course it becomes difficult to maintain a strong identity.

It is important to have your network of anthropologists that you can talk to for ideas and support and it is important to find your allies within the organization you are working in or consulting to. Who appreciates your unique view? Keep those allies close to you. What are you doing to continue to demonstrate the value of anthropology and are you continually educating those who don’t know much about the field? The undereducated are a blank slate, thus, it is a prime opportunity to fill that slate.

So in summary, define what you value about anthropology and what you want to represent in relation to this identity, communicate through your 30-second speech and be prepared to continually educate about what anthropology is and what it can do for individuals, communities, organizations and the world.

[Judy Tso is an anthropologist, speaker and coach and President of Aha Solutions Unlimited. The focus of her work is diversity consulting, coaching and training. She can be reached at judytso@ahasolutions.org.]

Public Archaeology Update: Archaeology and Peace

Barbara J. Little [blittle@umd.edu]
University of Maryland, College Park

It’s summer and an archaeologist’s attention turns toward . . . peace. As I write this column I’ve just returned from the sixth World Archaeological Congress, held this year in Dublin. WAC is an organization that was founded with the idea that archaeology has a role and a responsibility in the wider society. The Congress has met approximately every four years since its founding in 1986 and there are InterCongress meetings as well. The next one planned is to be held in Ramallah to explore the question of structural violence. The InterCongress Call for Papers asks, “As anthropologists, archaeologists, cultural heritage professionals, and concerned local community members, we ask what role archaeological and cultural heritage research has in overcoming these ‘in-built’ obstacles. Must we engage against structural violence outside of archaeological practice, or can archaeological practice confront and impact the ravages of structural violence?”

There are both Israeli and Palestinian archaeologists who have been working together toward agreements supporting the peace process. You may have seen the news item this Spring about an agreement on the disposition of archaeological collections following the future establishment of a Palestinian state. This is a remarkable achievement that lays out the principles of repatriation of artifacts and control of archaeological sites in a region where the past is an extremely volatile topic. Here are a few sources of information about this project. First is the UCLA press release: [http://newsroom.ucla.edu/portal/ucla/plan-brokered-by-ucla-usc-archaeologists-47749.aspx](http://newsroom.ucla.edu/portal/ucla/plan-brokered-by-ucla-usc-archaeologists-47749.aspx). At the end of that press
release is a link to a youtube video:  www.youtube.com/watch?v=wkRATNj8WDo.  Also see the article in Science on April 18 (volume 320, page 302).

It doesn’t take a particularly astute observer to see that archaeology is a highly politicized practice in the Middle East.  Archaeology and other tangible manifestations of heritage are politicized all over the globe, in places where the peace is stable and places where it is not.  As I look for examples of archaeologists explicitly working on the cause of peace, I have to point out colleagues’ tireless efforts to work across borders and work to establish El Pilar Binational Peace Park.  The site of El Pilar straddles the Adjacency Zone near Melchor de Mencos in Guatemala and Bullet Tree in Belize.  I learned more about the project from a recent newsletter from Anabel Ford, Director of the MesoAmerican Research Center at the University of California, Santa Barbara, and President of Exploring Solutions Past: The Maya Forest Alliance.  She writes that the Peace Park plan “provides a blueprint for confidence building and collaboration, not to mention a basis for peace.”  Learn more about the future of this park as well as community based projects that use traditional knowledge about the Maya Forest Garden at these web sites:  http://www.marc.ucsb.edu/elpilar/ and http://www.espmaya.org/index.html.

It’s not possible to talk seriously of building peace without pursuing justice, and therefore a whole array of forensic anthropology projects spring to mind.  In particular I’m thinking of Memoria Abierta in Argentina (http://www.memoriaabierta.org.ar/).  The archaeology there has been not only of graves of victims of state-sponsored violence but also to document clandestine detention centers.

Archaeologists are making explicit connections between our practice and justice.  For example at the 2007 American Anthropological Association meetings in Washington, DC, I participated in the session that Carol McDavid and Patti Jeppson organized on “Pathways to Justice: Exploring the Intersections between the Global Justice Movement, Archeology, and Anthropology.”  The invitation asked the participants to consider how our work may intersect with the goals of the global justice movement which aims to find another way, a “just third way” (http://www.globaljusticemovement.org/).  This “just third way” is meant to be something other than capitalism or socialism that will move humanity forward.  There are growing numbers of applied archaeologists with a vision of creating cultural change, including the “Archaeologists for Global Justice” at the University of Sheffield in the UK (http://shef.ac.uk/archaeology/global-justice.html).

I return to the case of Ireland and the Peace Process there.  While at WAC I toured the Boyne Valley, particularly to see the archaeological World Heritage Site.  The tour organized by WAC included a few other sites as well, and one of those is an explicit part of the long and difficult road to peace in Ireland.  The new visitor center and site of the Battle of the Boyne at Oldbridge Estate near Drogheda is part of the peace agreement between Ireland and Northern Ireland.  The battlefield is the site of the 1690 defeat of Catholic James II by Dutch Protestant Prince William of Orange, securing the British throne.  Northern Ireland Unionists still celebrate the victory every year with parades and bonfires every July 12.  A press release from Ireland’s Department of Foreign Affairs dated May 19, 2005 quotes Dermot Ahern, the Minister for Foreign Affairs:

“In the Good Friday Agreement [1998], the Government committed itself to actively promoting and developing respect, reconciliation and mutual understanding between the different traditions on the island of Ireland.  The preservation and appropriate development of this historic battle site is a powerful and tangible expression of that commitment.”  In language which will pique the interest of those SfAA members interested in tourism, Ahern is further quoted as being optimistic about further benefits for Ireland:  “In addition to the peace-building symbolism of the project, I believe that Oldbridge will become both an outstanding tourism attraction, and a rich recreational amenity for the Meath-Louth region.  The almost 500 acres of rolling parkland, extensive walkways and scenic riverside vistas located at the edge of Drogheda will most certainly prove to be a popular amenity.”  (http://www.foreignaffairs.irlgov.ie/home/index.aspx?id=25530)

I suspect that there are increasing numbers of heritage projects which explicitly cite the cause of peace in their planning and implementation.  If you know about projects in which cultural heritage (archaeological or otherwise) is being used to bridge factions and bring people together, please let me know.  I believe it is an area of applied anthropology worth developing.  My email address is:  blittle@umd.edu.

Discourse on Environmental Discourse

By Benjamin Blount [bblount13239@sbcglobal.net]
SocioEcological Informatics, Helotes, TX 78023
As everyone knows in this electronic world, academic listserves provide a number of services for their subscribers and their professional interests. Perhaps the majority of postings are for announcements of meetings, grant opportunities, job openings, publications, field schools, and, in general, events of likely interest to the list. Another common posting, especially by junior scholars, is a request for references on particular topics as a way of beginning the long process of developing a research protocol. Again, these are all familiar and usually valuable services. Occasionally a discussion actually breaks out about a topic or issue, and a number of subscribers weigh in with comments and observations, typically followed by other examples or points of view or requests for clarification. Sometimes, the ensuing discussion takes on the appearance of a blog or radio talk show in which anyone can say virtually anything that has relevance, borderline or otherwise, but fortunately much of the time, some focus is maintained. A listserv that has a particularly good record in collegial and substantive exchange is the one housed at the University of Georgia, for environmental anthropology (EANTH-L@LISTSERV.UGA.EDU). In fact, a recent discussion continued for several days on a topic that has proven to be very interesting—the relation of discourse to ecology and environment. A summary of the thread may well be of interest to applied anthropologists.

Contributors to the discourse, more or less in sequence, include: Lucero Radonic (a graduate student at the University of Alaska, who wrote asking references that study how discourse shapes livelihood strategies and resource management); Deb Ranjan Sinha, A. P. Vayda, Benjamin Blount, Leah Horowitz, Ilyssa Manspeizer, Eric Cunningham, Eugene Anderson, Rosina Hassoun, Luciano Pellegrino, Ed Carr, Carlos Garcia-Quijano, Barbara Brower, Julie Brugger, and Arun Agrawal. Some of the individuals had more than one posting, mostly in the form of exchanges. Incidentally, the names are given as a list to acknowledge the contributors but also to avoid recapitulation of the individual postings, which were made informally. Accordingly, some contributors may not want their comments in print.

Although the original request was for works in ecological linguistics that show how discourse shapes livelihood and environment, the discussion quickly turned to the question of whether discourse can actually shape environment, and if so, how that might occur. Several contributors noted that the literature on environmental discourse is sizeable and growing, but doubts were raised that any clear demonstration had been made that discourse shapes environment in any direct causal sense. Discourse can eventually lead to impacts on natural resource bases and the environment, but that was seen as “up front loading,” and not as direct causation. Other contributors noted that impacts can be relative. A request, for example, to someone to “open the window” can be seen as directly impacting behavior and this environment, at least in a sense, whereas longer and involved discourse, say on democracy, doesn’t necessarily mean that changes will occur, toward or away from democracy. Still, several contributors appeared to be content with the notion that discourse can play a significant role in shaping environment.

Inevitably one thread of the discussion led to Foucault and his ideas that discourse leads ultimately to consideration of its effects, as for example in development. Others (most in fact) appeared less willing to accept an untested assumption that discourse plays that central a role in macro-theorizing about society, pointing out that more rigor and discussion of methods are a priority if any demonstration of causality is to occur. Whether that perspective prevails remains to be seen, and in fact, proposals for methods were in relatively short supply. Two contributors, however, noted early in the thread that an intermediate state or stage was a necessary consideration, intermediate between discourse and consequences. The likely candidate for that role was cultural models, i.e., that discourse can lead to shared cognitive schemas or models and that people then make decision, act, enact, etc., in relation to the knowledge. The listserv discussion was not the venue to elaborate that argument, but note might be made here that the proposal has the potential to play a pivotal and powerful role in any discourse-environment discussion. In effect, any action consequential to the environment can be seen as operant through shared models of information and understanding. Even the example of “open the window” likely would not be an unquestioning robotic response but one based on some common understanding, such as “yes,
While not everyone would be likely to agree that cognitive/cultural models are at the core of discourse and environment actions and activities, a good case can be made for that argument. At the most generic level investigations about consequences of discourse will likely lead to proposals for results and conclusions. Those proposals will be intended to appeal to acceptability of the actual claims presented as results, an appeal to sharing and thus ratification of the results, or in other words, to establish common informational ground. Impacts on livelihood, natural resource bases, and by broad extension to environment will be proposed in conceptual form, to be subject to acceptability, i.e., shared endorsement. To move away from the broadly generic, some specific examples were given in the listserv thread, one by Leah Horowitz (anonymity overridden here) on her research using cultural models on religious beliefs among fundamentalist Christian villagers in New Caledonia. Leah noted that socio-economic concerns appeared to underlie environmental attitudes, or in other words, cultural models about environmental concerns and issues were mediated by models constructed socioeconomically. The author provided several examples from recent dissertations at the University of Georgia (by Carlos Garcia-Quijano, Rob Cooley, and Colleen O’Brien), cognitive models about livelihood were constructed on societal and experiential bases. Recent dissertation research at the University of Washington also could have been presented, work by Jennifer Sepez, Karma Norman, Courtenay Carothers, and Teressa Trusty, among others. To elaborate on one example, Teressa Trusty’s work shows how environmental discourse is inextricably woven into local understandings and action about the environment among residents in northwestern Bolivia. Those include representations by NGOs, which have an influence but through broader based cultural models about local environments.

To generalize from the claims, proposals, and counter-proposals made in the listserv discussions, an interesting pattern emerged. No comment was made about the pattern, but inspection of the discourse can lead one to see that whatever the scale of theorizing, researchers tend to see discourse as subject matter, texts if you will, for further investigation. Discourse is seen as pointing to, indicating or serving as catalyst for deeper insights into beliefs, attitudes, and actions. The examination or assessment of discourse leads to identification of patterns socially and culturally substantive. Discourse may be “up front” in a series of actions or developments and thus causative, but in a chain of events and as only one phenomenon among others. Though not mentioned in the listserv thread, the perspective presented here can be referenced by the title of Naomi Quinn’s most recently edited collection of articles, entitled Finding Culture in Talk: A Collection of Methods (Palgrave Macmillan, 2005). Put mundanely, discourse is a map or window providing direction toward and data for anthropological investigations (and perhaps adding yet another possible meaning of “open the window”).

The Emerging Climate Justice Movement in Australia: An Overview by a Transplanted American Scholar-Activist

by Hans A. Baer [hbaer@unimelb.edu.au]
University of Melbourne

An anti-global warming or climate justice movement has quickly emerged around the world since the beginning of this century, one that has built upon warnings about the dangers of global warming or climate change over the past two decades from climate scientists, environmental groups, small island states, indigenous peoples in the Arctic, and other Third World peoples, and some mainstream and even a few evangelical Christian churches. The climate movement exhibits overlaps with the global justice or anti-corporate globalization movement, in that they both struggle against corporate control of the global economy and for environmental sustainability. Various organizations involved in the climate justice movement include the International Climate Justice Network, the International Indigenous Forum on Climate Change, the Inuit Circumpolar Conference, the Durban Group for Climate Justice, the Global Justice Ecology Project, the Transnational Institute, Climate Indymedia, the Environmental Justice and Climate Change Initiative (U.S.), and ClimAction (New Zealand). Along with Merrill Singer, I have been involved in an effort to develop a critical anthropology of global warming (Baer 2008a, 2008b; Baer and Singer 2008), an effort which started with our discussion of the impact of global warming on health (Singer and Baer...
2007:189-193) and has more recently resulted in a book which is slated to be published in late 2008 (Baer and Singer 2008).

Since the beginning of this year, I have begun to both conduct observations on and become involved in the emerging climate justice movement in Australia, particularly in Melbourne. This has entailed attending events of Friends of the Earth Australia and the Climate Movement Convergence in Melbourne on February 9, 2008; serving as a participant on a panel on climate change and environmental issues at the Victorian state conference of the Socialist Alliance on February 23, 2008; participating in a forum on ‘The Time is Now: Solutions to Global Warming’ co-sponsored by the Development Studies Program at the University of Melbourne and Solidarity, another socialist organization, on April 8, 2008; and speaking on ‘Toward a critical anthropology of the global warming: beyond capitalism and toward an alternative world system’ at the ‘Climate Change/Social Change’ conference sponsored by Green Left Weekly (a Socialist Alliance publication) in Sydney on April 11-13, 2008.

The Climate Movement Convergence was organized primarily by the Sustainable Living Foundation, Friends of the Earth, the Greenleap Strategic Institute, and Sustainable Business Practices and met at Northcote High School in an inner northern Melbourne suburb. Organizations supporting the conference included Beyond Zero Emissions, CarbonEquity, the Central Victorian Greenhouse Alliance, Environment Victoria, Greenpeace, the Moreland Energy Foundation, the Western Region Environment Centre, Zero Emissions Network, and an array of suburban climate action groups. The organizers reported that some 250 people had registered for the conference. The conference handbook states:

In planning today, we have simply attempted to create a space where the many and very diverse elements of the ‘climate change movement’ can get together, share info, educate and inspire each other, and hopefully, decide if we do, in fact, have an emerging movement. And if so, to consider the question - what are we aiming to do about it, and how can we work together in future in the most effective ways.

As is often customary at many events in Australia, the conference started around 9:15 am with a welcome and an "acknowledgment of the traditional owners of the land." Owen Pascoe, a representative from Climate Action Network Australia, gave a 20 minute presentation on “The Current Landscape” in which he discussed new opportunities from climate action in light of the election in November 2007 of a new Australian Labor Party government under the leadership of Prime Minister Kevin Rudd. The Rudd government has ratified the Kyoto Protocol and has committed itself to an emissions trade scheme, the details of which are still being discussed. Prior to lunch speakers from various organizations and groups addressed the attendees in ten minute presentations about topics such as moving beyond zero carbon approaches, where to go in the wake of the Bali conference, the need to declare a climate emergency, carbon rationing, the implications of climate change for business, the issue of nuclear power, the issue of forests and climate change, plans to build a new coal-burning power plant in the Latrobe Valley in eastern Victoria, and adaptation funding for climate refugees. After lunch, the attendees broke up into various workshops on a wide array of topics, such as water and climate change, the contribution of food production (including animal production) to climate change, transportation, the Zero Emission International Campaign, and the impact of climate change on low-income people, and the anti-coal campaign. A highlight of the conference was the launching of a report titled Climate Code Red: The Case for a Sustainability Emergency authored by David Spratt (CarbonEquity) and Philip Sutton (Greenleap Strategic Institute) and sponsored by Friends of the Earth. Spratt and Sutton propose a framework for climate change campaigning based on the argument that the time to address climate change is urgent and requires emergency measures on the order of those adopted by the Allied powers against the Axis powers during World War II.

While the vast majority of the speakers and workshop organizers were proposing strategies of adaptation and mitigation that clearly seek to address global warming within the parameters of ‘green capitalism’ writing letters and lobbying politicians and business leaders, conferees also by and large seemed to be committed to mass action and moving beyond “business-as-usual.” While the Socialist Alliance and Solidarity had tables with their literature on them,
a more radical or democratic eco-socialist approach to addressing global warming by and large was not discussed in the various addresses and workshops. I came away from the conference feeling that the emerging climate justice movement in Australia at the moment is a rather disparate one, ranging from social democrats (left-wing ALP-types) greenies of various sorts, New Agers, perma-culturalists, to eco-socialists. Ironically, neither the Green Party nor the Australian Conservation Foundation, both of which also have expressed concern about global warming, exhibited an overt presence at the conference.

Even prior to the Climate Convergence conference, during the 2007 federal election, the Socialist Alliance (an electoral party), delineated a strikingly progressive 10-Point Climate Action Plan for Australia that could be modified for other countries, both developed and developing:

1. Aim for 60% overall emissions reduction, including 95% power station reduction by 2020, and 90% overall reductions by 2030;
2. Ratify the Kyoto Treaty and initiate a further international treaty and mutual assistance program to bring other countries together to meet a global target of 90% emissions by 2030;
3. Start the transition to a zero-waste economy [starting out with a program of energy auditing];
4. Set a minimum 10-star energy efficiency rating for all new buildings;
5. Bring all power industries under public ownership and democratic control;
6. Bring the immense manufacturing potential of the auto industry under public control;
7. Immediately begin constructing wind farms in suitable areas;
8. End industrial farming based on fossil-fuel fertilizers, pesticides, and fuels;
9. Stop logging old-growth forests and begin an urgent program of re-forestation and protecting biodiversity to ensure a robust biosystem that can survive the stress of climate change and provide an increased carbon sink; and
10. Make all urban and regional public transport free and upgrade the network to enable all urban residents to use if for all their regular commuting.

While this climate action plan many strike many people as utopian, it constitutes a vision for an alternative to flawed business-as-usual or existing climate regimes and green capitalism.

In an effort to “strengthen radical action to stop climate change,” the Socialist Alliance and Green Left Weekly (www.greenleft.org.au) organized a three-day conference on Climate Change/Social Change on April 11-13, 2008. Some 180 people registered for the conference which met initially on Friday morning and afternoon at the Redfern [Indigenous Australian] Community Centre and at the Sydney Girls High School from Friday evening on. Plenary sessions focused on topics such as “Climate change and its social roots,” “Climate change solutions: what role for the market,” “Transitions to sustainability,” and “strategies for winning.” The opening workshop at the Redfern Community Centre focused on “Indigenous communities, climate change and the struggle for country,” during which Sam Watson, a Munnejari man from the Brisbane Murri community, and Pat Eatock, a Kairie community elder and the secretary of the National Aboriginal Alliance, spoke. Other workshops included “Nuclear is still not the answer,” “Elite cooption of the environmental movement,” “climate change and its social roots,” “The Cuban experience: the challenge of fossil fuels and climate change,” “critical anthropology of global warming,” “protecting jobs and the environment,” “climate change and the global South - beyond Third Worldism,” “Individual and collective solutions: getting the balance right,” “radicalising the Australian climate change movement,” and “setting up ecosocialist networks in your city - the Adelaide experience.” The three principal presenters at the conference were John Bellamy Foster, Roberto Perez Rivero, and Patrick Bond.

Foster is a sociology professor at the University of Oregon, the author of Ecology Against Capitalism (2002), Marx’s Ecology: Materialism and Nature (2000); The Vulnerable Planet: A Short History of the Environment (1999), and numerous other books and articles. He also is the editor of Monthly Review. Foster gave a plenary address on “Ecology, capitalism and socialism” and a workshop on “Marxism and the environment” and participated in plenaries on “Climate change and its social roots” and “strategies for winning.” Contrary to his very unassuming appearance and personal mannerisms, I found Foster most impressive in his ability to articulate complex issues in very accessible language. In a sense, he is Superman and Clark Kent wrapped up into one
person. At any rate, I found the opportunity to hear Foster and speak with him for the first time most gratifying. Guess that makes me a John Bellamy Foster groupie.

Roberto Perez is a young Cuban biologist, permaculturist, and the Environmental Education and Biodiversity Conservation Program Director for the Antonio Nunez Jimenez Foundation for Nature and Humanity, a Cuban NGO. He is a key spokesperson in the renowned documentary *The Power of Community*, an account of the Cuban’s people’s economic struggles since the collapse of the Soviet Union, ones that have transformed Cuba in what the World Wildlife Federation deems to be the most “environmentally sustainable” society in the world. Perez’s tour of Australia, which included various cities, was sponsored by the Cuban Australia Permaculture Exchange. In his Saturday dinner address, he spoke about “Cuba - from economic collapse to sustainability.” Perez also conducted a workshop on “The Cuban experience: the challenge of fossil fuels and climate change.”

Patrick Bond is a Professor of Political Economy at the University of KwaZulu-Natal School of Development Studies in Durban, South Africa. With Rehana Dada and Graham Erion, the edited *Climate Change, Carbon Trading and Civil Society: Negative Returns on South African Investments* (2007). He participated in the plenary session on “Climate change and its social roots” and conducted a workshop on “Equity in energy consumption: getting the prices right for people and the environment.”

Unfortunately, a major flaw of the conference, despite a relatively large number of female attendees and female plenary and workshop moderators, was their paucity as plenary and workshop presenters. A notable exception was Stephanie Long’s (Friends of the Earth) participation in the plenary on “Transitions to sustainability” and her workshop on “Climate refugees, adaptation issues in the global south.” Various attendees, including female Socialist Alliance attendees, commented in various settings about this shortcoming. At the end of the conference, participants and attendees discussed and revised a statement on “Climate crisis - urgent action needed now!” which is being distributed to environmental, trade union, migrant, religious and community organizations as part of an effort to “build the movement against global warming.”

As a point of comparison, I found the conference, which included not only socialists but also Green Party people, left-wing Australian Labor Party people, academics, and labor union people, much more intellectually stimulating and certainly provocative than the *Climate Change and Social Justice* conference sponsored by the Social Justice Initiative at the University of Melbourne that I had attended on April 2, 2008. I was quite mystified how it came about that of the five speakers [two of the speakers were climate scientists] in the morning portion of the conference, three were neo-liberal economists. Fortunately, the afternoon presentations which included Peter Singer, a well-known ethicist based both at Princeton University and at Melbourne University, and Cam Walker, the Director of Friends of the Earth Australia [who also was a participant in the *Green Left Weekly*] conference proved to be more relevant to the issue of climate change and social justice.

At any rate, while conferences and rallies are important mechanisms in building a movement, mass actions, perhaps even lobbying, and building climate action groups and networks ultimately will have to be the backbone of the climate justice movement both in Australia and in other countries. As part of this effort, various climate activists are presently organizing a Camp for Climate Action Australia to take place on July 10-15, 2008 in Newcastle (New South Wales), the world’s largest coal port, which has been designated to undergo expansion. In the words of the organizers, what is needed is a “just transition from coal to clean energy - not an expansion of the coal industry.” The climate justice movement is still in its infancy and still very much a disparate phenomenon in terms of participants, aims, and strategies. I encourage my fellow anthropologists wherever you may be to not only study this new movement but also to become involved in it.
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The Discourse on Displacement and Development

By Preeti Sampat [psampat@gc.cuny.edu]
Department of Anthropology at The Graduate Center
City University of New York

At the Annual Conference of the Society for Applied Anthropology in Memphis, Tennessee held from 25th-29th March, I had the opportunity to present a paper on Special Economic Zones and Displacement at a panel on Displacement in India (chaired by Walter Fernandes, Director, North East Social Research Center). Displacement, Resettlement and Rehabilitation was one of the three main themes at the conference, which was attended by a diverse crowd of applied social scientists from around the world. There were 11 panels on the theme itself and among those of us from India we attended at least five of these (which included our own). The plenary session set the tone for most of the discussion on the theme, and we were not too shocked to find that despite years of mature struggle and debate on the question of prior informed consent, democratic process and the paradigm of development that induces large-scale displacement, there was no mention of these issues by the plenary speakers. Speaking from within the paradigm of resettlement and its improvement, Michael Cernea (Senior Adviser, World Bank), the first speaker at the plenary session, spoke of the achievements of the international community of social scientists in pushing the agenda of better compensation in multilateral and national policy arenas while Ted Downing (President, International Network on Displacement and Resettlement), the other plenary speaker, spoke of the exercise of eminent domain in land acquisition for development in different national contexts. The two speakers made a distinction between land acquisition by the state for ‘public purpose’ as opposed to acquisition for private business interests. Supporting the exercise of eminent domain by the state for development, they criticized the invoking of the principle in favor of private business. Disappointingly (and predictably), they gave cursory treatment to the questions of three scholars from India challenging them on the definition of “public purpose,” prior informed consent, democratic process and participation and the dominant paradigm of development. What was shocking, however, was that no one else present from the academic communities around the world engaged these questions. Needless to say, most of the panels that followed were structured within this overall schema of resettlement and compensation, and in the overall theme of Displacement, Resettlement and Rehabilitation, displacement was a short-changed issue.

Those of us who questioned the democratic process and implicit paradigms of development in the exercise of the principle of eminent domain, were appalled at the lack of engagement from most of the scholarly community present on these crucial issues emerging from people’s struggles for justice across the world, whether against forcible displacement caused by the Sardar Sarovar Project on river Narmada or the Pak Moon Dam on River Moon in Thailand or more recently seen in the establishment of Special Economic Zones in India. The most probing critics of the prevalent resettlement and compensation processes fell short of taking their engagement further when asked if they ever imagined that the gaps that they pointed to could be addressed by any resettlement package. The applied anthropologists from universities across the USA would not engage the issues of democratic process and prior informed consent at all.

What strikes one in this paucity of debate is that the responsibility of the academic community to engage with issues arising from people’s struggles for justice on the one hand and issues of justice and democratic process on the other is negligible in these academic spaces influencing critical international policy. Even the international human rights framework that has pushed the bounds of human rights justice to include economic, social and cultural rights emerging from these very struggles for justice was minimally invoked—by only one speaker who, ironically, is from the Asian Development Bank.

Is it that scholars concerned with justice and development have abandoned applied social science spaces and hence allowed the established paradigms of the World Bank or Asian Development Bank to run their writ (literally)? Is it that the predominant engagement on development in the US Universities is completely taken over by multilateral institutions like the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank and the like? Is it that applied anthropology and social science as practiced in the US is accountable only to these multilateral institutions for the jobs and funding they provide?
If this is the case, then this powerful community of Northern scholars is, at the very least, abdicating its responsibility to the people of the global South it seeks to represent. The ramifications of these silences and omissions are felt right down to the next village and the next family whose land is to be acquired forcibly, by the exercise of eminent domain, for an ill-defined public purpose that an increasingly neoliberal state resorts to, to serve corporate interest over human interest.

The state has displaced and pauperized millions of people in the countryside that inhabit the shanty towns of global cities in countries across the world (or in native reservations in this one). These global cities are now evicting generations of victims in their quest for modernity and international capital. If people have become so cumbersome that they must be pushed out of their homes and livelihoods to form pools of cheap labor in the name of development, and given the impossibility of a just resettlement (that Cernea himself acknowledged), what should be our role as academics concerned with justice and development? For many of us whose political education was fundamentally shaped in the river valleys and the villages where the state works on behalf of elite private interest, there is a pressing need to make our presence felt, our voices heard, and our arguments engaged within these important policy arenas. We must ensure that this international policy making cohort is compelled to engage with the fact that the question of development is political, the question for whom development works is political, and the question of who bears the cost of development is political. In disengaging the politics from the process, privilege and power conceal their nature, are reinvigorated, and further their reach. Wherever we are, we must train our vision firmly on the ground, bring our voices together, because these are not solitary battles, and fight for justice.

The Anthropology of Censorship “Yes, But . . .” The Heggenhougen Challenge

By Brian McKenna [mckennab@umd.umich.edu]
University of Michigan-Dearborn

Some years back Harvard anthropologist Kris Heggenhougen argued that the strength of anthropology in collaborating with other disciplines lies in saying, “yes, but . . .” and to critically examine the decisive factors affecting peoples’ health including power, dominance and exploitation (Heggenhougen 1993).

Yes, but. . . . while I generally agree, more needs to be said. First of all, we spend much more time saying “yes, sir” than “yes, but” in paid employment. This is necessary if we wish to stay employed.

The workplace is a not a democracy but a hierarchy in which academic freedom does not apply. There are penalties for speaking one’s mind. Workers - anthropologists included - have to gauge the cultural politics in any given context so as to not unnecessarily risk censure, reprimand or worse.

A veteran medical anthropologist told me, “At [the teaching hospital where I work], sometimes when I’d say ‘yes but’ they’d simply say ‘we are in the business of providing health care, not changing the world’. They didn’t fire me for my ‘yes but’ statements - they just sort of emphasized that my mind was better put to use on problems they/we COULD solve then and there”.

“Frankly,” he added, “when money is flowing one can push the ‘yes but’ angle but when it dries up it’s much harder to do that with any semblance of elbow room. There’s a kind of a regression to the mean - to the core mission of the institution.”

The hospital’s reaction is predictable. Hospitals budget for direct patient care, not social change. Being ring-fenced by an organizational or business remit is part of the inevitable domestication process for all intellectuals in applied work. If at some point you do not ratchet down your interrogatives or find more subtle ways of “getting your social science message across” you can be marginalized, reassigned or worse. Censorship and suppression of one’s work are among the worst things that can happen to an applied anthropologist.

Ted Downing, former SFAA President (1985-87), experienced this and more. In 1995, Downing wrote an evaluation report describing the severe social and environmental impacts likely to be suffered by Chile’s Pehuenche Indians from a proposed dam project underwritten by the World Bank. After his report was censored Downing
demanded that the World Bank publicly disclose his findings. The Bank responded by threatening “a lawsuit garnering Downing’s assets, income and future salary if he disclosed the contents, findings and recommendations of his independent evaluation.” (Johnston and Garcia-Downing 2004). As a result of his whistleblowing, Downing was blacklisted from the World Bank after 13 years of consulting service.

“Personally, I was blackballed for 10 years for filing, what turned out to be 3 human rights violations charges against the IFC (private sector arm of The World Bank),” said Downing in an interview. “The experience left me only the devil’s alternative, to get involved in politics.” Literally.

Downing went on to serve two terms in the Arizona legislature from 2003-2006. He rejected corporate contributions and collected hundreds of $5 contributions to qualify for public campaign financing. Dr. Downing retains that probing, cantankerous spirit today. “I have no idea what ‘yes, but’ means having not read Heggenhougen,” he said. “The reference to ‘collaboration to other disciplines’ makes no sense to me - as I work on problems and am Undisciplined. I don’t think anyone would consider me a “yes man - which has helped and cursed me. . . . .But, I insist, fighting within a bureaucracy is part of being a good applied anything.”

In Downing’s anthropological journey, when “yes, but” didn’t work, he progressed, reluctantly, to “no, sir.” In fact this happens to many applied anthropologists but most do not have the resources, support or disciplinary guidance to assist them in their struggles. They might become whistleblowers but their careers suffer. And their stories are untold. We do not have a good accounting of how often this happens to anthropologists, but we need to learn more about this. In any case, resisting censorship is, as Downing says, “good applied” anthropology.

“Good applied” anthropology harkens back to one of the masters of social science, Robert Lynd. In 1939, Lynd, author of the groundbreaking Middletown studies (the first full bore ethnography of a U.S. city), wrote a book that is less well known, but just as important. *Knowledge for What? The Place of Social Science in American Culture*, is as relevant today as the moment he penned it.

In it he wrote that “[T]he role of the social sciences to be troublesome, to disconcert the habitual arrangements by which we manage to live along, and to demonstrate the possibility of change in more adequate directions . . . like that of a skilled surgeon, [social scientists need to] get us into immediate trouble in order to prevent our present troubles from becoming even more dangerous. In a culture in which power is normally held by the few and used offensively and defensively to bolster their instant advantage within the status quo, the role of such a constructive troublemaker is scarcely inviting.”

“Troublemaker” is of course the pejorative term emanating from within the dominant culture, targeting those who refuse to keep quiet in the face of injustice. “Yes but” is an ample part of their vocabulary. Anthropologist Barbara Johnston has written about the work of being an anthropological troublemaker, especially in relation to doing environmental justice work. But she warns about associated risks. Environmental justice work “requires confronting, challenging and changing power structures.”

When someone is involved in this work,” says Johnston, “backlash is inevitable. When environmental justice work involves advocacy and action - confrontational politics - a number of professional bridges are burned. . . . ‘Cause-oriented’ anthropology suggests people who make trouble. Troublemakers are celebrated in this discipline when their cause succeeds and justice prevails. But often ‘justice’ is elusive, success is hard to gauge, and action results in unforeseen adverse consequences. (Johnston: 2001:8).

Because most anthropologists usually enter organizations as change agents of some kind they need to be aware that they are especially at risk of being labeled a “troublemaker” at any time. If the label sticks it can lead not only to getting fired; it also can lead to a vicious form of bullying that can make one’s life unbearable.

Anthropologist Noa Davenport knows this very well. In 1999 she coauthored a book with two other professionals...
called, *Mobbing, Emotional Abuse in the American Workplace* (1999). In the book’s forward Davenport and her colleagues noted, “This book came about because all three of us, in different organizations, experienced a workplace phenomenon that had profound effects on our well-being. Through humiliation, harassment, and unjustified accusations, we experienced emotional abuse that forced us out of the workplace.” Often the *mobbing* begins soon after the professional challenged a superior in some area. In other words, it’s often a “yes, but” interrogative. Today Davenport conducts workshops on mobbing and counsels people who have experienced such abuse. She turned her private suffering into a public issue and has advanced the culture.

In my research, “mobbing” has a great deal of unconscious group behavior associated with it. To understand it one must research the realms of psychoanalysis and group dynamics (Bion 1961, Armstrong, et al 2005, Grotstein 2007). Often the abuse had the tacit approval of upper management who themselves are often behind it. All terrains of employment in capitalist culture operate in a sea of conflict. As Kincheloe and McLaren (1994) emphasize, for a critical applied anthropologist one is in dangerous waters from the first day on the job. Critical ethnographers need to critically analyze how larger domains of power, including global and local capital, define one’s job and inhibit the possibilities of social science practice.

In the applied field, anthropologists are always trying to discern the location of what I call “the line of unfreedom,” the place where speaking up may cause reaction. Here’s a story from a veteran medical anthropologist who will go unnamed that illustrates the pressures to conform to the “yes sir.”

“I’ve recently been eased off of a multi-million dollar grant that I co-wrote and am (supposed to be) the co-investigator on. My 5 year participation was cut off at year 1 by the Primary Investigator who was getting really nervous about what affiliating with me would do to his career. In a nutshell, I wrote a paper that he thought would offend his superiors and so didn’t want to have any links to me anymore. So he revised the budget and cut me out - without actually telling me until about 9 months into year 1 - and only finally because I directly inquired as to where my subcontract for years 2-5 had gotten to. Ultimately he’s the PI. He was the MD, I was the PhD. He was the insider at the ‘very large integrated healthcare system’ where the research is sited, I am not. So yes, he has decision making power - yes he could do that. Of course, that doesn’t make it ‘right’, but that’s how it is. Ironically, the higher ups liked the paper, which was really quite non-threatening.”

What would happen if this applied anthropologist made a work issue over this? He won’t. From experience he knows that it might not turn out well.

Indeed, as I tell students in my “Doing Anthropology” course, there is an inevitable and permanent tension between three key aspects of “applied” work as: 1) an employee, 2) a professional and 3) a citizen. As an employee you sell your labor power to an employer. As a professional anthropologist you seek to abide by the goals, rules and ethics of your discipline. As a citizen you are most interested in advancing democracy and public education. These subject positions conflict and overlap in numerous ways. But one can be sure that an employer is more interested in your value as an employee than a citizen. I teach the Ted Downing story as an instructive for students own applied work. Like Downing, applied anthropologists have to be prepared to travel the road from “yes, but,” to “no, sir” in order to better serve the public interest.

David Price (2004) continues to catalogue the perils of activist applied anthropologists, demonstrating how, in the 1930s through 1970s, they were subject to surveillance, marginalization and worse for their work. Anthropologist Michael Blim, in summarizing the Price book concludes, “Emerson’s adage that all it takes for evil to triumph is that good people do nothing is here confirmed. Based on Price’s book, one might also add: ‘if you try to change your society, trust not your state, your university, or your profession.’ (Blim 2007:3)"

Your profession? “Are graduate schools not doing a sufficient job in preparing anthropology students to protect themselves in the non-academic job world?” I asked Johnston.

“I am not sure the issue is simply that anthropologists are ‘not sufficiently educated about how to protect themselves when challenging authority’ - as that assumes that historically our anthropological teachers have the means and experience to educate their students.” Johnston said that anthropology faculty, in general, do not have the “seasoned understanding of power and backlash,” as it occurs in the non-academic world. This is so, she said, because they are still immersed in the “generic disciplinary reality of the ivory tower cocoon.” She argues that “political naïveté is built into the dependency relationship between the discipline and the university structures that sustain the discipline.”
That may or may not be changing. But it’s an uphill battle. As Henry Giroux (2007) discusses in his writings, universities are turning into military-academic-industrial complexes where hierarchy is more entrenched and emboldened. Academics need to model “good applied” anthropology in their own workplaces (the knowledge factories of higher education) to be more convincing to their students.

So how do we better protect ourselves in a harsh work environment? Downing says, “Telling the truth is the most important thing - scientific credibility is critical. I document my reports with hundreds of references pointing directly to documents and footnotes. No embellishment - extra adverbs or adjectives - use the words of the documents. Facts, numbers, uncertainties, etc. Good science is your best defense as an activist. If your methodology is approved ahead of time...and leads to an unexpected result - you are on good grounds. Good science gains respect, which becomes a shield....but not impermeable. Keep close to the overall organizational objectives of your client or organization - in the case of the World Bank, poverty alleviation.”

Downing, who is today a research professor of Social Development at the University of Arizona, said, “Whistleblowing is a last resort - since once it is done, your effectiveness as an internal change agent - moving the organization in the direction that it needs to go - is finished. I always feel a sense of personal failure when I had to take that last step. It was quite painful. There are other ways to release information to the outside without blowing the whistle. For example, a freedom of information request or demand for an open meeting may crack opens an issue without the need for self-destruction.” “I learned this during my two terms as a State lawmaker. And, above all, maintain a sense of humor on your self-importance. Awards are not given and statutes are not erected to whistleblowers! I have been booted out of several countries and organizations,” said Downing. “And be assured, the minute a whistle is blown, any weakness in your scientific and professional abilities will be questioned. It is a last resort after you have tried your best to change the organization. I had 3 feet of internal correspondence on the Pangue case going on for over a year before I field my first human rights violation charges against the World Bank (IFC) - trying to set things right so the Pehuenche Indians would not be harmed.”

Still, Barbara Johnston is not optimistic about academic culture’s abilities to prepare students for the perils of non-academic applied work. In an interview she said that the “ever-expanding continuum of engagement,” that is currently underway in anthropology will likely result in more censorship and backlash against applied anthropologists. Johnston points out that academic culture “trivializes the importance of this work,” while, at the same time, the engaged anthropologist struggles to find disciplinary support in dealing with backlash, which can range from papers that cannot be published (and thus cannot advance careers) to disinformation campaigns, character assaults, threats, even murder. She cites the execution of a Colombian anthropologist in 1999 after studying displaced persons from a proposed energy development. He was shot by three masked gunmen at a faculty meeting. But the more common forms of retribution and retaliation come in the form of lost jobs, lost careers and lost health.

“While anthropology is a powerful social persona (in Hollywood, public consciousness, legally mandated reviews, etc.) in terms of numbers, it is a very minor discipline. The AAA has only about 11,000 members compared to the American Economic Association with 21,000, or the American Psychological Association with over 150,000. This means that when it comes to power (who gets the most research grants, who gets to serve as the dominant social science voice in the corridors of power, etc), anthropology is a very minor afterthought. And yet there is much room for resistance,” Johnston adds. “We have an unusual power because as a social personality anthropology/ists have captured the public imagination. There is a cachet to the title, to the opinions emanating from ‘An Anthropologist.’ So backlash is not only a matter of an unprepared, unforeseen, poorly played hand, but also a matter of threat, and how best to silence that threat. Anthropology is a very loud mosquito buzzing around the head at night. There is a lot of power there.”

Indeed, as Rylko-Bauer, Singer  and van Willigen (2006) argue, the historical successes of “pragmatic engagement” must be reclaimed for the 21st century. “For applied anthropologists, the commitment to action is a given; the challenge lies in continuing to find ways of acting more effectively and ethically while linking the specificity of local problem solving to larger sociopolitical contexts (Ibid:185).”

“Yes, but,” is only one way to act. It’s often not effective. In response to Heggenhougen’s challenge, we need to become better prepared, as a discipline, to teach and support colleagues who find themselves in circumstances where, “no, but,” is where they must go.
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FieldWorks Data Notebook: Software for Writing Digital Fieldnotes

by G. Tomas Woodward [tom_woodward@sil.org]
SIL International, Dallas Texas

FieldWorks Data Notebook (FWDN, ver. 2.8) is an electronic notebook for writing and managing fieldnotes. It is part of the FieldWorks suite of software (FW, ver. 5.0) produced by SIL International. The program is Windows based and works well with both the XP Pro and Vista operating systems. Though not designed for Apple OS, it is also usable on Macs with Intel chips running the Boot Camp/Windows combination or emulation software.

FWDN comes with standardized templates for data input and several ways to search, retrieve and review data. Recognizing that most ethnographers are allergic to the word “standards,” FWDN lets the user create fields and customize the interfaces. Multi-language and script technologies allow its use in almost any linguistic environment in the world. Best of all, FWDN is free. It can be downloaded from the SIL server at: http://www.sil.org/computing/fieldworks/DataNotebook.html. It can easily be learned by fieldworker, research assistant, local collaborator or anyone else interested in a free, easy-to-use, powerful fieldnote-taking software program.

Product and Niche

With text analysis software like NVIVO, Atlas/ti, MAXQDA, and ten or more others, there is a dubious need to crowd the field with one more program. So what’s the point of FWDN? There wouldn’t be one if the competitive exclusion principle were operative. But it isn’t. That is, FWDN really doesn’t pretend to be an analysis package. It does have a complimentary niche, however. The irony of having a million brands of analysis software is that the digitally inclined fieldworker has few solutions for primary data entry. In fact, Russ Bernard’s methods bible, “Research Methods in Anthropology,” generically mentions text management (TM) programs, but that is as close as he gets to suggesting a digital tool for writing fieldnotes. (Bernard 2006:406) FWDN may well be the only software designed for front-end, qualitative data gathering - writing fieldnotes.

James Mullooly (California State University, Fresno) summarizes the consensus of several ethnographers that students using qualitative analysis software are sorely tempted to analyze too soon. (Mullooly: slide 4, www.slideshare.net/theanthrogeek/with-great-power-mullooly). The problem is that the technological cart (software) often winds up in front of the inductive horse (data). Or, rather, the cart may simply not have anything in it. The point is that good qualitative analysis relies on a sizeable data set, but the software tools associated with analysis are not
particularly concerned with data collection. Students with insufficient data often go ahead and crunch it anyway. Here is where a tool like FWDN might help by slowing the rush to analysis. FWDN is all about collecting the data, recording it properly, giving it organization, and finding it again. If there is no data, there is no analysis. On the other hand, once the data is in hand, it can be exported to a spiffy analysis program where all that cool theory building stuff happens.

**Getting Data In**

Good software doesn’t turn a researcher into a great writer. That skill comes with a lot of effort. In the meantime, don’t forget the need to support well-written fieldnotes with good documentation. Standardized templates are useful in this regard. Dates, sources, locations, topical codes, and so on, are essential kinds of metadata. FWDN offers more than thirty fields that encourage researchers to provide metadata for a record. And, if these aren’t enough, go ahead and create some more.

Here it is appropriate to note that a good fieldnote should also generate more research. That is one goal of FWND. Fields like Further Questions, Hypothesis, Research Plan, and Status remind the ethnographer to investigate further.

In the following paragraphs, I will walk through the basic mechanics of data entry and management in the Data Notebook.

**Records**

Before even starting to write a fieldnote, FWDN makes the researcher do some critical thinking. The Data Notebook incorporates two fieldnote typologies: Event and Analysis Entries. Event Entries are used to describe and document observable activity. Instances of events such as interviews, performances, or observations, can be detailed individually or embedded in multiple sub-Event Entries.

Analysis Entries are intended for reflective tasks. There is a slightly different template for each fieldnote type. For example, the main component of an Event Entry is called a “Description” field. The corresponding field in an Analysis Entry is called a “Discussion.”

**Data Entry View**

FWDN has three user interfaces called “Views.” The Data Entry view is for, well, data entry. This is where the researcher writes. One record at a time is visible and a customizable template offers the user guidance in generating a well-documented fieldnote.

Fig. 1 Data Entry view: Event Entry

Fig. 2 Data Entry view: Analysis Entry

The default Data Entry view displays ten standard fields starting with Title, then Date of Event, Researcher,
Source, and so on. Hidden from view, so as not to overwhelm new users, are seven additional fields: Participants, Personal notes, Confidence, etc. But the researcher is not limited to these fields. An indefinite number of additional fields can be created by the user.

**Browse View**

The second interface in FWDN is the Browse view. This is essentially an index of all fieldnotes in the database. Visible to the user are multiple rows of fieldnotes with truncated information. Both the number of fields and the lines of information in a field can be limited in order to reduce the screen space used by a record. For instance, five people may be listed under “Source” in an entry, but Browse view can be set to display only the first individual. Browse view provides a quick summary of the fieldnote details that the researcher determines are important and wants to have easily at hand.

Browse view provides the best way to get a global overview of data. Mullooly alludes to the importance of this kind of perspective in his presentation. “When indexed, fieldnotes become far more available and facilitate systematic iteration and annotation.” (Ibid: slide 26) In addition, Browse view is the easiest way to navigate from one record to another, especially if the records are not in sequence. Browse view can also hide or display sub-entries and thus reduce or expand the amount of data confronting the researcher.

**Document View**

Document view is the third interface. This is the place for reading through fieldnotes, or “iteration” as Mullooly calls it. (Ibid:18) While Browse view condenses entries, Document view expands them. It displays all data from all records. The user can then scroll through the entire database. As with Browse view, the interface can be customized and fields may be hidden from view or rearranged.

The number of fieldnotes viewed at one time is flexible. Later, under Sorting and Filtering, I will discuss ways to isolate and view selected sets of records.

**Lists, etc.**

There are two types of fields in FWDN: Texts and Lists. Text fields are self-explanatory, although the language of the text and the writing system employed are flexible. Both Roman and non-Roman scripts can be used interchangeably. List fields store reusable information such as names or topical codes that will be repeated in other records. Both field types are searchable, but the List field opens doors into a parallel universe of information. For example, the People list supports three fields: Source, Participants, and Researcher. The actual list is maintained in an integrated but separate program called the Topics List Editor (TLE). We could get lost in this technology, but the big idea is that the small detail of a person’s name in the Source field belies interesting, and maybe crucial, information about that person. The TLE lets researchers compile multi-layered information around the supporting metadata of a fieldnote.
The Outline of Cultural Materials (OCM) is the largest and most complex List in the Data Notebook. It is used by permission from Yale’s Human Relations Area Files, Inc. The OCM gives researchers a powerful way to code fieldnotes. But it does not prevent ‘en vivo’ coding which can be accomplished in two ways. One is by adding sub-codes to the OCM. The other way is for users to create a code field of their own. New codes can be added on the fly, and descriptive detail can be added to the code list whenever necessary.

Fig. 5 OCM Categories Chooser

FDWN allows hyperlinked cross-references between records, and the External Materials field supports links to files on a hard drive or website. While FDWN doesn’t overwhelm the user with detail, there is considerable functionality imbedded throughout the program. Data entry can be learned quickly and even novice fieldworkers can produce high-quality fieldnotes.

Sorting

Sorting allows the user to index data based on different criteria - specifically, values in the list fields. FDWN’s default Sort routine is based on the Date Created field which automatically logs the date and time a record is entered. This field’s location is conveniently hidden in the lower left corner of the screen. And note that Date Created is different than Date of Event. If the researcher is not conscientious about entering data right away, the Date of Event may differ considerably from the Date Created. But back to Sorting: defaults are meant to be tampered with. So, to assist tampering, several Sort routines come pre-packaged. The Sort feature is accessed below the Views menu on the left-hand side of the screen.

Perhaps the most useful Sort routines are Location and Source. The records are arranged alphabetically. Those with fields having no values will be displayed first. One oddity of the Sort routine is that if there is more than one value in the field - multiple Sources, for instance - the record will be duplicated for each person and ordered alphabetically. So don’t be surprised if your record count jumps from 503 to 758 when you Sort on a field with multiple values.

Filters

Another helpful feature is the ability of FDWN to limit the range of viewable records. This is the Filter utility. Filters come in two sizes: Basic and Advanced. Basic Filters match single criteria to a value in one field. For instance, you might filter for a particular OCM code in the field “Anthropology Categories.” The result would be an abbreviated set of records, all of which are coded with the given OCM category. This set can then be viewed in any of the three user interfaces (Data Entry, Browse, or Document).

An Advanced Filter adds multiple criteria to the filter equation, typically using the Boolean syntax “AND/OR” in various combinations to expand or narrow the search focus. With large data sets, this type of filter has enormous research value. The down-side is that creating the right formula takes time and patience. Building filters is the most complicated feature of FDWN. Hopefully, by the time a researcher gets around to creating Advanced Filters, they have become adept at using the other aspects of the program and can concentrate on making Filters work productively.

Miscellaneous

Even though it is easy to use, FDWN is not a rinky-dink program. FDWN is built around core-technologies that most ethnographers working in multilingual environments will want to use. These include:
Unicode Standard: This is a universal character encoding scheme that attempts to uniquely identify every character in every language of the world. Most people won’t care a fig about this, but, if you work in one of the world’s lesser-known languages, the fact that your software is Unicode enabled means that in ten years, digital technologies will still be able to make sense of your data.

Non-Roman Scripts: The fact that users can jump between French, Thai and Arabic in the same paragraph is impressive. Don’t get lazy, though. Users will still need to load the right language systems, Unicode fonts, and keyboard definitions into their operating system in order for FWDN to take advantage of its linguistic adaptability. Note that FWDN does not yet support vertical scripts.

FLEX: FWDN is only one program in a suite. Another program in the suite is the FieldWorks Language Explorer, or FLEX. This program was designed by linguists and has a variety of analytical tools for describing languages: lexicon, texts, words, and grammar. FWDN and FLEX make use of the same database so an anthropological linguist gets a two-for-one package.

It’s Free

What else do I need to say? Have a look at www.sil.org/computing/fieldworks/DataNotebook.html and try it out. If you don’t like it, uninstall. There are no gimmicks, cookies, add-ons, or pop-ups.

Conclusion

Besides the fact that FWDN fills a unique niche and might encourage greater ethnographic engagement prior to the seductive lure of analysis, there is another elemental thought to consider. Oswald Werner mentioned the idea of “standards” in CAM several years ago. (Werner 1998:1-3). Werner’s appeal did not get much response, so maybe we aren’t ready to discuss “standards” yet. But what if we talk about “best practices” instead? That may be a more palatable description of the pedagogical attraction of FWDN. It is certainly my experience that students using FWDN quickly learn the requirements for good documentation. Tim Wallace, in his summer Ethnographic Field School (see www4.ncsu.edu/~twallace, noticed that instead of taking a week to finally write a proper fieldnote, students picked up the technique in a day or two. The payoff was additional time to explore methodologies and ethnographic situations (Personal communication). And, in fact, the technology didn’t become the focus of research. That’s the point of having “best practices” - they ensure quality and help us get on with our work. Plus, we don’t have to keep reinventing the wheel. But, of course, someone probably will.

Tim Wallace and I will conduct the 5th NAPA sponsored FieldWorks Data Notebook workshop at the next AAA meeting (San Francisco, Nov 19-23). If you want a hands-on demonstration of FWDN, come join us! (See AAA Workshop #18 at http://dev.aaanet.org/meetings/Workshops.cfm)
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Understanding Physicians: Enantiadromia, “My success as a physician counts as my personal success.”

By John-Henry Pifferling, PhD [CPWB@mindspring.com]
Director, Center for Professional Well-Being, Durham, NC

In the last issue, I discussed the word alexithymia, describing people who cannot connect with or articulate their personal feelings. Adapting to cultural norms in medicine maintains alexithymia. Asking about their feelings produces non-response. In this issue, I would like to comment on enantiadromia and its occurrence among physicians. Enantiadromia describes someone who is so tied up with their professional identity that other facets of their being are starved.

Prevalent norms in most of the medical culture sanctions comfort with one’s own or peer’s feelings. Self-disclosing or apparent comfort with feelings provokes ostracism, and Society for Applied Anthropology
stigma from many colleagues. Let me give you an example. “Pyramid” programs must eliminate some residents because fewer slots are available for the next year’s class. Typically those who do not fit modeling norms, because they are too interested or comfortable with “soft stuff,” are “pyramided” out. Medical folklore offers classic stereotypes on anti-soft stuff programs including neurosurgery, hand surgery, cardiovascular surgery, and invasive cardiology. Those residents pyramided out were often characterized as too “touchy-feely.”

Barriers for entrance into the physician culture are almost immediately erected if an anthropologist prematurely discloses any interest in “soft” (feeling) issues like the impact of residency training on child-rearing, psychosomatic illness among fellows, or tearfulness in the neonatal intensive care unit. Building rapport among these “natives” subtly pressures the anthropologist to emulate alexithymia, laughing, for example at sarcastic humor deprecating some person, or group. Classic in-group humor, among physicians, deprecates LMD’s (local medical doctors, now updated to include family physicians) as incompetent. Do you (the anthropologist) confront the stereotypic and demeaning behavior or do you gloss over it? Rapport-building requires many such integrity de-valuing decisions. Where are these paradoxes processed?

Alexithymia is also displayed by putdowns for those who spend time self-reflecting. “Advice” is given to the trainee, “don’t self-reflect,” the implication being you will end up as a “lesser” physician, like a psychiatrist. “Real doctors don’t self-reflect and those who do are not real doctors.” Alexithymics and those suffering from enantiadromia avoid, or can’t seem to introspect.

Internalizing achievement, as a physician, becomes their sole source of self-esteem. Their behavior mirrors their enantiadromia. I have witnessed their almost limitless ability to say “yes” to requests for work --- validating their function as a physician. The reward system among peers is associated with productivity (“How many stents did you perform today?”), efficiency (“How many patients did you see before lunch?”), and achievements (diplomas, awards, certificates). One time I was closeted with a physician whose walls were draped with certificates and who could not understand my professional visit to help him: to confront his “failure” as an ineffective and abusive communicator.

Enantiadromia builds as a subtle adaptation, mythically conferring control. Becoming and then maintaining a stance as the “master,” “best quality clinician,” overrides any sense of balance. Losses accumulate as the physician is unable to say “no” to yet another need to prove competency by comprehensiveness, inordinate detail, completeness or accolades. Losses for the enantiadromic include intimacy with family and friends, sleep hygiene, self-care, and development of other skills in life. Fear of failure, internally perceived to lead to a poor outcome and protection from projected peer-shaming dominates their life.

Underpinning the evolving and consuming identity issue is unprocessed fear. The unreflective peer culture avoids discussing (processing) fear of failure, flexibility, litigation, burnout, the ubiquity of mistakes, and dysfunctional communication. Physicians suffering from enantiadromia are fearful of retirement because they are only a shell of a person; their personhood is their physician identity. Physicians suffering from enantiadromia disregard, and aggressively defend the evidence of their incompetence. No longer referred to as a heart surgeon and relegated to a fallible role is implausible. Their spouse has adapted to unavailability by becoming more independent. They consider, “what would I do if he were now home?”

Compress enantiadromia and perfectionism and you have a recipe for personal disaster. Achievement with concrete recognition, titles, awards, publications, credentials as the doctor is the doctor’s self-esteem. Gravitation towards production and peer recognition is a kind of addictive seduction. Balancing personal and professional demands dissipates into the background and self-care (the balance of life) disappears.

The net result for many physicians is an epidemic of self-care deficits. For some lucky few, crises allow the opportunity to reflect, discovering that self-esteem is predicated on the many facets of a person—including family, friend, community, citizen, and most of all comfort with self. The hallmark of someone suffering from enantiadromia is Society for Applied Anthropology
that they are not able to comfortably handle functioning without a concrete and recognizable purpose. They only do and cannot be. How sad.

Enantiadromia produces probably its greatest pain among physicians when they confront (perceived) failure. To many physicians being in litigation is felt as total failure not an unfortunate component of their professional role. The ubiquity of severe, almost unremitting stress while in litigation manifested in psychosomatic illness, depressive and anger problems is so common that an epidemic term has even been coined: malpractice stress syndrome (MSS). Physicians suffering from MSS feel out of control, are conferred no immunity because of their special status, and are judged as imperfect. Their perfectionism gave no immunization. Each physician suffers anger, sadness, anxiety and aloneness. Such a distraught state provokes multiple psychosomatic illnesses. Yet, minimal support is available allowing the distress to foment.

If “I am my identity,” for a physician the criticism of being in a lawsuit is torture. Obsessional behavior didn’t prevent the lawsuit, and best efforts did not keep the devil away thus an entire worldview can collapse. Suicidal actions, self-prescribing, and ruminating are not uncommon during this period.

In a cohesive, tribal culture you would expect an epidemic of distress to promote cultural support—rituals, ceremonies, and opportunities to walkabout. Such is generally not the case in the medical community. Colleagues avoid the litigant, staff retreat feeling like they are walking on eggshells, further alienating the doctor, and their attorney tells them to talk to no one.

The anthropologist can describe this context and needs to offer methods to reduce isolation and pain among the natives.

[Dr. Pfifferling, founded the Center for Professional Well-Being [www.cpwb.org] in 1979 to promote well-being among healthcare professionals, including students, and their families, their practice organizations, and other professionals. He will be contributing a column each issue on key terms that have emerged from his practice with health professionals. -Editor]

A New M.S. Program in Applied Anthropology Focuses on Cultural Heritage

By Bill Wedenoja [billwedenoja@missouristate.edu]
Missouri State University

Missouri State University is a selective, public institution located in the Ozarks highlands, in the southwest corner of Missouri, in Springfield, the third-largest city in the state with a population of over 150,000. The University has about 20,000 students and a statewide mission in public affairs.

The Anthropology program at Missouri State began with a minor in 1975. A major was added in 1997, and we average about 110 majors. This fall, we are pleased to announce the start of a new program, an M.S. in Applied Anthropology.

The focus of the new program is cultural heritage, which cuts across the four fields, encompasses the interests of all the members of our faculty, and incorporates the Center for Archaeological Research, an autonomous University research institute. The aim of the program is to prepare students for careers primarily in cultural resource management, public archaeology, cultural and linguistic preservation, and heritage tourism.

There are six full-time anthropologists in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminology.
am a cultural anthropologist and work closely with a community in Jamaica on a variety of applied projects in tourism, education, fishing, and historic preservation. Margaret Buckner is a cultural and linguistic anthropologist working in Guinea-Bissau and Central African Republic as well as with Native American language preservation and Mexican immigration. Suzanne Walker is a biological anthropologist currently studying the health issues of Latino immigrants, particularly diabetes, as well as doing forensic consultations with law enforcement agencies. William Meadows is an ethnohistorian working closely with the Kiowa-Apache-Comanche of Oklahoma and also doing archaeology in Indiana. Elizabeth Sobel is an archaeologist who has worked on many cultural resource management projects with tribal and federal agencies in the Northwestern U.S. Recently, she has initiated research and applied projects relating to the prehistory and history of southwest Missouri. David Byers is an archaeologist who comes to us this fall with a background in CRM, zooarchaeology, and the human ecology of prehistoric hunter-gatherers in western North America.

The Center for Archaeological Research was established in 1975 and currently has four professional archaeologists on staff. Center staff will be integrated into the teaching program next year. Neal Lopinot, the director of the Center, has expertise in the prehistoric and historic archaeology of the Midwest as well as in archaeobotany, and is also studying a plantation site in Trinidad. Associate Director Holly Jones is an historic archaeologist currently studying The Trail of Tears, which passed through Springfield, and the Civil War battle of Wilson’s Creek, a National Battlefield where she has conducted summer field schools.

Another asset of the new program is the Missouri Archaeological Society, which recently moved its headquarters to Missouri State University. The program will also benefit from the Ozarks Studies Institute, and the University’s long-standing tradition of research on the history, culture, and folklore of the Ozarks region.

The Masters curriculum emphasizes the cultivation of professional skills such as research methods, quantitative analysis, computer applications, technical writing, and public speaking. Students will study both archaeology and ethnography, but normally develop expertise in one or the other. Every student will complete an internship and a practicum or thesis. Applicants should have a strong undergraduate background in anthropology.

All of the ten initial graduate students starting this fall have a strong interest in cultural heritage. Seven are focusing on the Ozarks region in particular, including the pioneer heritage, Native peoples, and African Americans, and two will be working in Jamaica. One is already employed as an applied anthropologist by a large local advertising firm. For more information, please see http://anthropology.missouristate.edu/MSAppliedAnthro.htm.

REFLECTIONS FROM STUDENTS IN THE FIELD

Engaging Structures of Power: A Reflection from the Field
by Kiran Jayaram, Ph.D. Candidate [mjkiran@gmail.com]
Applied Anthropology, Columbia University

When considering the application of anthropology, a typical (though not the only) format consists of taking one’s socially relevant research and sharing results. In certain cases, granting agencies even require such an approach to be included in proposals. It makes sense, and I have on more than one occasion presented findings as a condition of research support. In this essay, after I describe an event that occurred during my dissertation research in Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, I discuss specific aspects to consider regarding the sharing of research with an institution closely linked to structures of power.
After nine months of fieldwork, I agreed to an invitation, initially informally offered through my contacts through the US Embassy in the Dominican Republic, to speak at the Fundación Global Democracia y Desarrollo (FUNGLODE), which has President Leonel Fernandez as its honorary president. After a brief introduction about FUNGLODE and lecture series in which I participated, I began my presentation. I was nervous about the presentation because it was my first professional presentation in Spanish, because it was in front of an audience of over sixty people (Dominicans, Haitians, and others), because a camera from a national television station was pointed at me, and because other presentations of my work have led to heated arguments. With all this in mind, I began reading my paper.

Briefly stated, my talk focused on the intersection of social distinction, the market, and governmentality. In other words, I described how different types of Haitians were treated differentially by the state (e.g., illegal police detentions) according to the market value of their skills, an off-shoot of the work of Aihwa Ong. Throughout the presentation, I thrice elicited appropriate laughs both from the general audience (after a joke about not torturing them with chat-style presentation, given a lack of confidence in my professional Spanish abilities) and from Haitians familiar with some of the so-called emic distinctions among Haitians in the capital. I ended with two conclusions, one calling for on-the-ground ethnographic research to address policy-relevant social issues and another imploring the Dominican government to implement legal and educational measures to reduce tensions between Haitians and Dominicans. Questions were predetermined to follow all the presentations, so after my talk, the moderator quickly sprung up (perhaps to contain any frustration) and reminded the audience that “this is on-going research”, that “findings aren’t conclusive”, and that people “should keep an open mind and objective position” when listening. The rest of his comments were lost in my post-presentation stupor. The moderator limited questions (partially due to his lengthy monologue on the topic at hand), but one audience member voiced his confusion over whether lower class Haitians in the urban areas are a problem for development. With a quick clarification of a point I made in my paper, that they are often considered as Wooding and Moseley-Williams (2004) stated “needed but not wanted”, my formal presentation at FUNGLODE ended.

This episode prompted me to derive something like the “5 W’s” of sharing one’s research with power structures. The first two, closely related in this case, relate to venue, and are: with whom do you share your research, and where do you share your research? Obviously, I believe sharing findings with research participants is important, and their power to accept or reject research findings should not be ignored. But do you give findings in formal presentations to your funding agencies, who may be linked to US government agencies? This clearly implies a need for careful ethical consideration. Should you share with in-country academic sponsors or other contacts? In my case, this implied connections to the current administration, recently re-elected for a four-year term. Some grassroots organizers who I know wouldn’t even attend the talk, as they abhor FUNGLODE and the neoliberal economic policies they support. So the who and where have ethical and political considerations. As an addendum to the who, recall that in working toward change, it’s not the number of people to whom you present that is important. No one gets famous from anthropological research, with the possible exceptions of Margaret Mead or Paul Farmer. Tugging on the appropriate two ears might just make a difference.

The last three questions to consider when sharing with structures of power concern content, tone, and purpose. Researchers should consider what to share. Clearly, I had no intention of sharing how Haitians get around police checkpoints or legal guidelines. Though it might be instructive to show so-called resistance, it might also lead to my friends and their families being detained, imprisoned, or deported. Recall the overall ethical idea of “do no harm.” Another question to consider (not exactly a W), is how to share. Of course, with television cameras and the ears of the government perked, a part of me wanted to deliver a blistering talk on police corruption and Dominican government complicity to exploitation, injury, and death of Haitians in the current scheme of national development. However, I wanted to avoid another “don’t tase me bro!” incident, I kept my tone effectively descriptive without
being polemical. I was to some degree wrestling with the “self-imposed censorship” (Nader 1999) that accompanies working with people and institutions of power and the question of advocacy that Fluehr-Lobban (2006) poses.

The final \( W \) to consider is why does it matter if you do or do not share findings. I have no idea what the impact of my talk will be, but I would be optimistic if I claimed it would be miniscule. With his follow-up comments, the moderator effectively discounted my research and presentation as being rather controversial, most likely due to partial results, and that the completion of which would (hopefully for them) show that I was wrong in my critiques of the state apparatus. Post-presentation discussion was eliminated, so I have little idea of what people thought. I was partially encouraged to hear that on feedback surveys, the overwhelming majority of the responses indicated that the participants enjoyed my presentation the most due to its anthropological perspective and insight.

To finish the discussion of the why of sharing with structures of power and to conclude this essay, I recall a discussion with my colleague Nisha Varia at Human Rights Watch, who reminded me that if we have access to these fora, we have a responsibility to participate in them (even if we find them offensive on ethical, moral, or political terms), if only because often times, the people we research do not have such access to affect change. So I follow in the footsteps of a tradition ranging from Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict, my professors (one whom co-authored a Presidential Report on Ganja use in Jamaica), to Paul Farmer (who testified in the US Senate on health in Haiti). The Bhagavad Gita implores us toward enlightened selfless action for the greater good without contemplating the consequences, and it was with this in mind that in word and deed, I recommend engaging power structures (for better or worse).

Notes:

1. As of early 2008, over 300 Haitians have died in the construction of the Santo Domingo Metro subway system, the pet project of President Fernandez.

2. This refers to the University of Florida incident where Andrew Meyer was tasered by school security when asking a question of John Kerry.
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Watch Your Step -or- Reflections on Putting PAR into Practice

by Kristen Hudgins [hudginsk@gwm.sc.edu]
Ph. D. Candidate, University of South Carolina

I wrote in the May (2008) newsletter about the basic premise of my dissertation project and the applied aspects of that work. For this piece I am focusing on a situation in my fieldwork that was the cause of some conflict and required careful treading as I tried to mediate my position as a participatory researcher. I found myself cast as an expert and caught in a situation that forced me to choose between groups.

To quickly recap my dissertation fieldwork: I’m working in a batey community in the Dominican Republic with grassroots women’s groups, two Haitian and one Dominican. My work with the women’s groups in this community forms an applied element of my research, which more generally speaking, focuses on the influence that international education based groups have had on the development of the community and how the community negotiates power dynamics in order to meet their development needs. The work of the women’s groups is a vital part in the development process in this community as they produce goods to sell to the international groups in order to support their community-based projects. For example, with the Haitian women’s group with whom I work most closely, the projects largely involve procuring passports and visas for women who need to update their legal documentation. This Dominican women’s group has been involved in selling goods to international groups as well, but they are also trying to find ways to make and sell goods within the community.
Attempting to stay out of community politics, or at least remain neutral, proved to be quite challenging at times within a community that in many ways is deeply divided yet mutually dependent (as most small communities are—think of academic departments for instance!). For the sake of this article I want to share one particular situation that proved to especially challenging when I tried to unite two of the women’s groups in what I saw as a small task, but turned out to be much larger.

I went to visit a sister community to Batey Voluntad (a pseudonym) on the north coast of the Dominican Republic called Monplan*. Many residents of Voluntad have over the years moved up to Monplan (also a pseudonym), which has recently begun using the same development model that Voluntad has been using of establishing relationships with international university-based groups that engage in development projects in the community. Moreover, Monplan has established some grassroots community groups including a women’s group that makes candles. My research assistant, Delika, in Batey Voluntad wanted to accompany me on my trip as she has family in Monplan, so she and I both attended a meeting with the community. In talking to the women’s group in Monplan it became apparent that they are struggling to find their niche with regard to the projects that they are trying to develop for their members. They have been making candles but it turns out they have been making them upside down as the women’s groups in Voluntad had been prior to taking a formal candle making class. Delika is a part of both types of Haitian women’s groups I working with—one secular (in which she is part of their governing council) and one church-based (in which she is a member) in Voluntad and suggested that perhaps some of the women from Monplan could come to visit and learn the new candle making techniques. I will note here that both the secular and the church-based women’s groups in Voluntad make candles, but the church-based group also makes coconut jewelry. I thought this was a wonderful idea and suggested that perhaps the church-based group might also be willing to teach the coconut jewelry making techniques to the women of Monplan as well. I offered to pay for the transportation and board for two women from Monplan to come to Voluntad and learn new crafts as well as meet with both Haitian women’s groups there to do an exchange of sorts. Delika had all of the contact information for the women in Monplan and was to organize between both communities in order to arrange their visit.

Later that week Delika met with the secular women’s group and they said that they would be interested in working with the Monplan group, but they would need someone to pay for the paraffin wax for the candles, and they wanted to charge the Monplan group for the lesson. I was taken aback. I asked how much they wanted to charge and was told that they hadn’t decided yet, but that if the Monplan women couldn’t pay for it, then perhaps I could. The ease with which I had hoped this situation would take place all but evaporated in front of me. I had been trying to cull a positive relationship with the secular women’s group, but with few successes (they did not seem particularly interested in having me work with them) and so I felt that this was a moment that might seal our fate with regard to establishing a working relationship. I tried to take the diplomatic approach. I started by pointing out that the secular women’s group had received a lot of outside help in getting the money together to attend their candle classes and that surely they could empathize with the Monplan group’s situation of having little to no resources. The counter argument was that the secular group had had to pay for part of their class, and so the Monplan women should too. I asked Delika to ask the secular group to reconsider and suggested that if they insisted on being paid, that perhaps the church-based group might be willing to do both trainings as they’d already agreed to do the coconut jewelry (free of charge).

The following week the church-based group had their regular meeting and the issue of the Monplan women came up. Delika explained how the secular women’s group wanted to charge for the candle class and I found myself in a tight and difficult situation. Many of the church women’s group found the notion of charging women in their same situation to be abhorrent and the meeting turned into a debate. I was regularly drawn in as having organized the exchange and the women wanted to know what I planned to do about it. I reflected back on what had been the original plan to facilitate an exchange between two communities and essentially remove myself from the process believing that this should be an end goal for community development and here I was being touted as some sort of expert who should make the final decision for the community groups involved. I tried to refuse. I told the women that they were solely responsible to make the decision, as I wouldn’t be in town when they would have the Monplan group visit, so everything was up to them. By the end of the meeting Delika, speaking on behalf the secular women’s group, had declared that they would not meet with the
Monplan women; and the church women’s group would teach both candle making and jewelry for free if I would provide the wax. At this point I couldn’t believe what I was hearing and found myself dragged back in to the argument noting to Delika that she had been the one to invite the Monplan women in the first place and that even if they weren’t going to be teaching the women to make candles because of the issue of the fee they wanted to charge then surely they could at least meet with them to discuss the way that the secular group is organized and how they run their projects. She reiterated that if they weren’t going to teach the women anything then there was no point in meeting with them. I had resolved to let the women decide for themselves the course that this community exchange should and stay out of the end result, but when most of the dust had settled everyone seemed to be waiting for me to make it official. I said that if the secular group felt that strongly about not participating then the only thing to do was to give the wax to the church based group.

What does all this mean? Well to make a long story short (I know, not soon enough) I learned some really valuable lessons. Community organizing takes a lot of time, even for small things and should not be attempted in your last weeks in the field. This situation also highlighted some of the discrepancies in my role in the community and particularly with the women’s groups where I wanted to be seen as a student there to learn, but I had somehow become someone there to teach. This terrified me as I generally presume that I know nothing, or at least very little. It also sent me reflecting on what the expectations, realities, and responsibilities are in participatory research. I know that the tone of this article reflects a lot of frustration and anger, and I know that is not fair, but after ten months and several rounds of being battered around a bit by some of the women’s groups and taking blame here and there (some deserved, some not) I found myself feeling a little raw and defensive. I will never truly understand the politics of this community, I’m not from there, I don’t know all of the intricacies of people’s relationships there but I know that they form the political structure and power dynamics of what went on around me. And sometimes I felt at a loss about my exact role as a participatory researcher and whether I should have pushed a little more or just needed to stand back.

I still wonder if by trying to remove myself from the Monplan situation I was doing more harm than good? When Delika and I were in Monplan and the suggestion was made that the women there come to visit Voluntad I had no doubt in my mind that the women would organize and arrange everything without any intervention from me; only my promise to facilitate with the basics was needed and they would take care of everything else. I had wanted so badly for both Haitian women’s groups to be involved in the exchange with Monplan because both groups such different ways of organizing and running their groups and their group projects have (I suppose this is somewhat obvious now).

This whole situation forced me to face some serious questions about my role as someone trying to engage in participatory research. I think in the end I felt that this situation highlighted all of my fears and frustrations with regard to what I had wanted my role to be and what I had wanted to contribute to the community. It highlighted my tenuous relationship with the secular women’s group—which I had been trying for ten months to establish, but with no real luck—and also made me uncomfortable being put into a position of decision-maker which I felt was counter to what I had wanted to cull given my hope for sustainability. Reflecting back now, a scant few weeks later, I would like to think that instead of seeing me as some sort of expert in these matters it was simply a matter of being respectful that I was involved in some way in the process and that maybe I served as a someone to direct and thus diffuse a situation that could have led to bad feelings between the two groups. However I may have liked to have been removed from the situation, I was right smack-dab in the middle of it as per my own actions. Participatory research can be a tightrope sometimes and much as we may try to stay balanced, I believe it is forgivable to falter.

BOOK REVIEW ESSAY

Review Essay on the Anthropology of Modernity

based on Charles Taylor, A Secular Age, Harvard University Press, 2007, 896 pages, $39.95

By Jerome Braun [jbraun@uron.cc]
Independent Scholar

Prof. Taylor’s meditation on the meaning of both secularization, and the religiosity it displaces, has ramifications for the anthropological understanding of modernity. At one time there was a clear-cut division of labor in the U.S. between the sociological studies of modern societies dominated by associations, often rather bureaucratized ones, and anthropological studies of traditional societies organized less on the basis of bureaucratic specializations and more on the basis of communal cultures, communal values, and social roles that served for the most part these values
or the values of interpersonal closeness as in the family. But now modernization produces all kinds of mixed cases, and anthropology is increasingly focused on modern societies, not traditional, communally-based ones.

I learned about Prof. Charles Taylor’s most recent book _A Secular Age_ about the same time that I was reading Prof. Charles Martin’s most recent book _On Secularization: Toward a Revised General Theory_ (Ashgate, 2005) which is itself a follow-up to his classic book _A General Theory of Secularization_ (Blackwell, 1978). Perhaps this is an example at work of Carl Jung’s concept of synchronicity. Or not.

Especially from Prof. Martin’s later book one learns of many developments in modern religion and in its rivals, the spiritualism that is one form that individual experimentation takes in the modern age, and the reactionary conservatism that reacts against the vagueness, the narcissism, and the sheer disorder of modern society, and in the process often suggests a return to a past that never really existed in the form that they imagine it did.

Actually the best essay that I’ve come across on religious evolution is Prof. Robert Bellah’s “Religious Evolution” found in his book _Beyond Belief: Essays on Religion in a Post-Traditional World_ (University of California Press, 1991). From him we learn that “primitive” religion of the simplest tribal societies is based not on worship nor on sacrifice, but on “participation,” acting out in the psychological sense. In ritual participants become identified with the mythical beings they represent, and rituals of initiation into becoming full-fledged members of the community are predominant. Archaic religion reflects the emergence of true cult with the complex of gods, priests, worship, sacrifice, and often divine or priest kings. Here the myth and ritual complex of primitive religion has become systematized and elaborated, and in the process mythical beings are treated as gods and must become placated through sacrifice so that communication between gods and worshippers becomes much more the prerogative of cult specialists, that is to say priests.

Historic religions, of the sort understood through documentation and not archeology and ethnography, have had their belief systems elaborated to the extent that spiritual agency, sometimes gods but often a single God, are considered transcendental and also determinative of the natural order, often through concepts of natural law. The result is a sense of required obedience, and avoidance of its opposite, sin, are thought of as being determinative of moral functioning, reinforced by a belief that natural law exists not only in the community but in nature, or at least that part of nature that is controlled by the spiritual world. Religious knowledge therefore becomes necessary for attaining “enlightenment” (as in the Buddhist tradition) or “salvation” (as in the Christian tradition).

For Bellah the prototype of early modern religion is the Protestant Reformation when attaining salvation became conceived of as requiring less withdrawal from the world than activity in it. The mediation for gaining grace through saints or sheiks or Buddhist monks became replaced by a belief that salvation is available directly to anyone who believes, and hopefully will automatically behave, appropriately. Of course this belief that modern man should be driven by “faith” and not by social or even individual identity eventually proved unstable. Thus pretty much all religious questions concerning the right way to live have survived as dilemmas, and at least the quest for definitive solutions for individual problems that require individual choices and coordination with others who may seek different choices remains unanswered. Religion and its competitors, anti-religion, pseudo-religion, secular philosophies that seek to substitute for religion, and alternative religions each seeking to serve as the basis for personal identity, continue to fight it out for social predominance.

I once read that when a new religion becomes popular in a society, first it’s not understood very well, then finally through good teaching and through mistakes that illustrate the lessons of the religion there results a good understanding of its teachings and their consequences, and then this knowledge too is eventually forgotten. That is an explanation of social evolution in all its sadness and glory that is rarely dealt with in our present-day culture of intellectual specialization where psychological, sociological, historical, and philosophical approaches to understanding human phenomena exist parallel to each other but do not mix much.

Just as political movements are joined for rational and irrational reasons, any number of reasons in fact, just as romantic entanglements are entered into wisely or on the rebound and not so wisely, so do people choose their religion, when they do so and not when this is part of their hereditary identity pure and simple, for many reasons. Evaluating such choices are difficult, just as it has proven difficult to prove which method of psychotherapy works best, the placebo effect is so strong that any method that arouses self-confidence seems to work, at least in the short-run. No doubt if these clients had more intellectual insight or curiosity this wouldn’t be the case and they would ask probing questions, but they don’t, for the most part.

So religions can be chosen, for example in reaction to missionary activities, by a deep understanding of what is
taught, or as a kind of placebo effect in a forced-choice situation where one's previous identity is devalued for whatever reason, and there seems to be offered one alternative for a more meaningful, happier, or even financially more secure life. Where religious identities have become hereditary, which is most of the time, in succeeding generations the details of this new religion may be increasingly understood in all its nuances, or not, or the details may be slowly forgotten, or not.

This takes us to Prof. Taylor’s book and what it can teach us about these processes, and the religious dilemmas of the modern world. First of all, it is obvious Prof. Taylor’s emphasis is on intellectual history, and how interconnected ideas, and this includes value systems, evolve. If I remember correctly, Jacques Barzun in one of his books remarked that during the Renaissance the great return to appreciation of classic Greco-Roman literature was motivated by a desire to get back to naturalistic explanations of reality and to get away from the metaphysical essences of theology. Well, Charles Taylor’s book is filled with theology and philosophy which is used to comment on metaphysical speculations.

It was a long time coming between the rather realistic psychological analyses that can be gleaned from Aristotle and Cicero and the return to the somewhat realistic, non-theologically-based psychology of the last 200 or so years, in America dating back to the influences at its founding from the 18th century’s Age of Reason. Religion as a system of idealism that has its practical consequences in terms of understanding the world and more especially rebuilding social consensus and even reinvigorating individual morale and morality is not discussed to any great degree in this book, though religion as a source of philosophies of life is discussed to a great degree, and quite well too. But depth psychology, why people feel better or estranged or engage in wishful thinking or what is the relation between the rational and the irrational components of human motivation (a discussion most influenced by Freud because he basically started it in the modern era and the discussion he started is still continuing though with much dissension) is not much discussed, though he does make some attempts at the end of the book.

To take an example of what is discussed in the culmination of this book, after Prof. Taylor discusses religious history (mostly the history of philosophies with some emphasis on their relevance for developing religious philosophies), there is his discussion of the secular philosophy of modernism, originating in humanistic attitudes but slowly the cynicism has crept up among the intellectual classes, and implicitly, though he doesn’t go into much detail, the more popular version of this for people who grow tired of prideful contemplation of one’s angst, post-modernism.

The end result is in many ways a book in the tradition of existentialism, and he is on the side of religious existentialism (perhaps he would feel at home with the work of Martin Buber and Gabriel Marcel) and not atheistic existentialism (Jean-Paul Sartre is probably not his cup of tea). Thus he seems to be more on the side of the modernists and the existentialists than the post-modernists and the ironists. For what his history of modern philosophies of life culminates in is showing how the replacement of the supernatural claims of religion, starting especially with the growth in 18th century Europe of Deism (the clockwork universe and all that), led to the growth in the 19th century of philosophies of humanism, but then later on to disillusionment with humanism too.

And so optimistic humanism became replaced by pessimistic humanism of the existentialist sort which accepted if it did not outright relish angst, and loneliness, and expressions of the ongoing, often rather fearful, feeling-states that Christian (and Stoic and Buddhist for that matter) self-control had tried to sweep under the rug, often with claims for justification in the next world, if not in this one. Humanism had specialized in asking for salvation in this world, and then political and cultural (such as nationalistic) movements had made a hash of that, and so now at this point in history post-modernists have settled in to a life of irony and enjoying the trivial escapisms of pop culture as if there is no basis anymore for “authentic” feeling, with simulated feelings being the next best thing.
Prof. Taylor’s book becomes most interesting near the end starting with the “Religion Today” chapter when he gives lots more examples of behavior and attitudes than he did in the earlier parts of the book, but this is also the section when analysis starts to break down and consists much more of descriptions consisting of the “no atheists in foxholes” sort together with a certain distance he maintains from the secular elites of Western Europe who needed religion once to justify their right to rule, but now seem to do well enough without it, and also they get to be less guilty about their hedonistic excesses in the bargain.

He basically concludes that a cynical humanism is a contradiction in terms, and he would like Christianity to remain a cultural model for those who reject it as a religious model. His examples are moving for the intellectual, somewhat like going to a good opera but with less music and more wordiness, but down-to-earth descriptions of religiosity and hypocrisy are somewhat lacking. Why Santa Claus and the Easter Bunny are such noticeable parts of present-day American religious celebrating, as if the celebrating part has overwhelmed the religious part, is not really discussed by him. He offers a rationale for being religious for intellectual elites, certainly in a cultural sense. For the mass of people, a discussion of their common fate, not intellectuals’ angst, would make a good next step. Nevertheless he does provide a useful beginning.

Regarding Paul Rabinow’s *Marking Time: On the Anthropology of the Contemporary*, just as Prof. Taylor elaborates on the attitudes underlying the “there are no atheists in foxholes” argument without providing the evidence whether those attitudes are justified by anything other than the angst of existential dilemmas, so does Prof. Rabinow elaborate on the choices opened up by modernity, particularly conditions for social change opened up by science and technology, and then elaborated by industrial civilization. He tells us that science opens up more opportunities to fiddle with the boundaries between nature and culture, but how to develop standards to govern this is not really elaborated other than telling us it all depends on what in fact is discovered and how it impacts upon people. Like the work of his mentor Michel Foucault, he introduces people to whole fields of scholarship, but in such an elementary way those already familiar with those fields may accuse both of them of belaboring the obvious.

Nowadays anthropologists face the dilemma that they rarely have pristine, non-contaminated by exposure to “modern” culture cultures to study, so that the cultures they do get to study, colonized cultures, Creole cultures, cultures made up of elements from various times and places just are complex and hard to evaluate. This is particularly true in regard to whether these cultures exist because of conformity to those with power, and to what extent the cultures exist because of freely-chosen decisions, in the process producing a functional fit between means and ends in that culture, as well various combinations of “authentic” cultures and “colonized” cultures.

In summary, Prof. Rabinow’s book is a discussion of the provisionally of knowledge, and how in the modern world we use experts to frame the discussion of knowledge, I would say perhaps in a consoling manner, perhaps in a probabilistic manner so as to help plan insurance schemes against failure, perhaps to provide entertainment so as to appeal to wishful thinking. Does he offer more specificity than this? Not really, no more than Prof. Taylor gives reasons to be religious. Both of them are trying to illustrate the conditions of knowledge production, Prof. Rabinow showing the kinds of cultural environments in which science is produced and used, which does not attest to the truth of science, just as Prof. Taylor shows how the phenomenology of religion produces the raw material for psychological discussions, whether or not these cultural creations are a true psychology in a scientific sense.

Prof. Rabinow mentions the importance of setting up distinctions as a starting point for scholarly endeavor. He gives the examples for the study of history of the birth of historical consciousness, the actualization of political and social freedom, the emergence of a self-reflective subject, risk society, the disenchantment of the world, and the triumph of alienation. He doesn’t explore any of these issues in detail, but in this small, little book he tells us these issues are important. And I imagine they are. Toward the end of his book his examples of setting up a standpoint for scholarship, what it means to have a point of view and to be self-reflexive, becomes somewhat more concrete. I particularly enjoyed his discussion of the ancient Greek historian Thucydides and how in his *The Peloponnesian War* he invented likely speeches because I imagine they did not have our methodologies for determining the accuracy of documents, and they knew enough about the conditions that led to the war, which we long-removed from their position do not know, that the exact reproduction of the speeches wasn’t important to them the way it is important to...
Prof. Rabinow does have a certain amount of insider’s knowledge, and his stories about such things as developments in the life sciences will be just as interesting for some as stories by village elders about developments in their societies. Do we learn much that is new, especially regarding anthropological research methodology or for theory-building? Not really. So read him for the stories.

Religion as a psychological experience produces around it various philosophies of religion that comment on religion as a “search for meaning” without providing any ultimate proof of a religion’s veracity. Likewise the conditions that produce science produce a provisionally of knowledge that may or may not produce science that is empirically true. Thus science in a basic sense as the experimental method has a fact-checking capability but science in the broader sense of organized wisdom as in “political science” does not. Ultimately the musing of these writers have relevance for studying the angst of everyday life, for example the way people are affected by population growth, economic inflation, and the loss of perceived credibility in inherited religion and/or culture as well as backlash against this loss. This is because both books are relevant to the epistemology of wisdom-seeking in scholarship. But unlike science they offer few new facts and no new experiments. Just as philosophy of science is not science, philosophy of religion is not religion, and philosophy of anthropology is not anthropology. Philosophy provides a depth of knowledge for evaluating facts produced by other means, but even applied anthropology must resort to philosophy sparingly or otherwise face the prospect that wishful thinking and ideology will substitute for factual knowledge about the reality of people’s lives.

SFAA NEWS

The Malinowski Award: A Brief History

By Ann McElroy [mcelroy@buffalo.edu]
Dept. of Anthropology, University at Buffalo

The SfAA honors its intellectual ancestors through established traditions, as do many scholarly groups. For the past 36 years, the Society has given the Bronislaw Malinowski Award to a scientist of senior status who has significantly contributed to “the goal of solving human problems using the concepts and tools of social science” [www.sfaa.net/Malinowski]. Having been associated with the award committee for six years, as a member and then as chair from 2002 to 2005, it is a pleasure to write a brief history and critique for the SfAA newsletter.

First, an observation on the custom of giving honorary awards, a cultural phenomenon often associated with banquets, graduations, and annual meetings: distributing honors to notable community members is entrenched in North American society and probably in much of Europe. It reinforces values and rewards hard work, while casting illumination on the organization or community for having such illustrious members.

Not all cultures recognize achievement through certificates, medals, and speeches. In 41 years of working with Canadian Inuit, I have observed that many are bemused by the certificates and plaques a family accumulates over years of interacting with European Canadian institutions. One elder pointed out the varied spelling of his name and the fact that his last and first name were frequently reversed on his certificates. He also commented that he hadn’t done anything special other than living longer than most of his peers.

The SfAA gives a lot of awards, eight altogether. Some go to young, rising stars (e.g., the Margaret Mead Award), others to seasoned veterans (e.g., the Sol Tax Award), and some to students. The Peter K. New Award is an especially prestigious and competitive student award for a research paper on health. There is no question that this organization strives to mentor young researchers and practitioners and to honor older ones while they are still alive.

Society for Applied Anthropology
The Malinowski Award is probably the most prestigious of these eight, judging from the fact that it is scheduled last and is given the most time during the Friday night award sessions at the annual meetings. After biographical introductions, accolades, and sentimental or humorous anecdotes from colleagues and former students, the honoree receives a stunning silver medallion made by Emory Sekaquàptewa, a Hopi artist, lawyer, and lecturer in anthropology at the University of Arizona (Weaver 2002:11). The honoree also receives a framed certificate and then delivers a plenary lecture on his or her work (later published in *Human Organization*).

The original Malinowski Award, made possible by an anonymous donor, was first announced in 1950 and was granted in 1952. There were three awards based on submission of an unpublished paper: first and second prize for professionals and a special student award. Henry F. Dobyns won the first professional prize, although he was a student at the time, and Leonard R. Sayles won the second prize. The reviewers were unable to award the student prize to any of the papers submitted (Weaver 2002). For the following twenty-one years, a time of financial difficulty and turnover in leadership for the SfAA, the award was not granted (Gallaher 2008).

In 1968, Thomas Weaver, a member of the Executive Board, started lobbying the Board to reinvent the award, and two years later, the Board announced its decision to reinstate the Malinowski Award, specifying that it be made annually to a senior-status social scientist for “sustained accomplishment rather than a single paper” (Weaver 2002:2). Three years later, 1973, Gonzalo Aguirre Beltrán received the first award under the new system; he is considered the first Malinowski Award winner (Weaver 2002:2).

A tally of the 37 honorees between 1973 and 2008 shows the following distribution: 32 anthropologists, two sociologists, two physician-anthropologists, and one economist were selected. Twenty-nine men and eight women, and three persons of color or of indigenous background received the award. Twenty-eight were living or working in the U.S., four in Latin America, four in Europe (including the U.K.) and one in Asia (Fei Xiaotung - Peoples Republic of China - in 1980). (There were 37 awards in 36 years because the 1998 award was granted to Robert and Beverly Hackenberg).

Although the committee encourages nominations of women, international scholars, and people of color, the method of choosing an awardee has generally tipped the balance toward white males and U.S. citizens. There is no overt discrimination in deliberations, but the process itself creates disparities in who is considered and who receives the award. My critique here is based on the decision processes of the committees on which I served; copies of correspondence before 1999 suggest that earlier dynamics were similar, although possibly less formal.

The method hinges on the committee (five SfAA members appointed by the organization’s president) reviewing nominations sent by supporters of an individual or from the individual him/herself. A nomination package includes a complete *curriculum vitae*, letters of support (including a lengthy nominating letter), and publications. A nominee’s name remains in a pool five years and is fully considered for the award each year. The rationale for this time limit was never made clear to me. Some committees prefer not to use a hierarchical system of giving greater consideration to candidates who are in their fourth or fifth year, so it is possible that outstanding candidates can be displaced by new nominations and consequently be forced out of the pool after the time limit.

As far as I know, the committee has never nominated individuals directly, nor has it formally solicited nominations from supporters for specific individuals. (Informally, members do issue pleas for more women and international figures, but there is no quota system). The committee is bound to review only the nominations that have been submitted, rather than considering a wider range of names. In any given year, the pool of candidates ranges from a low of six to a high of fourteen. With such a high number, the committee has a lot of work and may have difficulty achieving consensus, but expansion of the nominee pool increases diversity.

Submitting a nomination is a large task, requiring an organized effort with persuasive documentation - not unlike the academic tenure and promotion process. The escalating standard for nomination packages may discourage our colleagues from nominating individuals who deserve consideration. Our Executive Board would do well to consider creative solutions to problematic aspects of soliciting nominations, setting time limits for nominees, and selecting awardees. For example, the traditional emphasis on recognizing individuals has precluded consideration of giving the award to research teams or organizations that have done exemplary applied work. If the Award Committee, collaborating with the Board, can develop greater flexibility in its policies and procedures, the prestige of the Malinowski Award will remain high in the coming decades.
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*Society for Applied Anthropology*
Hackenberg Memorial Lecture to Kickoff at the Santa Fe Meetings

By Don Stull [stull@ku.edu]
University of Kansas

The 69th annual meeting of the SfAA in Santa Fe in March 2009 will mark the inaugural Robert A. Hackenberg Memorial Lecture on Advancing Applied Social Science. A panel discussion and reception will follow. Lunch with the Hackenberg lecturer will also be arranged for a limited number of students.

Robert A. Hackenberg, professor emeritus of anthropology at the University of Colorado, died at age 79 in Boulder, Colorado, on April 22, 2007, following heart surgery. Hackenberg was internationally known for research and practice in the American Southwest, Southeast Asia, and Latin America, as well as his contributions to theory, method, and graduate training. He was primary graduate advisor to more than 60 professional anthropologists. Bob was an active and influential fellow of the SfAA throughout his distinguished career. He was nominated for its presidency in 1975; was honored, along with his wife Beverly, as the 1999 co-recipient of the Malinowski Award; and served as associate editor of Human Organization from 1970 through 1976 and 1999 through 2004. He and Beverly were the driving force behind the creation of the Del Jones Student Travel Award.

Hackenberg’s two primary domains of research interest were in developing countries and indigenous peoples, and there are growing numbers of scholars and practitioners from these backgrounds who are making significant and lasting contributions to applied social science.

Many within the SfAA have long expressed the need to bring more international applied social scientists to our meetings. The Hackenberg Memorial Lecture is a major step in that direction. It will fund travel and lodging expenses for an international or indigenous professional to attend the annual meeting and address our membership on innovative developments in practice or application or proposed future directions for applied social science. The lecture will not only provide an opportunity for our membership to think about applied social science in new ways and learn about exciting developments in the social sciences in parts of the world where the SfAA may not have a significant presence. It will also provide an opportunity for our members to hear from a productive applied social scientist who might not otherwise attend our annual meeting.

The Hackenberg Memorial Lecture Fund and Call for Donations

The SfAA Board voted unanimously to approve the proposal for a Hackenberg Memorial Lecture on December 1, 2007. The Hackenberg Memorial Lecture will be funded by interest earned on endowment funds, which are maintained in the Annual Awards Trust.

The Hackenberg Memorial Committee and the SfAA Board of Directors have set a goal of $40,000 to endow the lecture, which will be held biannually. These funds will pay for the lecturer’s travel, lodging at the meeting hotel, and a reception and student lunch. If funds permit, a modest honorarium will also be provided.

The endowment has already raised more than $15,000, thanks to the generosity of the Hackenberg family, memorial fund committee members, and many others. The SfAA Board authorized an additional $10,000 in matching funds. As a result, the endowment is well on its way to reaching its target of $40,000. But additional donations are needed to ensure adequate funding for this important new initiative to recognize individuals at the peak of their professional productivity, those who are actively charting the future course for applied social science.
Donations to the lecture fund are tax deductible. Checks can be made out to the:

Hackenberg Memorial Lecture Fund  
SfAA  
P.O. Box 2436  
Oklahoma City, OK 73101.

You may also contact the SfAA office by phone (405-843-5113) or e-mail (tom@sfaa.net) to arrange for credit or debit card deductions.

Call for Nominations

Candidates for the Hackenberg Memorial Lecture on Advancing Applied Social Science will be drawn from among applied social scientists who are in mid-career, and preference will be given to international and indigenous professionals. Although the lecture topics will be open, lecturers will be selected with attention to those who share the special interests of Robert Hackenberg, which included medical social science, development, population dynamics, research methods, globalization, the future of application and practice in the social sciences, and the relationship between theory and practice. The selection committee will look favorably on those candidates whose lecture would provide an international or indigenous perspective on the theme of the annual meeting, which is “Global Challenge, Local Action: Ethical Engagement, Partnerships, and Practice.”

Candidates may be nominated by any SfAA member, and self-nominations will be accepted. Nominations should consist of a letter of nomination, describing the individual’s background, contribution to advancing applied social science, and lecture topic or title. The letter of nomination must be accompanied by a resume or short vita, not to exceed two (2) pages, and the names and contact information for two references.

Final selection of the lecturer will be made by the Hackenberg Memorial Lecture Committee, whose members serve staggered three-year terms. Current members are Diane Austin, Kerry Feldman, Beverly Heckart Hackenberg, Mark Grey, Craig Janes, Peter Kunstadter, Tom May, and Don Stull (chair). Selection criteria include:

Required

* scholars or practitioners in mid-career whose work is at the forefront of applied social science

Preferred

* international applied social scientists, especially those from developing nations or countries with limited representation in the SfAA  
* indigenous applied social scientists, including American Indians and Alaskan Natives and native peoples from countries other than the United States  
* applied social scientists with a focus on medical social science, development, population dynamics, research methods, globalization, the future of application and practice in the social sciences, or the relationship between theory and practice  
* a lecturer whose topic speaks to the theme of the annual meeting  
* engaging and dynamic speaker

Other considerations

* someone not otherwise likely to attend the SfAA annual meeting, due to financial constraints for applied social scientists from developing countries

Nomination Deadline

Nominations and accompanying materials should be sent to the SfAA Office by October 15, 2008. Electronic submissions are preferred.

Bea Medicine Travel Award

By SfAA Bea Medicine Award Committee Members

Society for Applied Anthropology
As with American anthropology generally, from its beginning the Society for Applied Anthropology--albeit an interdisciplinary organization--had strong links to American Indian peoples. For SFAA members, however, research on Indians was never just "science for the sake of science" but aimed characteristically to be useful for Native people in the modern world. See, for example, the SFAA on-line publication by Peter Jones and Darby Stapp (2005) listing Native American related articles in *Human Organization* and *Practicing Anthropology*. In fact, one of the 1940s founders of both the Society for Applied Anthropology and the National Congress of American Indians was the American Indian anthropologist D’Arcy McNickle, a member of the Salish-Kootenai tribe of the Flathead reservation.

By the mid-1990s, SFAA was drifting away from strong associations with American Indians, while anthropology on the whole was losing some of its luster as the preeminent discipline in American Indian research. Likewise, despite the auspicious precedent set by D’Arcy McNickle, the SFAA counted very, very few Native American anthropologists among its members. One notable exception was the late Lakota Indian anthropologist Beatrice Medicine. Affectionately known to many as “Bea,” Dr. Medicine became for all of American anthropology the exemplar of possibilities for personal synthesis of “being Indian” and “being an anthropologist.” Sue-Ellen Jacobs in her touching remembrance (*SFAA Newsletter*, February 2006, page 4) wrote that Bea Medicine’s “work as an applied anthropologist embodied her personal, cultural, and ethical values.”

In the late 1990s, SFAA took some steps toward regaining its historic bearings with North American Native peoples. Bea Medicine approved of these efforts and favorably noted them in her Malinowski Award address in 1996. Two legacies of those efforts to restore SFAA’s place in “American Indian studies” continue and are beginning to flourish. One is the Topical Interest Group on Native American peoples. The other is establishment of a travel award for Native American students to attend the Society’s annual meetings.

Several years ago, SFAA Fellow Sarah Robinson made a “seed money” gift to establish a travel award for Native American students. Before Bea Medicine’s death, Bea herself worked on developing criteria and procedures for selecting awardees. After Bea’s death in December 2005, several people at the 2006 SFAA annual meeting began discussing how best to honor Bea Medicine. The eventual result was deciding to name the travel award in honor of Bea Medicine (announced in February 2007), mounting a campaign to fully fund the award, and naming a committee to launch the award. The committee consists of Sue-Ellen Jacobs, Faye Harrison, Anthony Paredes, and Bea’s son, Ted Garner.

Only 18 months after formal announcement of the Beatrice Medicine Travel Award, in June 2008 SFAA executive director Tom May reported to the committee that $15,450 had already been raised for the Award. Under current SFAA policy, this is more than enough to request from the Board of Directors a matching amount to provide sufficient earnings to fund the award on a modest, continuing basis. Nonetheless, with today’s ever-escalating travel costs, more money is needed to make the award truly attractive and worthwhile, particularly for students at distant venues from annual meetings.

As SFAA members renew their memberships, they are asked to please consider making a contribution to the Bea Medicine Travel Award.

Any ideas about publicizing or administering the award will be welcomed by the Bea Medicine Travel Award committee. Send those ideas to the SFAA business office. Through the Bea Medicine Travel Award, SFAA hopes do its part to foster in future generations more of the likes of D’Arcy McNickle and—most especially—Beatrice Medicine. Big shoes to fill, indeed, are those of brave American Indian scholars who have stood stalwartly loyal to anthropology as a “noble and useful science.”

**Gender Based Violence, Part II: The Global Crisis**

By Hillary Haldane [Hillary.Haldane@quinnipiac.edu]
Quinnipiac University

Jennifer R. Wies [wiesj@xavier.edu]
Xavier University

*Society for Applied Anthropology*
As introduced in the May, 2008 SfAA Newsletter, the Gender Based Violence Topical Interest Group (GBV TIG) welcomes participants and contributors who study GBV within the United States and across the globe. We are particularly interested in bringing together scholars committed to theorizing GBV in various contexts while marrying our research results to practical solutions. One aim of the TIG is to provide a forum to assess the way scholarship on GBV reflects and rectifies the professionalized boundaries between groups attempting to assist victims and prevent further violence. The boundaries tend to coalesce around three domains: political and legal responses (courts, policy, criminal justice, police, lawmakers); medical and health responses (community clinics, hospitals, emergency shelters, doctors, psychologists and counselors, public health and epidemiological experts); and educational and social movement responses (activists, grassroots organizations, university based training, batterer and victim facilitated groups). While these domains are porous and practitioners move between them, the TIG hopes to facilitate robust scholarly and practice-oriented communication across professionalized boundaries.

Another aim of the TIG is to learn more about research focused on transnational venues, where policymakers and cosmopolitan elites determine how to categorize GBV and what the proposed consequences will be for non-compliant states and individuals. We also wish to establish a forum for scholars who work at the local level, witnessing the everyday acts of volunteers and victims, lawyers and perpetrators, counselors and clients, whose quotidian labor and experiences of violence are the hard surfaces and realities of GBV.

Does Gender Based Violence Exist Everywhere?

As anthropologists we have been trained to see experiences and understand categories of meaning from “the native’s point of view.” In this vein, the TIG wishes to explore questions and concerns at the heart of our discipline: can we claim that GBV exists in all societies, or are we at risk of exporting our own categories of meaning to our fieldwork sites and filtering our collaborators’ and informants’ experiences through our own lens? With this disciplinary conundrum in mind, we seek participants who are eager to discuss issues that are not amenable to simple categorization. Examples we have in mind include male and female genital cuttings and bodily alterations; male and female sexual labor/exploitation; notions of acceptable behavior within marriage and over the life course of a household; treatment of children and elders; as well as cultural categories such as domestic violence, family violence, sexual assault and abuse.

Anthropologists have much to contribute in the area of GBV. Our ethnographic attention to detail and careful documentation of the human condition can assist the work of practitioners who are working diligently to create programs and policy addressing violence. Dorothy Ayers Counts, in her 1990 special issue of Pacific Studies set the tone for how we can simultaneously document acts that are considered abusive within their own context and make connections to international efforts to prevent such abuse from continuing. More recently, Holly Wardlow’s Wayward Women (2006) explores the meanings of abusive acts and renders them in Huli terms, rather than imposing Western descriptive modes onto Huli experiences. At the same time, our TIG wants to invite the participation of those researchers who operate with internationally shared categories of abuse, and seek to make comparisons from one context to another. Support for this orientation comes most urgently from the recent World Health Organization’s 2005 report WHO Multi-country Study on Women’s Health and Domestic Violence against Women. The WHO study, carried out with 24,000 women in ten countries found, on average, that between 23% and 49% of women experience some form of physical violence and between 10% and 50% of women experience some form of sexual violence. The study took into account differences between rural and urban locations, as well as measured respondents’ attitudes towards violence.

Our disciplinary research methods are well positioned to bring the stories, experiences, and efforts to help victims to light. We hope to help the general public, as well as our colleagues, gain a sense of the people who make up the statistics. There is plenty to be done on GBV issues--join GBV TIG and let’s work together.

Notes
i. This phrase comes from Geertz (1973:30).
ii. See Christina Toren’s work on Fijian notions of veilomani and veidomani and hierarchy in relationships (1994).
iii. For a copy of the full report go to http://www.who.int/gender/violence/who_multicountry_study/en/
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SfAA Public Policy Committee Update

by Emilia Gonzalez-Clements [dsaintl@aol.com]
Director, Fifth Sun Development Fund

The Public Policy Committee (PPC) is a special committee of the Society for Applied Anthropology. The PPC has two main functions: 1) help prepare proposed policy statements submitted by SfAA members for board consideration, and 2) provide training to increase Society members’ understanding and skills for involvement in the policy arenas of their expertise and interest.

Members are appointed by the SfAA board. Current members are:

Mary Ellen Cohane, Assistant Professor, Department of English-Communications, Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts, North Adams, MA (Mary.Ellen.Cohane@mcla.edu)

Emilia González-Clements, Ph.D., Founder and Director, Fifth Sun Development Fund, Portland, Oregon (Chair) (egc@fsdf.org) or (dsaintl@aol.com).

Janice Harper, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Anthropology, University of Tennessee-Knoxville (jharper7@utk.edu)

Katherine Metzo, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Anthropology, University of North Carolina-Charlotte (kmetzo@uncc.edu)

Nancy Owen-Lewis, Ph.D., Director, Scholar Program, School of American Research, Santa Fe, New Mexico (lewis@sarsf.org)

Merrill Eisenberg, University of Arizona, serves as SfAA Board liaison. (merrill@u.arizona.edu)

This past year, the Committee worked on two resolutions for policy statements, one involving the Employee Free Choice Act and the other urging the National Park Service to fill the vacancy of the Chief Ethnographer position.

As part of the training function, PPC members and volunteers present workshops, sessions and open fora at the annual conference. Other materials include the following web-based resources:

- Policy Statements and Submission Guidelines
- Policy Papers
- Annotated Bibliography on Anthropology and Public Policy
- Public Policy Syllabi
- Policy Forum Bulletin Board

Committee members are working on a “Policy Tools” component for the web site (http://www.sfaa.net/committees/policy.html) Information will include how to write effective recommendations for policy statements, descriptions of the US federal policy-making process and key points where anthropological knowledge, effectively presented, can make an essential difference, and how to develop rapport with and gain the confidence of key staff and members of Congress to assist them in the policy process. The materials are based on a workshop presented at the Vancouver conference in 2006 by a former senior staffer for the US. House of Representatives Committee on Agriculture and a technical expert with extensive experience in policy formulation.

Readers are invited to view the web site and submit papers, syllabi or ideas for policy tools to PPC Chair Emilia Gonzalez-Clements at 503-860-4808 or egc@fsdf.org or dsaintl@aol.com.
The deadline for session abstracts for next year’s annual meeting in Santa Fe, New Mexico is fast approaching. This year’s theme is “Global Challenge, Local Action.” As a TIG we have the ability to sponsor member sessions; please let me know as soon as possible if any TIG members are planning a session that would be relevant for the TIG to sponsor.

Similarly, I am interested in forming a roundtable session that would explore and discuss local indigenous people’s actions (individually or culturally) to challenges that can be attributed to global forces. For example, last July 24 Indigenous Peoples Issues Today (http://indigenousissuestoday.blogspot.com) published a list of blogs written by indigenous peoples and/or issues affecting them locally. Reading these blogs indicates that there are many ways in which local indigenous peoples are challenging global forces in terms of natural resource management, human rights, racism, sovereignty, and many other issues. This roundtable would explore methods and specific actions indigenous peoples have used in dealing with forces tied to global processes.

As usual, if anyone has any information they would like to contribute to the mailing list, please forward it to me (pnj@bauuinstitute.com). Also, if there are any individuals who are interested in joining the mailing list, please send me an email and I will put you on. We maintain a fairly active list with regular postings of Call for Papers, News Items, Job Announcements, and other items.


Expanded Opportunities
Introducing Applied Educational Anthropology (TIG)

By Brian Lagotte, [lagotte@wisc.edu]
University of Wisconsin - Madison

Over the past few years, there has been a growing interest from various quarters of the SfAA to tackle issues related to education and schooling. In an effort to consolidate these perspectives and open opportunities for stronger collaboration, SfAA members met in 2005 at the Santa Fe meetings to discuss a new Topical Interest Group for Applied Educational Anthropology (AEA). Jim Mullooly, current chair of the TIG, has provided some initial greetings:

“As the newly elected chair of the AEA, I want to encourage everyone to visit our new blog at appliededucation.wordpress.com. It includes more details about the AEA, opportunities for readers to contribute their reports from the field, and simple tools to organize panels for the 2009 meetings.

Our brief history has been exciting thus far. We became a formal TIG at the 2006 meeting and organized a number of interesting panels around the applied anthropology of education at the 2007 and 2008 meetings. Additionally, a group of panelists at the 2007 meeting, under the guest editorial leadership of Janise Hurtig and Brinnie Ramsey have written a set of papers for the Spring 2008 Issue of PA (Vol. 30, No. 2) entitled, ‘Exploring Anthropological Approaches to School Reform.’

With an energetic Board and an enthusiastic Advisory Council, we look forward to a very active year. At the 2009 meeting of the SfAA, we plan to unveil a new AEA logo. We will be returning to Santa Fe, where in 2005 we had the initial planning meeting about the development of the AEA. As we consider this the symbolic birthplace of the
AE, we will be organizing a logo contest based on the cultural images and artifacts of Santa Fe, New Mexico.” –Jim Mullooly.

As Jim mentions, over the next year we hope to consolidate sessions related to education for the 2009 conference. This will be for two broad goals: first, it will provide chances for like-minded thinkers to form panels on similar topics, which can be a catalyst for further research collaboration; second, it will increase the audiences for education panels with more efficient organization. Basically, the AEA can serve as a clearinghouse for SfAA members interested in education issues and create a more vibrant interaction at the annual meetings.

The AEA also emphasizes an interest in education as a broader category, rather than just the anthropological study of schooling. Several panels at the 2007 Memphis meetings illustrated this wider scope and the group strives to create a greater dialogue among these participants. This conversation shall include all persons interested in education who may identify as anthropologists, professionals, educators, policy designers, or any combination of possible roles. More on the purpose of the group can be found at the website.

And please do take Jim’s advice and visit our website to become more acquainted with what the group has to offer. While we are a new start-up and still (very) small, we do feel there is need to combine efforts. Currently, there appears to be many small groups of brilliant thinkers doing powerful work. There is no telling what could be accomplished with a more cumulative project. We look forward to hearing from you over the year and seeing everyone next spring in Santa Fe.

A Call to Activism: Involvement in the Work of the Human Rights and Social Justice Committee

by Peter Van Arsdale, Chair [pvanarsd@du.edu]
University of Denver

The Human Rights and Social Justice (HRSJ) Committee of the Society for Applied Anthropology invites your involvement in its work. As the newest standing committee of the society, it works for (and reports directly to) its board. Our board liaison is Prof. Robert Alvarez of the University of California, San Diego. As noted in an earlier edition of this newsletter, our committee serves as a “point of first contact” for members and the general public regarding issues of human rights and social justice, reviewing issues identified as important and targeting areas of service and research. After review, key postings can be made to the SfAA website. Education is a primary committee function.

A simple model which I have developed can be employed. Not named for the American Anthropological Association, it nonetheless coincidentally is the “AAA model,” standing for awareness, action, and advocacy. It is clearly issue-oriented and, in a sense, sequential (step-by-step). Awareness provides the foundation. This can come through class work, library study, or basic field research. A thorough understanding of the issue, in context, is essential. Action builds on awareness. The “doing” may involve applied field research, paid participation in a community development project, volunteerism, or contributing to policy development. It can occur close to home or at a distance. Advocacy builds on both awareness and action. In this model, it can only take place effectively after the advocate has immersed him/herself in the issue, has engaged in actions that bring it to life, and is ready to effectively put forth a specific point-of-view. The advocate must be so well versed that s/he can debate two sides, while promulgating one. Advocacy is demonstrated in fora (e.g., as torture and rendition are debated), in demonstrations (e.g., as labor rights are promoted), and in political circles (e.g., as the human rights impacts of Middle Eastern wars are considered). Sometimes advocacy is engaged in concert with those who have been victimized. Sometimes it is proactive; often it is reactive.

The result of this is activism, the combination of awareness, action, and advocacy, as evidenced (in the case of our society) in the work of many applied anthropologists. The HRSJ Committee encourages members’ contributions - through this column and through participation in the annual meetings - such that the process of activism, and its outcomes, can be considered. The committee does not take stances, tout particular agendas, or promote specific policies. Again, education is our by-word.

Our educational thrust will be evidenced in Santa Fe in 2009. With the theme “Global Challenge, Local Action: Ethical Engagement, Partnerships and Practice,” the next annual meeting will prove an ideal venue for presentations.

Society for Applied Anthropology
involving human rights and social justice. The biosketches for each of our five HRSJ committee members appear below; please be in touch with that person or persons whose interests best match yours, as you contemplate abstract submissions prior to the October 15th deadline. Other thrusts also are welcomed.

**Biosketch for Mark A. Grey**

Mark A. Grey received his Ph.D. in Applied Anthropology from the University of Colorado-Boulder. He is Professor of Anthropology at the University of Northern Iowa, and also serves as Director of the Iowa Center for Immigrant Leadership and Integration. The Center is an award-winning program that provides consultation, training, and publications to Iowa communities, churches, organizations, and employers as they deal with the unique challenges and opportunities associated with influxes of immigrant and refugee newcomers. He is also Associate Director of the Iowa Center on Health Disparities. He has published extensively in academic journals on immigration in the Midwest including recent articles in *The Journal of Latino-Latin American Studies* and *Applied Research in Economic Development*. He has also published extensively for non-academic audiences. His handbooks include *New Americans*, *New Iowans*, and *Welcoming New Iowans: A Guide for Managers and Supervisors*. Among several honors, he received the Remington Award, Iowa’s highest award for the promotion of public health, and the Iowa Regents Award for Faculty Excellence. (mark.grey@uni.edu)

**Biosketch for Diane E. King**

Diane E. King is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Kentucky. She did her Ph.D. work at Washington State University, finishing in 2000, and also holds degrees from San Diego State University and Westmont College. She has a long history working in areas of human rights and social justice. Immediately after college, she worked for the national office of the Public Interest Research Group. She conducted her first ethnographic research in Southeast Asia, where she began to acquire a concern for both the misuses of state power (such as limits on freedom of expression) and the more brutal dividends of the global economy (for example, in the case of women who had left their villages to work in factories for pay that was only pennies more than their daily cost of living). Since 1995, she has focused on the Middle East. She was a resettlement counselor for World Relief Refugee Services in Seattle, helping newly-arrived Kurdish asylees adjust to life in the United States. She taught at American University of Beirut from 2000 to 2006. She makes regular trips to her main research site, the Kurdistan Region of Iraq. Her writing in the areas of migration, identity, kinship and gender regularly touches on issues of rights and justice. (deking@uky.edu)

**Biosketch for Mark Schuller**

Mark Schuller is Assistant Professor of Anthropology and African American Studies at York College, the City University of New York. He conducted two-plus years of anthropological fieldwork in Haiti, and several months of research in Washington, Brussels, and Geneva. He has published four peer-reviewed articles and two book chapters about Haiti. His co-edited volume, *Homing Devices: The Poor as Targets of Public Housing Policy and Practice*, culminated four years of experience working as a grassroots organizer in Minnesota, particularly with the St. Paul Tenants Union. He is also co-editor of *Capitalizing on Catastrophe: Neoliberal Strategies in Disaster Reconstruction*. As an applied anthropologist, he has been involved in many grassroots campaigns and organizations, such as PUEBLO, Voices for Global Justice, and Jubilee (debt cancellation), as well as an ad-hoc coalition in response to the recent food crisis in Haiti and elsewhere. In addition to applied anthropological research, he maintains a focus on social justice and human rights through teaching, with substantial experience directing students’ service learning activities. (mschuller@vassar.edu)

**Biosketch for Jason L. Simms**

Jason L. Simms is a graduate student at the University of South Florida in Tampa, where he is enrolled in a dual-degree program leading to a Ph.D. in Applied Anthropology and an M.P.H. in Environmental Health, as well as a graduate certificate in Geographic Information Systems (GIS). Previously, he earned a B.A. in Classics and an M.A. in Anthropology, both from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. At USF, he is a Graduate Multidisciplinary Scholar, working with faculty and students from Civil & Environmental Engineering, Chemical Engineering, and Global Health, in addition to Anthropology, on water, sanitation, and health projects relating to the United Nations Millennium Development Goals. His research interests include political ecology, social and environmental justice, and human
rights, with a specific focus on the political, economic, social, health, and environmental consequences of inadequate potable water and sanitation. (jsimms2@mail.usf.edu)

**Biosketch for Peter Van Arsdale**

Peter Van Arsdale is Senior Lecturer at the Josef Korbel School of International Studies at the University of Denver. Through June, 2006, he served as faculty advisor to its Center On Rights Development (CORD), a graduate student organization which sponsors human rights activities. Through June, 2008, he served as director of the school’s new Program in Humanitarian Assistance. Trained as an applied cultural and medical anthropologist, with a sub-speciality in refugee studies, he earned his Ph.D. at the University of Colorado-Boulder. He has conducted fieldwork in the United States, Romania, Bosnia, Palestine, Indonesia, Sudan, Ethiopia, Guyana, Peru, and El Salvador, and has just helped initiate a program in East Timor with Nobel Peace Laureate José Ramos-Horta. He is a former staff member of the Colorado Division of Mental Health and researcher for the Colorado Mental Health Institute. Among a number of publications, he most recently authored *Forced to Flee: Human Rights and Human Wrongs in Refugee Homelands*. He co-founded The Denver Hospice and the Rocky Mountain Survivors Center. In 2002 he was selected as recipient of the Omer Stewart Award for exemplary service to applied anthropology. (pvanarsd@du.edu)

**Tourism Topical Interest Group**

by Melissa Stevens [msanth@yahoo.com]
University of Maryland, College Park

The October 15th deadline for abstract submissions for the 69th Annual SfAA Meetings in Santa Fe will arrive before we know it. Therefore, anyone interested in organizing a tourism related session might want to begin brainstorming and entering into discussions with collaborators soon. Mining established channels of colleagues for session-mates simplifies and often informalizes the process, but extending calls for papers beyond scholars known personally provides a wonderful opportunity to expand a professional network, gain intimate knowledge of exciting new research, and identify future research collaborators. List-serves are always invaluable, such as the ANTH-TOURISM list-serve (sign up by emailing tourismanthropology@jiscmail.ac.uk).

The new SfAA online network (http://sfaanet.ning.com) also provides multiple options for locating and contacting tourism researchers through discussion threads, groups, or a simple search of members. However, many members are inactive and do not utilize the site on a regular basis. SfAA President Susan Andreatta has pushed for more activity and employment of this valuable resource, and perhaps the best way for the site to gain popularity is through individual TIG use and promotion.

Calls for papers and other Annual Meeting planning are not the only available uses of the networking site. Tim Wallace had mentioned in a previous Tourism TIG article the idea of sharing tourism-related course syllabi, and I would be interested in compiling book lists. Ongoing discussions related to tourism research could be conducted with multiple contributors leading to new avenues of inquiry.

Abstracts for the Third Annual Valene L Smith Student (graduate and undergraduate) Tourism Poster Competition are also due October 15th. This is a wonderful opportunity for students to showcase their applied research in the area of tourism with the potential of winning one of three cash prizes, $500 for first prize, $300 for second prize, and $200 for third prize. The judging criteria are based on: originality of work; organization, quality, and clarity of poster; effective use of both theory and data; significance to tourism scholarship; timeliness and relevance of the topic; and applied nature of the work. Presenting a poster provides the chance for students of all levels - from undergraduates just beginning to explore their research interests to advanced Ph.D. candidates - to present their research in a less formal arena than an organized paper session, one that encourages one-on-one, in depth discussions with a larger audience. Individual Anthropology departments should encourage students to submit abstracts; winning the award is not only a boon for the student, but for the reputation of the institution training him or her. Information on the competition can be found on the SfAA website (http://www.sfaa.net/valenesmith/valenesmith.html).
Other possibilities to consider for the meetings in Santa Fe are a Tourism TIG organized tour of Santa Fe and a planned informal TIG outing, for a meal or drinks. I would encourage anyone from the Santa Fe area, or familiar with the tourism sites of the city, to contact Tim Wallace (tmwallace@mindspring.com) or me (msanth@yahoo.com) with ideas for either of these activities. I will publish information on any events planned in the next two newsletters (November 2008 or February 2009).

Barbara Rose Johnston, Center for Political Ecology [www.centerforpoliticalecology.org], has let us know of an important grant opportunity concerning tourism and heritage resource conservation. She writes, “Passing along a tourism grant program that may be of interest or use to some of you who work with communities in isolated/natural/cultural areas. I have studied the adverse impacts of tourism for decades and see the dependency created (no matter how eco/cultural friendly and appropriate) as a dance in many ways with a devil. But then again, that is my view. I also know that tourism is truly a viable option from the perspective of many of the communities I have worked with/studied in, and in the broader array of options (extractive resource/energy development, etc) may be the best relative option. Certainly the global linkages that are generated can have both positive as well as the obvious negative consequences. I have not sought funding through this program and have not investigated the funding course, but at first glance it does look something worth checking out.”

Tourism Cares’ Worldwide Grant Program distributes charitable grants to worthy tourism-related non-profit organizations worldwide for capital improvements or programs as outlined below. The 2008 Worldwide Grant Program goals for grantmaking call for a balanced distribution to U.S. and non-U.S. recipients. Typical grants are $10,000; However, based on availability of funds, grants up to $100,000 will be considered. The steps to the grant funding process can be found below. Our Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) about the Worldwide Grant Program attempt to address other questions that are not explained elsewhere. 2008 Deadlines for Grant Letters of Inquiry Packets: Friday, February 1st, Friday, May 30, and Wednesday, October 1st, Grant Letters of Inquiry Packets must ARRIVE AT Tourism Cares’ OFFICE NO LATER THAN 5 PM EST on these deadline dates.

Tourism Cares’ Grant Funding Goals and Preferences. Primary consideration is to fund projects and programs, whose goal is:
* capital (“brick-and-mortar”) improvements that serve to protect, restore, or conserve sites of exceptional cultural, historic, or natural significance, or
* the education of local host communities and the traveling public about conservation and preservation of sites of exceptional cultural, historical, or natural significance.

Preference is given to organizations with projects or programs that:
* allow our grant funding to be leveraged to provide increased philanthropic support, through vehicles such as matching grants or challenge grants that have already been secured from an external source.
* are endorsed by the local, regional, or national tourism office.
* demonstrate strong support from and involvement of the local community.

Procedure for Grant Letter of Inquiry Packet and Full Proposal Process: The following steps outline the grantmaking process, from letter of inquiry to grant funding. Links are provided to more detailed information for some steps.
1. Verify that your U.S.-based organization has IRS non-profit, tax-exempt 501(c)(3) status, or that your non-U.S.-based organization has status equivalent to the U.S. IRS 501(c)(3).
2. Verify that the project or program for which you are seeking funding fits Tourism Cares’ Grant Funding Goals and Preferences for its Worldwide Grant Program.
3. If your organization and project meet the above conditions, please visit our World Wide Grant Program: Procedure for Grant Letter of Inquiry Packets page for detailed instructions for submitting your Letter of Inquiry Packet.
4. Letters of Inquiry Packets will be reviewed and some organizations will be asked to submit a full proposal for further consideration. You will find detailed instructions for this step on the Worldwide Grant Program: Full Proposal Requirements page.
5. Full proposals will then be subject to an in-depth review.
6. Grant applicants, who have submitted full proposals and are chosen for funding by Tourism Cares, will be notified and asked to complete several mandatory compliance steps, described in detail on our World Wide Grant Program: Grant Recipient Compliance page. These requirements include, among other things,
* spending the grant funds within 12 months of receipt, unless otherwise stated in the grant agreement.
* submitting a report at the end of the grant term documenting the use and outcomes of the Tourism Cares investment.

Tourism Cares reviews the letter of inquiry packets and endeavors to respond to all letters within six to eight weeks after the
applicable letter of inquiry deadline. All organizations that submit letter of inquiry packets will receive written notification of the status of their letter. Due to the volume of letters of inquiry packets we receive, we kindly ask that you do not call to check on the status of your letter. Grant funding generally falls no later than six months after the applicable letter of inquiry deadline, but it could take up to nine months. Suitable proposals are evaluated by the Executive Director and a Blue Ribbon Panel composed of experts in the fields of preservation, conservation, and tourism. Final selection is made by Tourism Cares’ Board of Directors. Grantmaking goals are set annually by the Board of Directors and are subject to change.

Contact Us at: Tourism Cares 275 Turnpike St., Suite 307 Canton, MA 02021 Tel: 781-821-5990 Fax: 781-821-8949 Email: info@tourismcares.org.

In conclusion, I would like to follow up on the discussion initiated in the last newsletter, by mentioning a recently published book addressing many of the issues explored in the research presented at the Memphis meetings. Critical Issues in Ecotourism: Understanding a Complex Tourism Phenomenon, edited by James Higham presents critical analysis of emerging and tangibly relevant issues by pre-eminent international scholars. The essays speak to students, scholars, and professionals engaged in ecotourism studies or activities. I would recommend this volume to everyone interested in alternative tourism development.

As always, any Tourism TIG questions, comments, or suggestions can be emailed to me at msanth@yahoo.com.

LPO News

Bill Roberts [wcroberts@smcm.edu]
St. Mary’s College of Maryland

I recently returned from two months in Senegambia, West Africa, where I was unable to find anything remotely resembling a Local Practitioner Organization for anthropologists. About the closest thing to an LPO is the West African Research Center (WARC) in Dakar, associated with the West African Research Association (WARA). In Senegambia, archaeology is the dominant subfield of anthropology. In the work I’ve been doing with the University of The Gambia, where sociology courses are offered each semester, archaeology is probably the most likely way to introduce the discipline of anthropology in the coming years. Hopefully there will be a session on the topic of archaeology and tourism in West Africa at next year’s annual meeting in Santa Fe.

It’s been a quiet summer for the LPOs, as far as I can tell. One of the recurrent issues all LPOs face is recruiting people to serve, voluntarily, in the leadership positions that are essential to keep the organization active and, in some cases, up-date its website or list-serve. The longest active LPO, the Washington Association of Professional Anthropologists (WAPA), has a tradition of alternating the position of WAPA president between males and females. Ron Nunn, who served as the WAPA president last year, has been succeeded by practitioner Shirley Buzzard. I met Shirley when I was in graduate school, and have been fortunate to have her come to St. Mary’s and talk with students when I teach applied anthropology about her career path. She has gone from her early days as a consultant to president of her own consulting firm. She’s worked all over the world, but has been especially active in the public health arena. WAPA will reconvene in September with a social event, and then begin to sponsor monthly meetings at the Charles Sumner school on 17th Street, N.W.

The High Plains Society for Applied Anthropology (HPSfAA) held its annual meeting April 25-27 in the student union of the Auraria campus, University of Colorado at Denver. Peter van Arsdale was the keynote speaker, and gave a talk titled “Healing the Body, Healing the Body Politic” (http://www.hpsfaa.org/documents/conferences/2008/conferenceProgram2008Final.pdf). There were 14 other papers or presentations on the program for the meeting. Although I couldn’t find any information on the website about conference attendance this year, HPSfAA is one of the largest LPOs in terms of its geographical reach and size of membership.

For anthropologists trying to organize or revitalize a local practitioner organization in the areas around Boston, New York, Seattle, Portland, Dallas, Memphis, or any other region of the country, I want to remind you that the SfAA office will assist you with contacting SfAA members in your LPO letter. The Bay Area Association of Practicing Anthropologists increased their membership substantially in this way. If you would like help contacting SfAA members and informing them/inviting them to LPO activities, this is what you should do. Craft a letter that you want sent out to SfAA members in your area/region. Send this letter to Tom May tom@sfaa.net, and he will see that the SfAA home office
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gets the letter to people in your area/region. To facilitate this, I suggest you provide Tom with the zip codes of the areas you would like to reach.

I encourage active LPO members to consider organizing a session or roundtable for the upcoming annual meeting in Santa Fe. As I wrote in the previous newsletter, many of us who met in Memphis thought that an LPO roundtable would be useful for the Santa Fe meetings, especially for anthropologists who are working to organize themselves at the local level. Current LPO leaders can expect to hear from me in early September asking for your ideas for this roundtable.

Enjoy the rest of your summer!


By Linda A. Bennett, COPAA Chair
University of Memphis

The 2008 SfAA meetings in Memphis provided a wonderful opportunity for several COPAA organized events and sessions. Susan Wright, Professor of Educational Anthropology at the University of Århus in Denmark, presented COPAA’s First International Distinguished Scholar Keynote Address. When COPAA decided to invite Professor Wright, we did so in light of our wish to broaden our perspectives on applied anthropology and higher education beyond our experience in the United States. Her presentation and the discussion that followed very much met those expectations. Susan Hyatt (IUPUI) handled the arrangements for Professor Wright’s visit and introduced her.

Professor Wright’s address was entitled “Making Application Count in a Global Knowledge Economy.” Abstract: European governments are subjecting universities to a reform frenzy, spurred by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development’s postulated ‘global knowledge economy’. Denmark’s strategy makes universities a driver of this economy, presses them to respond to the ‘surrounding society’, turn ‘ideas into invoices’ and produce employable graduates quickly. ‘Application’ appears central to such strategies. Yet systems to measure performance and differentiate funding reproduce old hierarchies between ‘pure’ and ‘applied’ in which the latter ‘counts’ for little. After reviewing initiatives to develop applied anthropology in such contexts, the earlier experience of a UK organization ‘Anthropology in Action’ is used to suggest an alternative approach.

To quote part of the introduction of Professor Wright’s talk: “Today I wish to focus on the equally important changes that are re-shaping the public sector—in that I include universities—and that are changing the boundaries between the public and private sectors in many parts of Europe. These changes go under the banner of making a nation competitive in the global knowledge economy. My questions are, how do anthropologists and our students analyze these large scale transformations in the nature and organization of governance? How do we find room for maneuver? How do we work out how to act to try and influence and shape these changes?” Her talk is available by podcast http://sfaapodcasets.net/ and on the COPAA website (www.copaa.info), along with Sue Hyatt’s introduction.

COPAA organized several other sessions for the SfAA meetings:

Exchanging Knowledge through a Visitor’s Program
PANELISTS: BRIller, Sherylyn (Wayne State U), FERGUSON, T.J. (Anthropological Research, LLC), WASSON, Christina (U N Texas) and HENRY, Lisa (U N Texas)

Overview: Academically-based and practicing applied anthropologists will address the exchange of knowledge and skills sets through a COPAA sponsored visitor’s program. The goal of the program is for faculty and/or practitioners to visit anthropology departments in order to educate and train students (and possibly faculty) on topics that complement the existing curriculum in the department. The goal of this session is to collaborate on the fundamental structure of this program and establish guidelines for those departments interested in participating.

Tenure and Promotion for Applied Anthropologists: Planning for and Experiencing the T&P Process
PANELISTS: KHANNA, Sunil (Oregon State U), WASSON, Christina (U N Texas),
Abstract: Since 2005, the Consortium of Practicing and Applied Anthropology Programs (COPAA) has been actively involved in demystifying the promotion and tenure process especially for faculty members working in applied anthropology programs. Earlier COPAA-sponsored sessions have focused on such topics as defining applied and engaged scholarship (2005), developing P&T portfolios and documenting applied work (2006), and opinions of the decision-makers in the P&T process (2007). This panel presents the experiences of faculty members who have recently completed the P&T evaluation. Panel participants will share their strategies for promotion and tenure, developing and organizing dossiers, the overall experience of the P&T process, and recommendations for change.


Abstract: Applied anthropology is a critical component in the development of public policy in human society. Public policy is also a rich arena for the employment of practicing anthropologists. In this session, we explore ways in which applied anthropology education is or could be addressing student preparation in the policy arena, as recommended also by the Public Policy Committee of the Society for Applied Anthropology. Presenters will address how through course work, mentoring, internships, or research their programs are or could be engaging students to understand, interrogate, develop or change public policy at the international, federal, state, or local levels.


Abstract: This invited session features practitioners and academics who have contributed to NAPA Bulletin No. 29 (2008). Participants in these two sessions discuss, from a variety of perspectives, the theoretical and practical skills that anthropology students should develop during the course of their studies to prepare themselves for careers in applied anthropology, whether as full-time practitioners or as applied anthropologists within academia. Panelists also provide specific advice to undergraduate and graduate students on the benefits and challenges of careers in applied anthropology, in both the national and international arenas.

Founded in 2000, The Consortium of Practicing and Applied Anthropology (COPAA) Programs has 26 member departments, which subscribe to the mission “To collectively advance the education and training of students, faculty, and practitioners in applied anthropology.” If you are interested in organizing or participating in a COPAA-organized session for the SfAA meetings in 2009, please contact COPAA Program Chair Lisa Henry (lhenry@unt.edu). If you are interested in learning more about the Consortium, please contact COPAA Chair Linda Bennett (lbennett@memphis.edu).

**Practicing Anthropology News: “The Big Switch” is Coming!**

by Jeanne Simonelli  [simonelj@wfu.edu]
Wake Forest University

_Society for Applied Anthropology_
As you know, the Big Switch is coming to PA. Bill and Jeanne will be stepping down as co-editors at the end of this year. But that’s not the only Big Switch looming on the horizon in Wilmington, North Carolina, where Jeanne parks her kayak when not teaching. As always, one of the best things about anthropology is that research opportunities are everywhere. The potential to understand a little more about the human situation exists where you least expect it, even watching network TV reruns during the dog days of summer. No, this doesn’t refer to the endless menu of reality TV shows which tell us a little about what the production moguls think is of interest to the “typical” American mind. It means something much more potentially interesting; the once in a century evolution of broadcast technology.

While watching a rerun of the UNC-Charlotte Anthropologist Kathy Reichs inspired Bones, the forensic anthropology thriller featuring an attractive but nerdy anthro (Emily Deschanel) and an ex-demon G-man (David Boreanaz - Angel), it became clear that the analog to digital conversion was about to be tested in Wilmington. On September 8th, the 12 inch black and white TV that my daughter received for her birthday 28 years ago could cease to function. Or not. It depends on which of the latest internet missives you chose to believe.

Wilmington was selected to preview the switchover almost five months before the rest of the nation because it is one of the five cities in the nation that is already good to go. Consequently, we have been experiencing an information campaign that rivals the Y2K blitz back in 1999. Hardly a TV broadcast goes by without some clarification of the process or a banner headline running across the screen counting down the number of days remaining. Community events, from the Farmer’s Market to the Blues Cruise to the Fourth of July fireworks are all accompanied by informational sessions about the switchover. Cadres of government and network representatives have been sent to the beach for the summer to oversee the process.

For an inquisitive anthropologist, one of the challenges has been getting a handle on the level of misinformation. How many people really believe the TV world will end on September 8th? What kind of converter box feeding frenzy is taking place at the local Wal-Mart, and how many people with cable service still think they also need to buy a converter? One might also ask why the potential loss of a TV signal is so unsettling to the general population. As someone who will admit in public that she likes mindless TV, the latter is not so difficult for Jeanne to answer.

Wilmington actually has really good basic cable for very little money. Dubbed the “survival package,” it exists in part because residents of coastal Carolina need to know when to get out of town. Yet the networks have chosen to do the switch during peak hurricane season. They must have some confidence that it will work. On the other hand, it would be intriguing if it all failed and there was no TV in Wilmington for the entire election season. Without FOX or CNN, how would the voting public come to a conclusion about the candidates? The potential for research is truly everywhere.

Since it is summer as we write, the potential for research and teaching took Jeanne and Bill out of the country once again. Jeanne spent the summer session teaching at the Wake Forest University mini campus in Venice. Serenaded by countless renditions of Santa Lucia as the tourist-filled gondolas floated past the house, it was clear that Venice is a smorgasbord of tourism and environment research questions. Students completed mini-ethnographies and also wrote ethnographic short stories utilizing what they learned about the city. Before returning to the US, Jeanne took a short trip to Istanbul. Struggling against a constant earworm (When Istanbul was Constantinople ....) one of the
most interesting experiences was watching Turkey win a Euro Cup match on a dozen big screen TVs hauled into the streets so that everyone could watch.

Bill returned to Senegambia for two months shortly after SMCM’s May commencement ceremony. Initially he helped the four SMCM students who had been in Gambia since mid-January to complete their service-learning research papers. Each internship was created to provide students with an opportunity to gain both academic and professional experience while abroad. For example, the biology major who hopes to attend medical school had spent the spring semester serving in the pediatrics unit of the Royal Victoria Teaching Hospital. A psychology major had volunteered at the Campama psychiatric unit affiliated with the same hospital. An English major had volunteered his editorial services for the semester at a Gambian newspaper publisher’s offices. The anthropology major worked at an urban health center in Serekunda, and investigated the government’s efforts to integrate traditional healers within the modern medical system.

Eleven students arrived in Gambia in late May for the 2008 Gambia Field Study Program - 4 psychology majors, 2 chemistry majors, 1 political science major, 1 biology major, 1 economics major, 1 French major, and 1 anthropology major. For two weeks the students spent 6 mornings a week studying either the Wolof or Mandinka language, in addition to discussions about Gambian culture. Every afternoon we either went on a short field trip, or met with Gambian professionals to talk about topics that ranged from politics and human rights in Gambia to Islam in Gambia. Students also met their counterparts from the University of The Gambia and Peace Corps volunteers serving in Gambia.

At the beginning of the third week we loaded on a bus and drove to the far eastern end of the country and prepared to go to Bajakunda village, where I had been a Peace Corps volunteer (1979-81) for three days. Most of the students loved their experience of village life. Many helped with cooking, others carried water on their heads for the first time in their lives. We visited the school, the health center, and went to the river where we completed the first archaeological surface collection in Fatatenda, an early Euro-African trade site that shows up on early 18th century maps, and has likely been a trade site since the 16th century. Once we returned from a week in rural Gambia, the students set out to research topics we had agreed upon during the final month of the field school.

I’m hopeful that a number of the students from this group will participate in next year’s annual meeting in Santa Fe, either by giving papers in a student session, or by putting together posters. The students tackled an impressive range of topics, including: food security in Gambia, malaria control and treatment, modern dental care, traditional healers and medicines, aspirations of high school students, the role of discipline in Gambian socialization, French language instruction in Gambia, among others.

The field study program ran from May 25 - July 14. During this period I participated in a number of other research activities. This included a preliminary visit by the chair of the Educational Studies program at SMCM to design a teacher training and teacher retention project with Gambians. Funding from the US embassy in Gambia helped launch an international collaborative effort involving SMCM, the Gambia’s National Centre for Arts and Culture, the University of The Gambia, the Maryland Historical Trust, the City of Annapolis, and the City Council of Banjul to develop a better cultural resources management program and explore the feasibility of creating an historic district in the city of Banjul. The Social and Health Assessment survey completed its third summer field season with over 180 10th and 11th grade students at Gambia Senior Secondary School in Banjul. Finally, archaeologist Christopher DeCorse, chair of the anthropology department at Syracuse University, visited Gambia and together we completed a rapid reconnaissance of a sample of early Euro-African trade sites along the river.

I have been back in the USA less than a week, just long enough to know that with some luck, and inshallah, there will be a number of sessions at next year’s annual meeting conceptualized with friends and colleagues during the most recent Gambia field season.
what you ask for: Tales of parent involvement in schools by Kevin Michael Foster; Eats Shoots and Leaves: Adding local understanding to the discussion of famine food resources in Niger by Jocelyn Muller and Iro Dan Guimbo; Challenges and Rewards in Bridging the Divide between Macro/Micro Perspectives by Angela Gomez and Inside the Zoo: Alternative Media and the Practice of Engaged Ethnography by Boone W. Shear and Vincent Lyon-Callo.

This issue will be the last Practicing Anthropology completely edited by Bill and Jeannie. The first issue of 2009 will be a joint production of the old PA team and the incoming editors, Jayne Howell and Ron Loewe. We introduced Ron to you in the last newsletter. Now, meet Jayne:

Jayne Howell is a 1993 graduate of SUNY Stony Brook and is now Professor of Anthropology and Associate Director of Latin American Studies at California State University, Long Beach. As the Secretary of the Society for Urban, National, Transnational and Global Anthropology (SUNTA) she has the responsibility of editing and producing the quarterly column for the anthropology news, which is good preparation for her job as Co-Editor of Practicing Anthropology. She has conducted research on patterns of employment and cityward migration in Oaxaca for twenty years. Her research interests include the personal and working lives of women who have acquired and who lack schooling. She has published articles on teachers, urban professionals, domestic servants, prostitution, Isthmus Zapotec identity, and gender role change in Oaxaca, and is currently completing a book manuscript Rural Girls, Urban Women: Migration, Employment and Gender in Southern Mexico.

Ron and Jayne’s first issue will be an Editor’s Choice featuring a variety of selections. If you are planning to submit an article to PA in the next months, we encourage you to make sure you send it to Jayne and Ron. They can be reached at jhowell@csulb.edu and rloewe@csulb.edu. You can meet the new editors at the upcoming 2009 SfAA meeting in Santa Fe. And remember, get those abstracts for the Santa Fe meeting in as soon as possible. It’s going to be an awesome and inspirational meeting.

From the Human Organization Editors’ Desks

By David Griffith [GRIFFITHD@ecu.edu]
East Carolina University

Jeff Johnson [JOHNSONJE@ecu.edu]
East Carolina University

In early July, Human Organization’s co-editor, David Griffith, was invited to participate in a week-long workshop of editors in Taipei, Taiwan, meeting with young Taiwanese scholars to discuss the process of preparing articles for journal submission and learn more about Taiwanese scholarship. Other editors at the conference represented American Anthropologist, Medical Anthropological Quarterly, The Journal of the Royal Institute of Anthropology, Journal of Ritual Studies, and The Taiwan Journal of Anthropology. The workshop was the brainchild of Dr. Shu-Min Huang, current director of the Institute of Ethnology at Academia Sinica in Taipei and formerly professor of anthropology at Iowa State University. It consisted of panels and tutorial sessions, with each editor meeting with three young scholars, most of whom were assistant professors at Taiwanese universities, and each scholar meeting with at least two editors for feedback on their work. In this day of increasingly global communication, it was refreshing to learn of the enthusiasm and dedicated scholarship of young Taiwanese scholars, most of whom are working on issues of local and regional importance, including HIV and drug abuse in mainland China, migration between Singapore and Taiwan, and Taiwan’s indigenous populations. It reflects well on the Society for Applied Anthropology that Human Organization was among the journals selected for this event, and during the visit Dr. Huang assured Griffith that, if ever the society wished to hold its international meeting in Taiwan, the Institute would provide important logistical support.

By the time you receive this newsletter, issue 67(3) will have gone to press and issue 67(4) is in the works. The former includes Gretel Pelto’s Malinowski Award lecture on maternal and child nutrition and health as well as articles Society for Applied Anthropology
on tourism and identity in the Amazon, fair trade coffee and gender, Salvadorans in Washington DC, gangs in Argentina, and mining in New Caledonia, among others. 67(4) includes the late Orlando Fals-Borda’s Malinowski Award Lecture on Participatory Action Research, along with work on Oaxacan wood carving, Romani women, ranchers in Arizona, and deforestation in the Bolivian Amazon. We continue to receive amazingly high quality work being produced in the applied social sciences, and we have managed to attract the attention of many anthropologists working on multidisciplinary teams as well as other kinds of social scientists, expanding the reach, relevance, and importance of the Society. As always, we offer our sincerest thanks to those who have provided reviews for the journal—an invaluable professional service that is, at bottom, responsible for the high quality of the articles we publish.

SfAA Wired - Digital Publications

by Neil Hann [neil@hann.org]
IT Coordinator, SfAA

Over the past year, the SfAA Office has been busy scanning all back issues of Human Organization and getting every HO article online. We have been working with our online publications partner, Metapress, to make this happen. To date, half of all Human Organization’s articles are available for downloading to current institutional subscribers and SfAA members. We anticipate that all Human Organization articles will be available online no later than the end of 2009.

We are extremely pleased with the progress of making all back issues of Human Organization digital and providing this online service to our members and subscribers. If you have not accessed the completed digital issues online yet, it is easy to do. Simply go to:

http://sfaa.metapress.com/

You will find the current and several past issues of Human Organization at this site. To access HO online, though, you will first need a Metapress ID, if you do not already have one for another publication. Obtaining your Metapress ID is a simple registration process at the sfaa.metapress.com site. Once you acquire your Metapress ID, simply email it to the SfAA Office at:

info@sfaa.net

Or, call us at (405) 843-5113 and provide us with your MetaPress ID over the phone.

We will then activate your online Human Organization account, and you will be ready to read the current issue and the great past issues of Human Organization.

In addition to the ease of reading digital copies, one of the best features of having Human Organization online is the robust search capability available through Metapress. By simply clicking on “search” at http://sfaa.metapress.com/, you can conduct key word searches on titles, abstracts, or the full text of articles, as well as author searches. This is an excellent feature, particularly when researching older articles.

The next step in our digital publication efforts will be with Practicing Anthropology, and making all issues of our highly respected practice publication available online as well. This work will start in 2009 with an anticipated completion date by the end of 2010.

Without question, the publications world is changing rapidly, but SfAA is staying ahead of the curve. Of course, for those of us who tend to move a little slower in the digital age, hard copies of both Human Organization and Practicing Anthropology will continue to be available.

However, as we continue to move toward digital publications, we hope that our members and subscribers will have better access for their reading, teaching, and research needs.
2008 SfAA ANNUAL MEETINGS IN MEMPHIS

by Satish Kedia [skkedia@memphis.edu]
The University of Memphis and 2008 SfAA Program Chair

The 68th Annual Meeting of the Society for Applied Anthropology was a tremendous success, with nearly 1,800 scholars from around the world coming together to share their exciting research and engaged scholarship. SfAA also welcomed 358 new members, including 210 students and 148 regular members, making the Memphis meeting one of the best in terms of growing the SfAA community.

The theme of this year’s annual meeting, “The Public Sphere and Engaged Scholarship,” was well-represented throughout the conference, and particularly in the conference’s three plenary sessions, which brought together esteemed scholars who shared their expertise and thought-provoking insights with enthusiastic and receptive audiences. The SMA Plenary, chaired by Ruthbeth Finerman (U Memphis), Lenore Manderson (U Monash) and Carolyn Sargent (S Methodist U), included a panel discussion on “The Political Construction of Global Infectious Disease Crises,” while the INDR sponsored a plenary on “Social Sciences and Forced Population Displacement,” featuring speakers Michael Cernea (George Washington U) and Theodore Downing (U Arizona).

The Presidential Plenary, with plenary speakers Marietta L. Baba (Michigan State U) and Erve Chambers (U Maryland), was convened to honor prominent SfAA member Professor John van Willigen and was sponsored by the SfAA. Echoing the conference theme in its topic, “The Art and Science of Applied Anthropology in the 21st Century,” the Presidential plenary, like the other two plenary, was well-attended and attracted a room-capacity crowd.

The Society for Medical Anthropology (SMA), which co-sponsored our meeting, featured as part of their program organized symposia, volunteered sessions, workshops, poster competitions, and memorable special events, including the SMA Riverboat Cruise — aboard an authentic paddlewheel boat — that proved to be an especially enjoyable event for all those in attendance.

In addition, representatives from other co-sponsoring organizations including the International Network on Displacement and Resettlement (INDR), the Political Ecology Society (PESO), the Consortium of Practicing and Applied Anthropology Programs (COPAA), and the National Association for the Practice of Applied Anthropology (NAPA), also put together an impressive number of sessions, special events, and workshops, all of which were well-attended and intellectually stimulating for participants.

Thanks to the sponsorship of the Society for Applied Anthropology and the University of North Texas Department of Anthropology, 17 sessions of the 68th Annual Meeting were audio recorded and made available, for free, as podcasts on the SfAA website [http://sfaapodcasts.net]. Worldwide response from both anthropologists and visitors from other social science disciplines has already been uniformly positive, with over 3,300 visitors to the website since April 2008 and almost 10,000 visits since the website was launched in April 2007.

Participants at the 2008 meeting were able to enjoy the many educational tours, recreational attractions, and eating establishments for which Memphis is world-famous. The location of the conference hotel proved a vibrant backdrop for the meeting, and was particularly conducive to exploring the many exciting highlights of Memphis’s vibrant downtown. Conference goers were also able to enjoy the sights and sounds of Beale Street, as well as getting an up-close look at Southern culture with a visit to the Center for Southern Folklore. Tours of the National Civil Rights Museum, Chucalissa Archaeological Museum, and the College
Park and Uptown neighborhoods, all provided stimulating perspectives on the vital ways in which local anthropologists are engaged in various community settings.

I, along with members of the Program Committee, express my gratitude to everyone who assisted, attended, or participated in the SfAA conference in Memphis. You helped make the 68th Annual Meeting in Memphis an outstanding and remarkable event, and we hope that you will visit us again.

Global Challenge, Local Action: Ethical Engagement, Partnerships and Practice
69th Annual Meeting of the Society for Applied Anthropology
Santa Fe, New Mexico
March 17-21, 2009

By Jeanne Simonelli, 2009 SfAA Program Chair

It's Your Turn to Create!
Now is the time to plan unique and productive ways of sharing information, practice, and research. We encourage your individual submissions, as well as organized sessions and roundtables/circles. Try a poster or organize a poster session. Propose a workshop. Plan a community gathering. Looking for others to join you? Try the SfAA Online Community.

Keywords hold the Key The 3 keywords you supply with your abstract are critical to how and where your session/paper appears. Help us to avoid deadly scheduling problems by accurately identifying the topical area of your work!

Registration materials and instructions are posted on the SfAA website http://www.sfaa.net/sfaa2009.html
Deadlines for submissions is October 15th. For additional information or to make suggestions, contact Jeanne Simonelli, sfaa2009@sfaa.net; (405) 843-5113

As you work on your contributions, SfAA planning continues in anticipation of one of the largest annual meetings ever and there is plenty of news!

The Setting
- SfAA representatives met recently with more than 25 members of local and regional community organizations in order to make these meetings responsive to their concerns. Discussions took place around four general themes: The Citizen and the Community; Participating in the Economy; Personal Health; and Environment. As a result, we welcome sessions, workshops and discussions that explore issues, concerns, projects and programs in each of these areas. The participation of the community will add a significant dimension to the content of the program and related dialogue. For more info see: http://www.sfaa.net/santafe2009/info2009.html
- SfAA will be the first major meeting held in the new Santa Fe Community Convention Center. While we will be based in several wonderful plaza hotels, most sessions will be conveniently housed together in this unique new facility. Since inception, environmental responsibility has been a major focus of the Center. 88% of the materials from an older building were salvaged and recycled, 75% of the waste generated during construction was recycled, and all exterior timber is certified, meaning it was rescued from the Sierra Blanca forest fire. Recycling and the use of environmentally friendly products will remain a focus, helping us to have a Green meeting.

The Content
- The meeting begins with New Mexico Day on Tuesday, March 17. Presentations, sessions, workshops and informal gatherings, all open to the public, will highlight the themes introduced above. Local history and global concerns come together all through the day, ending in the SfAA and SAR sponsored
showing of the 1950s black and white thriller *Atomic City*, filmed in and around Los Alamos. An accompanying discussion will pick up the themes of the SAR-SfAA plenary later in the week.

- Throughout the week, learn about *New Mexico’s Cultural Tapestry* with a series of storytellers, musicians, and others from the NMHC Chautauqua Series

- SAR (The School of Advanced Research) will host a plenary session on Thursday, March 19 entitled *Scholars, Security and Citizenship*. During that day, other sessions will also address the relationship between science, the military, and the community.

- Look for a special showing of the 2007 documentary film *Weaving Worlds*, with commentary and discussion led by it’s director, Bennie Klain.

- Wake Forest University’s Office of Entrepreneurship and the Liberal Arts has provided funding to allow regional artisans and farmers to attend an SfAA workshop on marketing their products through Internet, Fair Trade and Social Responsibility niches. Look for other interesting workshops open to meeting participants as well.

- Santa Fe and the Southwest are a perfect venue for tours. We will include at the meeting a mix of sight-seeing/entertainment tours and historical/educational tours, including organic farms and community gardens; regional archeology; art and cultural history; the casino-museum partnership; and even a pre-meeting stay in Canyon de Chelly, Arizona. We expect to have the particulars on our web page in late October.

- We are working with a number participating organizations that are planning sessions focusing on labor and fair wages; border issues; Latin America and the Caribbean, as well sessions and workshops on ethnographic writing, fiction and poetry.

- As in the past, the Society will host receptions each evening during the meeting (Wednesday-Friday). Our opening reception on Wednesday will be prefaced by special presentations that will give you a look at the diverse cultural history of the region. In addition to the food, these social gatherings are a perfect setting to meet other professionals with similar interests. And let’s not forget music!

  **Think Outside the Session!**

**GLOBAL CHALLENGE, LOCAL ACTION:**
Ethical Engagement, Partnerships, and Practice

Santa Fe, New Mexico
69th Annual Meeting of the Society for Applied Anthropology
March 17-21, 2009

**NEWS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Bea Medicine Travel Award Reminder II
As with American anthropology generally, from its beginning the Society for Applied Anthropology—albeit an interdisciplinary organization—had strong links to American Indian peoples. For SfAA members, however, research on Indians was never just “science for the sake of science” but aimed characteristically to be useful for Native people in the modern world. See, for example, the SfAA on-line publication by Peter Jones and Darby Stapp (2005) listing Native American related articles in *Human Organization* and *Practicing Anthropology*. In fact, one of the 1940s founders of *both* the Society for Applied Anthropology and the National Congress of American Indians was the American Indian anthropologist D’Arcy McNickle, a member of the Salish-Kootenai tribe of the Flathead reservation.

By the mid-1990s, SfAA was drifting away from strong associations with American Indians, while anthropology on the whole was losing some of its luster as the preeminent discipline in American Indian research. Likewise, despite the auspicious precedent set by D’Arcy McNickle, the SfAA counted very, very few Native American anthropologists among its members. One notable exception was the late Lakota Indian anthropologist Beatrice Medicine. Affectionately known to many as “Bea,” Dr. Medicine became for all of American anthropology the exemplar of possibilities for personal synthesis of “being Indian” and “being an anthropologist.” Sue-Ellen Jacobs in her touching remembrance (SfAA Newsletter, February 2006, page 4) wrote that Bea Medicine’s “work as an applied anthropologist embodied her personal, cultural, and ethical values.”

In the late 1990s, SfAA took some steps toward regaining its historic bearings with North American Native peoples. Bea Medicine approved of these efforts and favorably noted them in her Malinowski Award address in 1996. Two legacies of those efforts to restore SfAA’s place in “American Indian studies” continue and are beginning to flourish. One is the Topical Interest Group on Native American peoples. The other is establishment of a travel award for Native American students to attend the Society’s annual meetings.

Several years ago, SfAA Fellow Sarah Robinson made a “seed money” gift to establish a travel award for Native American students. Before Bea Medicine’s death, Bea herself worked on developing criteria and procedures for selecting awardees. After Bea’s death in December 2005, several people at the 2006 SfAA annual meeting began discussing how best to honor Bea Medicine. The eventual result was deciding to name the travel award in honor of Bea Medicine (announced in February 2007), mounting a campaign to fully fund the award, and naming a committee to launch the award. The committee consists of Sue-Ellen Jacobs, Faye Harrison, Anthony Paredes, and Bea’s son, Ted Garner.

Only 18 months after formal announcement of the Beatrice Medicine Travel Award, in June 2008 SfAA executive director Tom May reported to the committee that $15,450 had already been raised for the Award. Under current SfAA policy, this is more than enough to request from the Board of Directors a matching amount to provide sufficient earnings to fund the award on a modest, continuing basis. Nonetheless, with today’s ever-escalating travel costs, more money is needed to make the award truly attractive and worthwhile, particularly for students at distant venues from annual meetings.

As SfAA members renew their memberships, they are asked to please consider making a contribution to the Bea Medicine Travel Award.

Any ideas about publicizing or administering the award will be welcomed by the Bea Medicine Travel Award committee. Send those ideas to the SfAA business office.

Through the Bea Medicine Travel Award, SfAA hopes do its part to foster in future generations more of the likes of D’Arcy McNickle and—most especially—Beatrice Medicine. Big shoes to fill, indeed, are those of brave American Indian scholars who have stood stalwartly loyal to anthropology as a “noble and useful science.”

**Art Hansen assumes directorship of 3-year project on children working in industry and requests assistance**

Art Hansen resigned from his university at the end of fall 2007 semester. At that time he was the chair of the Department of International Affairs and Development at Clark Atlanta University. He left university life to accept a fulltime position with Macro International, Inc. as the director of a three-year research project on children working in the export-oriented handmade-carpet industry in India, Nepal, and Pakistan.

Art will be based in and telecommuting from his home in Atlanta to Macro headquarters in the Washington, DC area and will be traveling frequently to India, Nepal, and Pakistan. This marks a shift from his long-time career as an *Society for Applied Anthropology*
“applied” anthropologist (university-based and consulting part-time). Now he is a “practicing” anthropologist (fulltime in development work). He did not completely sever the university connection, however, as he continues to serve as the major advisor to a few Ph.D. students who are working on their dissertations.

The research project that he directs is funded by the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL), Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB). The research addresses the lack of reliable estimates of the prevalence of children currently working in the carpet industry as well as the working conditions for these children, especially the existence of the worst forms of child labor, including trafficking and bonded labor. The research will examine all aspects of the supply chain that processes the wool and silk used in handmade carpets as well as the actual production of the carpets by weaving, tufting, or hand-loomming. The results of this quantitative and qualitative study will increase the knowledge base on child labor and inform policy-makers.

Art wants to hear from anthropologists and other social scientists with research experience in child labor, forced or bonded labor, child trafficking, and/or the carpet industry in India, Nepal, or Pakistan. He wants to learn from colleagues about their experiences and their methodological, theoretical, and substantive findings (trials, errors, and lessons learned).

One specific area in which Art requests assistance is that he wants to learn how other researchers have handled the issues of identifying and measuring the existence of trafficking, bonded or forced labor, and the worst forms of child labor. The heart of the research will be nationwide surveys, which means that questionnaire design is critical. Art wants to hear from his colleagues who have developed, identified, and/or utilized appropriate methodological ways to identify and measure these conditions.

His contact numbers are:
Art Hansen, Research Project Director
Macro International, Inc.
Art.hansen@macrointernational.com
Telephone (blackberry) 301-572-0827

Political Ecology Society (PESO) Panel on Plants and People in Madagascar

Call for Panel Participants

by Douglas W. Hume [humed1@nku.edu]
Northern Kentucky University

A panel is being created for the upcoming joint meetings of the Society of Applied Anthropology and Political Ecological Society (PESO) meetings in Santa Fe, New Mexico (March 17 - 21, 2009).

Session Title: Plant Discourses: Cultural Implications of Plants on Development in Madagascar

Session Abstract: This session explores the economic, political and religious relationships that the Malagasy have with plants and the implications of these relationships to current

Society for Applied Anthropology
development programs in Madagascar. Plants that the Malagasy utilize for economic and subsistence purposes are interwoven within political discourses as well as with religious meanings and practices. These discourses, meanings and practices are not only influenced by current medical, agricultural and economic development programs in Madagascar, but shape the way the Malagasy experience and ascribe meaning to development. This session includes discussion of possible solutions and future directions in the disaccord between cultural meanings and development actions.

[100/100 words]

Sample Paper Title: Vary Gasy: Meanings of Rice and Implications for Agricultural Development in Eastern Madagascar

Sample Paper Abstract: This paper examines meanings of Malagasy rice (vary Gasy) and the implications of these meanings for agricultural development in eastern Madagascar. Rural subsistence farmers in eastern Madagascar ascribe meanings to rice varieties, which include beliefs of which varieties are healthier to consume and produce higher yields. These beliefs conflict with those of the development agencies attempting to increase rice production. The result of this conflict is an increased difficulty for development programs to enact long-term agricultural change. This paper concludes with a discussion of the possible solutions to the conflict between farmer beliefs and development program actions.

For more information please contact Douglas Hume via email at humed1@nku.edu.

CALL FOR PAPERS (SfAA)

INVITED SESSION: Society for Applied Anthropology, March 17-21, 2009, Santa Fe

TOPIC: Collaborative Ethnography in Museum Practice, Policy, and Exhibition

ORGANIZER AND CHAIR: Betty J. Duggan (New York State Museum)

SUBMIT PROPOSALS TO: bduggan@mail.nysed.gov

Collaboration with indigenous peoples became a hallmark of ethnology as early as the mid-19th century, resulting in many foundational museum expeditions, series publications, collections, exhibitions, and live demonstrations. Rarely, however, were indigenous or other local cultural specialists recognized publicly as co-producers of project results and knowledge, in tandem and on coequal terms with “their” anthropologists, until the past two decades. Converging and co-mingling influences, including action anthropology, community heritage studies, and most especially the realities and opportunities opened by enactment of the NAGPRA legislation, have led anthropologists and applied ethnographers to increasingly innovative collaborative and participatory partnerships with indigenous and local peoples, many based within or from museums. In this session, participants/presenters focus on the real and potential effects and changes for and in twenty-first century museum practice, policy, and exhibition, and anthropological theory and praxis, which emerge from museum-based or -related case studies of collaborative ethnography, relationships, and products. Paired or co-authored presentations with indigenous or local project members are especially encouraged, as are innovative presentation and discussion formats.

Santa Rita Courts added to the National Register of Historic Places; Austin, Texas, April 25, 2007

Fred L. McGhee & Associates (FLMA) announces the successful nomination of Santa Rita Courts to the National Register of Historic Places. FLMA prepared the nomination materials and sponsored the nomination. All work was done independently and pro bono.

Santa Rita Courts, located in East Austin, is the nation’s oldest housing project built by the United States Housing Authority (USHA) created by the 1937 Housing Act. One of the enduring legacies of President Lyndon Baines Johnson — then a young Congressman — the housing project still serves as much needed affordable housing almost 70 years after its construction. The property continues to be managed by the Housing Authority of the City of Austin.

"It is particularly fitting that the National Park Service recognizes the historical and social significance of Santa Rita Courts with the affordable housing crisis and gentrification of low-income neighborhoods - specifically in
East Austin,” Dr. Fred L. McGhee said. “The ongoing preservation of these homes is important to the culture and history of Texas and the nation, and reminds us that the affordable housing challenges that are ahead have been successfully confronted before.”

The National Register of Historic Places is the Nation's official list of cultural resources worthy of preservation. Authorized under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the National Register is part of a national program to coordinate and support public and private efforts to identify, evaluate, and protect our historic and archeological resources.

About Santa Rita Courts

Santa Rita Courts consists of 11 one-story housing structures and 1 one-story storage building occupying a site of 3.2 acres. The buildings are of brick, reinforced concrete, tile, and masonry construction. The property is bounded on the east by Pedernales Street, on the south by East 2nd Street, on the north by Santa Rita St. and on the west by Corta St. The official address of the property is 2341 Corta St.

Santa Rita Courts is the first public housing development completed under the 1937 Housing Act that created the United States Housing Authority (USHA). The Austin Authority made an initial application to the USHA in the amount of $500,000 (later raised to $714,000) to build 186 units of public housing.

Built to house families of Mexican descent, Santa Rita Courts was one of three East Austin housing projects built under the 1937 Act, the others being Chalmers Courts (86 units built for white families), and Rosewood Courts (60 units built for African-American families). The complex was constructed between November 17, 1938 and June 24, 1939.

The segregation of public housing was part of the federal and state public housing law and was an accommodation to southern members of congress who insisted upon the legislative language as one of their conditions for supporting the housing bill. Another accommodation was the insertion of express rules forbidding government competition with private enterprise, legislative language, which was sought by boards of realtors (local, state, and national) and chambers of commerce. The prohibitions were inserted into both the federal and state law. Upon approval of the loan, the Austin Authority selected three sites in the eastern portion of Austin for the housing developments, in keeping with City of Austin’s 1928 master plan, which segregated the city by race. Of the three housing developments, Chalmers Courts is located closest to downtown Austin.

The land for Santa Rita Courts was purchased for approximately 3.5 cents per square foot. About six acres in total were initially purchased. The land was mostly vacant, although several structures on the property were demolished. Santa Rita Courts was designed by the firm of Giesecke & Harris under the supervision of H.F. Kuehne. The prime contractor for the project was the San Antonio based firm of Vincent Falbo & Sons. The general construction contract totaled $76,711. Martyn Bros. Inc. of Dallas successfully won the bid to install plumbing at Santa Rita for $18,994, and W.K. Jennings Jr. of Austin received the electrical wiring contract for a figure of $6,572.

About Fred L. McGhee & Associates

FLMA is the nation’s only African American and disabled veteran owned and operated historical and archaeological consulting firm. Dr. Fred L. McGhee, the firm's principal, is a noted Black Texas history and archaeology scholar and is the author of the National Register nomination. He first learned about the importance of Santa Rita Courts while working at the Austin Housing Authority in 1996.

For more information please contact:
Dr. Fred L. McGhee
512-275-6027 mobile
fmcghee@flma.org

Photo of Congressman Johnson with members of the first Santa Rita family at 2408 East. 2nd Street.
Courtesy of the LBJ Library and Museum, Austin, TX

For more information about Santa Rita Courts visit FLMA’s Santa Rita page at http://www.flma.org/santarita.html.
Guatemala Connection

By Axel Alburez
Asociación Rescate

Asociación Rescate seeks alliance organizations for planning and implementing their programs of long-term preventive health care in Guatemala.

Despite its incomparable beauty and the kindness of its people, Guatemala is ranked among countries with the worst human welfare of the American continent with infant mortality rates of 40 for every 1000 births (Pronacom, National Competitiveness Agenda 2005/20012), an illiteracy rate of 25%, and 56% of its population below the poverty line (National Centre for Epidemiology/MSPAS). That is why Asociación Rescate provides indigenous minority populations like the Q’eqchi’ group with resources to improve their standard of living through support programs such as access to safe water, proper sanitation training and latrines, preventive health and dental as well as providing primary education.

So far our objectives have been satisfactorily achieved, by working with parents committed to the health and education of their families. By observing the development of young Q’eqchi’’s we know that once children subjected to our medical care, or students receive an education at our school, their success tells us that we are on the right path.

Therefore, it is time to set more ambitious goals and longer term strategies; seeking to expand, to project and to economically secure the implementation of existing programs, and to guarantee the positive impact on a permanent basis in the populations of our area of influence.

Seeking an Ally in the Long Term

The Asociación Rescate board of directors, believes that the best way to achieve long-term objectives is through partnerships with organizations with experience in the field of social development with whom we can identify the key elements of human welfare, measure their current conditions, creating objectives and actions to improve such conditions... and of course, create the means for monitoring and evaluating those goals.

This alliance should ideally be with a NGO or with the faculty of a university with an interest and strength in community development programs, ready to work and provide its long-term experience and theoretical performance to supplement the availability of physical facilities, the ability to act and the existing relations between Asociación Rescate and the population it serves.

What is Asociación Rescate?

Asociación Rescate (AR) is a non-governmental organization dedicated primarily to promote preventive health programs, access to drinking water, education and latrines, whose area of influence is located on the Río Dulce zone, in the department of Izabal, Guatemala.

Established in 1990, by a group of Guatemalan friends, whose interest is the development of the people of their country, identified the need for support on the residents of the Rio Dulce’s area, who are mostly Q’eqchi’, migrants that fled from their homes during the civil war that
indiscriminately hit Guatemala for more than 30 years. The Q’eqchi’ have been one of the most affected victims of this protracted war.

The system of alliances is not new to AR. In conjunction with Rotary International and International Health Emissaries of California, it has been successfully offering a dental program since 1994. Also, with the backing of the Ministry of Education and with the village of Puntarenas parents’ cooperation, AR fully financed and managed the school’s maintenance for more than 15 years. This is a high impact program, since education is one of the main factors to achieve better human welfare.

Organizations that create an alliance with AR in its plan of preventive health, drinking water and latrines program, will benefit from an excellent opportunity to implement planning, implementation and management techniques in social development, with the advantage of sending its members to the countryside and experience all those lessons learned first hand.

In addition, participants will gain from working with an established Guatemalan organization, known for its responsibility and its respected record of task completion, giving the opportunity to engage, in depth, with a Guatemalan minority population that lives in precarious situations in places whose only access is by boat.

Organizations interested in working with the Q’eqchi’ community in Guatemala, through partnerships with Asociación Rescate can find more information at www.asociacionrescate.org, or contact Lic. Axel Alburez in Guatemala at (tel)502-5401-7571 or info@asociacionrescate.com

Jean Franco Research Studentship Printable version

The Jean Franco Studentship, named in honor of one of the most innovative and stimulating Latin Americanist thinkers in the UK, is available to applicants for the M.Phil. and Ph.D. programmes. Awarded directly by the department, it covers full-time College fees and living expenses according to need, up to the amount awarded by the UK Research Councils. Its normal duration is three years full-time. Holders may be undertaking some teaching at undergraduate level in their area of expertise.

Applications are now invited for topics covering the entire range of Latin American, Spanish and Portuguese Studies, and from areas including visual studies, literary criticism, film studies, museum and performance studies, cultural geography, art history, politics and anthropology.

Application is informal. Those wishing to apply should send a letter to the Spanish, Portuguese and Latin American administrator outlining their research plans. If not already registered they should apply to the M. Phil / Ph.D. program. The deadline for applications is September 15, 2008.

Birkbeck also supports applications to the UK Research Councils, as well as to various national and EU-funded schemes for overseas students. For an overview of funding opportunities, go to http://www.bbk.ac.uk/reg/finance/res_finance/res_academic.

For information about Spanish, Portuguese and Latin American Studies at Birkbeck, please go to http://www.bbk.ac.uk/llc/subjects/span_lat_amer

Dr Jens Andermann
Professor of Latin American and Luso-Brazilian Studies
Birkbeck College, University of London
School of Languages, Linguistics and Culture
43 Gordon Square
London WC1H 0PD

New Book: Anthropology & Climate Change: from encounters to actions
Susan A. Crate & Mark Nuttall, Eds.

The first book to comprehensively assess anthropology’s engagement with climate change, this pioneering volume both maps out exciting trajectories for research and issues a call to action. Chapters in part one are systematic Society for Applied Anthropology
research reviews, covering the relationship between culture and climate from prehistoric times to the present; changing anthropological discourse on climate and environment; the diversity of environmental and sociocultural changes currently occurring around the globe; and the unique methodological and epistemological tools anthropologists bring to bear on climate research. Part two includes a series of case studies that highlights leading-edge research— including some unexpected and provocative findings. Part three challenges scholars to be proactive on the front lines of climate change, providing instruction on how to work with research communities, with innovative forms of communication, in higher education, in policy environments, as individuals, and in other critical arenas. Linking sophisticated knowledge to effective actions, Anthropology and Climate Change is essential for students and scholars studying the human dimensions of environmental change.

Contributors:

www.LCoastPress.com
October 2008, 384 pages,
$75.00 / sale price: $60.00 (hardback)
ISBN: 978-1-59874-344-0
$34.95 / sale price: $27.96 (paperback)

Call for Papers. “Death and the Fieldworker: Dealing with Loss in Ethnographic Research.”

Anthropologists and other social scientists that conduct ethnographic fieldwork are invited to submit an essay for consideration in a new edited volume on death in the context of fieldwork. Essays will explore the meanings, ramifications, and challenges of death and dying within three broad contexts. First, what is the relationship of investigators with their research communities when there is a death? With death, it seems, community life and individual relationships destabilize. As ethnographers, we are not immune to feeling the stress and grief of losing close friends and collaborators in the field. Second, what is the relative importance of some deaths (juvenile, human, ideological, linguistic, etc) over others within a community? The death of an individual represents more than just the passing of the life of that person. It can also mean that the sum total of cultural knowledge carried by that individual and enacted through her or his social relationships dies as well. Ethnographers and communities feel the impact of the loss of such culture bearers, albeit in different ways, as the loss of cultural knowledge or community potential. Finally, how do communities and researchers learn the management of unexpected or endemic mortality and chronic sorrow? Fieldwork partly becomes a process by which we learn from those around us different ways of coping. These may not be ways we fully adopt, but they certainly inform a greater understanding, or epistemology, of death and continual loss.

Essays should be ethnographically driven, theoretically grounded, and humanistically compelling.

Interested authors should submit a 500 word abstract and curriculum vitae by e-mail attachment to Jon Wolseth (jwolseth@gmail.com) and Samantha Solimeo (Samantha@solimeo.com) no later than August 22nd, 2008

Whiteford Graduate Student Award in Applied Anthropology

The Society for Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology (SLACA) announces its 2009 Whiteford Graduate Student Award in Applied Anthropology, in honor of Michael B. Whiteford and Scott Whiteford. Papers submitted to the award’s committee are limited to a maximum length of six thousand words, including bibliography, have an applied component, and be based on field research carried out in Latin America, the Caribbean, or among first-generation migrants from these areas. The papers can be written in English, Spanish, French or Portuguese and have been submitted to be presented at the 2009 SLACA Spring meetings in Santa Fe, New Mexico, March 17-21. The student should be a member of SLACA.
The award is intended to help two students attend the 2009 SLACA Spring Meetings, which will be held jointly with the Society for Applied Anthropology in Santa Fe, New Mexico, March 17 - 21, 2009. The prize consists of US $200.00 for a student registered in a graduate program in the U.S.A. or Canada, and US $300 for a student registered in a graduate program in Latin American or the Caribbean. Scott Whiteford will present the prize during a SLACA event at the Santa Fe meetings. We encourage anthropology departments to support students entering the competition by providing additional conference travel funds.

The Whiteford Graduate Student Award in Applied Anthropology in Latin America/Caribbean was created through the enduring support of Michael B. and Scott Whiteford who have donated all of the royalty income from their book Crossing Currents: Continuity and Change in Latin America to the Society for Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology since its publication in 1998. Their contributions have allowed SLACA to support the travel of scholars of Latin America in presenting their work at the annual meetings of the American Anthropological Association. We are proud to extend the Whiteford’s generosity to students’ emerging scholarship at the annual meetings of the Society for Applied Anthropology.

Please address queries and send papers to Walter E. Little at: wlittle@albany.edu

Dr. Rosita Worl, 2008 Solon T. Kimball Award Recipient

Dr. Rosita Worl, President of the Sealaska Heritage Institute, a member of the Alaska Federation of Natives board, and Assistant Professor at the University of Alaska-Southeast, has been selected as the recipient of the 2008 Solon T. Kimball Award for Public and Applied Anthropology. The Solon T. Kimball Award ceremony will take place on Thursday, November 2, 2008, at the San Francisco Hilton, 7:00 pm-8:30 pm, as part of the American Anthropological Association’s business meeting.

This award, designed to recognize extraordinary recent accomplishment in the practice of public and applied anthropology, fits the exemplary achievements of Dr. Worl’s (M.S. and Ph.D. Anthropology Harvard University) long and stellar career in applying anthropology to public life in Alaska and beyond. She is of Tlingit descent on her mother’s side tracing her roots to the Chilkat Tlingit village of Klukwan in Southeast Alaska. She provides an extraordinary model of how a person of deep personal commitment to their heritage and identity can utilize the tools and perspectives of anthropology to comprehend, explain and ultimately strengthen the cultural practices of her group. Through anthropological method and theory she provides exceptional contributions to the public understanding of what “cultural heritage” means and how it has material, not just mental, representation and grounding.

Dr. Worl’s extensive knowledge testimony and publications in the area of Inupiaq culture particularly the whaling culture has impacted international, national and state of Alaska policies regarding whaling quotas and hunting restrictions. She is frequently asked to provide research and give testimony before a wide variety of institutions and agencies. Her efforts with the Smithsonian Institute, the Sealaska Heritage Institute and the Sealaska Foundation in Alaska have incorporated the holistic cultural approach to educational systems, as well as community and economic development and public policy. “Most certainly collectively it would take a great many more words to fully convey the enormity of her body of work and unprecedented achievements as a scholar/activist/leader and mentor over the past 30+ years engaged in public and applied anthropology."

Highlights from Dr. Rosita Worl’s notable accomplishments:

**Indigenous Law:**
- Served in the administration of Governor Cowper in the mid 1980’s as adviser on Alaska Native and rural affairs in which capacity she was instrumental developing the Governor’s policy of the State of Alaska recognizing the existence of Alaska Native tribes, the first time this occurred in Alaska.

- The adoption of a resolution allowing for the enrollment of future generations of southeast Alaska Natives into the Sealaska Corporation established by the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA). Serves as special advisor to the Honorable Tom Berger, Alaska Native Review Commission examining the impacts of ANCSA. She founded the journal Alaska Native News educating Native people on many issues.
While directing the Sealaska Heritage Institute, Dr. Worl has also served as the Vice Chair of the Sealaska Corporation Board of Directors. In that capacity, she assisted in the development of new corporate by-laws to extend share-holding opportunities to descendants of shareholders born after 1971.

NAGPRA:
- Served on the National Review Committee; Played a crucial role in assisting the Saxman Native community of Southeast Alaska repatriate over fifty pieces of clan atooow. Dr. Worl produced a significant video, "Kuwoot yas.ein - His Spirit is Looking Out from the Cave", which explores the collaborative relationships that developed among Southeast Alaska Natives, western scientists and government agencies. Under her leadership, guided by Native Elders, the collaboration culminated in the Southeast Alaska Natives supporting DNA analysis based on their concept of Haa Shagoon, which unifies their ancestors and future generations with the current generation. Dr. Worl's experience with NAGPRA in conjunction with Tlingit law helped the staffs of five major museums, including the Harvard Peabody Museum, and the Saxman Tribal Council in Tlingit, manage expectations regarding handling, shipping, and more importantly, receiving the objects with due Tlingit respect.

Leadership Combining Anthropological and Indigenous Peoples' Interests:
- Over the last 10 years as President of Sealaska Heritage Institute (SHI), an institution created by the Alaska Native regional corporation representing the Tlingit and Haida (primarily) people in Southeast Alaska. Under her leadership, a major initiative for language preservation has been developed involving the recording and teaching of the Tlingit language. New efforts are under development utilizing digital audio recordings and mp3 file creation for insuring the continued utilization of the Tlingit language. Dr. Worl has set a goal of building an Institute based on both academic and Native scholarship, integrating the elements of both academic and traditional culture.

Indigenous Language Restoration Efforts: Alaska and the U.S.:
- Dr. Worl is active in national legislative efforts and successfully proposed an amendment to the Native American Languages Act through the Alaska Federation of Natives and the National Congress of American Indians, which included restoration programs.

Subsistence rights of Alaska Natives-Alaska Native public policy issues:
- A central focus of her career, her commitment has brought her to the forefront of public policy and political process on numerous occasions. From her ardent support of Alaska's creation of a subsistence priority for the use of natural resources in 1978 to her role on the Alaska Native Federation's (AFN) Board of Directors, Dr. Worl has continuously fought for Alaska Native rights to subsistence resources while seeking legal means to protect those uses into the futures. In this capacity, she has perhaps made her most significant impact on Alaska Native life.

Alaska and Beyond:
- Dr. Worl serves on significant local, regional, national, and international committees. Her tireless service on so many committees gives native and indigenous people around the world a strong, well-informed voice in the political and economic arenas. She has provided extraordinary service on the national level in the establishment of the Smithsonian's National Museum of the American Indian and subsequently in the development and display of a major exhibit concerning contemporary Tlingit and Haida culture in Southeast Alaska. She continues to be called upon for her vision and expertise in developing new directions for NMAI. One of her current initiatives focuses on a project to analyze how the creation of Alaska Native business corporations (spawned by the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971) transformed institutional arrangements between Alaska Natives, state governments, ecosystems, and regional-global economies, and how these corporations have contributed to particular outcomes in indigenous groups' biocultural health as measured by the sustainable livelihood assessment model.

See also: [http://www.sealaska.com/page/rosofta_worl.html](http://www.sealaska.com/page/rosofta_worl.html).

### Announcing a Social Impact Assessment (SIA) Training Course

Making Social Impact Assessment (SIA) Count for Planners and Resource Managers:

23 & 24 October, 2008 at the Holiday Inn-Arlington, VA

(Washington DC area at the Ballston Stop on the Metro Orange line) For a registration form and more details contact Rabel Burdge at burdge@comcast.net or phone +1-360-676-9892. To view the SIA course outline go to: [http://www.socialimpactassessment.net/WashingtonDCSIACourse.htm](http://www.socialimpactassessment.net/WashingtonDCSIACourse.htm)
FROM THE EDITOR

Tim Wallace [tmwallace@mindspring.com]
North Carolina State University

Another summer has come and gone. As I write this classes are just beginning here at NC State, and I have just finished my 15th consecutive summer ethnographic field school in Guatemala (the 7th time for Guatemala). And, here is the third issue of the SfAA Newsletter of the year welcoming you to the end of summer and the beginning of the fall season.

This is a time for transitions. Sen. Barack Obama shortly takes the mantle as the Presidential candidate of a major party. Sen. Ted Kennedy has embraced Sen. Obama as a representative of the new generation of leadership that is coming to power in the USA. Many young Americans are excited by Obama's candidacy and as a 60-something it is amazing to see how they are responding.

Likewise, I think we are seeing the same kind of excitement occurring in the SfAA. I am deeply saddened by the death of one of our elders and 2008 Malinowski Award winner, Dr. Orlando Fals-Borda, but I also am excited by the participation of younger and student members in the Newsletter, at the Memphis meetings and in the SfAA leadership. Dr. Fals-Borda clearly was enthusiastic about the new generation of leadership in his own country and I am sure he would be just as enthused with our own Society's rising leaders. It is clear that the SfAA is blessed with a committed contingent of young and student colleagues whose participation is increasingly visible at our meetings and in the leadership of the organization. I know that the SfAA Board is always looking for "new blood" and there is a steady stream of new participants.

Since I have been a member of SfAA I have been amazed and excited by the breadth and diversity of interests of the members, both professionals and students alike. The Newsletter is one of the most important ways we can communicate quickly within the membership, and I am thankful that so many have contributed their time and ideas to this (and the previous) issues. During my editorship, I have been trying to increase the number of articles written by younger members and by students. Each Newsletter has had increasingly more student-related or student-written articles and columns. Those that I have asked have responded fully and effectively to the challenge. I would urge you to let me know who else we can tap to provide interesting and valuable content to the Newsletter. Please volunteer or recruit someone to write a piece on a topic of interest to you. The Newsletter has grown to a point where I need more and more content to continue to make this publication an interesting, exciting and challenging part of your applied anthropology experience. I look forward to working with you on the next issue (November). Please send me your ideas, comments, articles by November 1.

Once again, we (Kara and I) are grateful to everyone who has contributed to this issue. And, once again, I want to thank my assistant editor, Kara McGinnis. her invaluable help in putting this issue together.