SfAA PRESIDENT’S LETTER

By Noel Chrisman <noelj@u.washington.edu>
University of Washington

September 11 is the topic that seems to open most forums nowadays; this column will be no exception. I have been lucky throughout and hope that most of you were too. Although I was in Rockville, Maryland—and thus much closer than I would have been at home in Seattle—there were few untoward effects. We had to evacuate the buildings of the National Cancer Institute, as all who were in federal buildings had to do. Across the country, we were shocked and bleary (from non-stop television watching) by the end of the week, but holding together well. I am also lucky in that I am pretty sure I knew no one at the Pentagon or the World Trade Center; however their stories are burned into our minds. Anthropology is in a good position to understand the cultural dynamics behind the way the country has presented a united front. However, I don’t know what applied anthropologists are doing to promote positive national responses. Perhaps others are like me: I think of my work in community health as having long-run positive societal effects, and I will focus on my work.

This time of year the Society as a whole is gearing up for the 2002 meeting in Atlanta. Members have been arranging sessions and volunteering papers—and even when this column comes out there may still be space for new initiatives. Information about the meeting is on the web site (and undoubtedly in this Newsletter in a report from Ben Blount, the program chair). However, it is important to remember that the theme is Environment and Health in the New Millennium and that the meeting takes place in Atlanta, March 6-10, 2002. This is important because the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention are located in that city and there is a concentration of top-ranked universities nearby. That means that the opportunities for synergies across disciplines are even higher than at most SfAA meetings.

In addition to institutions adding to our professional development in March, there are a number of co-sponsoring organizations that will bring their talented members to the meeting. The Society for Medical Anthropology has contributed to the success of the meetings every other year for the last four or five years, and they will be with us again. I hope that the program will offer their views on the theme as well as explore new relationships with the CDC. I wonder if anyone has thought of the role applied anthropology

(continued on page 2)
ought to play in the Anthrax and Smallpox scenarios—topics
that are traditionally seen to be the province of epidemiology.
The Council on Nursing and Anthropology and The Council
on Nutritional Anthropology will also be co-sponsors, along
with the Political Ecology Society (which presents an award
annually at the meeting), Culture and Agriculture, and
Anthropology and Environment. With such expectable
excellence in the sessions, we don’t have to wait for the
preliminary program to see that the meeting will be good. Of
course, it will be fun with a variety of events in the works.
The meeting hotel is centrally placed in the city so that
many spots are easily accessible.

On another trip to the NCI, I was privileged to attend
the second meeting of an unnamed group of anthropologists
who work in the DC area for Federal Agencies. (It’s not that
I am protecting their anonymity; they just don’t have a
name yet.) Six to eight agencies were represented at the
morning meeting. The program included two presentations
of people’s work to illustrate to the group how diverse their
job responsibilities are. There was also a discussion of
findings from their survey of federally employed
anthropologists about the job titles, responsibilities, and
use of anthropology. They made some steps toward more
organization, but few were interested in rushing into a
structure before they knew what they wanted and needed.
I was fascinated with the range of expertise around the
table and believe that this is the kind of forum that can crop
up in other places too. I hope they will want to affiliate with
the Society in the near future.

The Officers and Board of Directors are preparing for
our Fall meeting that is held at the same time the American
Anthropological Association meets. This will be the time
when we adopt a new budget; thus committee heads have
been getting their budget numbers in. We will also adopt
the slate of candidates for office in the Society. The
Nominations and Elections Committee, ably chaired by
Diane Austin, recommended the list that follows. The list
will not be complete until the Fellows of the Society have an
opportunity to make additional nominations. Be sure to vote
in the winter when the ballot is mailed out and don’t hesitate
to make nominations (including yourself) for offices in the
future.

President-elect:
Linda Whiteford ~ Amy Wolfe

Board of Directors
Ruthbeth Finerman ~ Tomoko Hamada
Mark Grey ~ Tim Wallace
Nominations and Elections Committee
Kitty Corbett ~ Ann Jordan
Riall Nolan ~ Michael Evans

TIG FOR INDIGENOUS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

By Mary Riley <mriley88@hotmail.com>
Calumet College of St. Joseph

The upcoming AAA 1000th Annual Meeting (November 28 – December 2, 2001) in Washington, D.C., has a number
of sessions of interest on indigenous rights, heritage and
intellectual property concerns. There is an Invited Session,
sponsored by the AAA Committee on Human Rights, titled
“HRP Forum: The ‘Endangered Peoples’ Project: Struggles
to Survive and Thrive in a Globalized World.” Tentative
session date and time: Thursday, November 29, 2001, 1:45
p.m.–3:30 p.m.

Additionally, there are three organized sessions relating to
indigenous rights and IPR issues. Also convening on
Thursday, November 29, 2001, 8:00 a.m.–11:45 a.m., is the
session “Global Processes, Local Choices: Identity
Ideology, Rights, and the Loss/Revitalization of Languages
– Part I”, and from 1:45 p.m.–3:30 p.m. the concluding session
“Global Processes, Local Choices: Identity, Ideology, Rights,
and the Loss/Revitalization of Languages – Part II.” And
finally, the session titled “Intellectual Property Rights,
Bioprospecting and Local Knowledge: The Making and
Unmaking of Anthropological Objects” is scheduled to
convene on Thursday, November 29, 2001, 10:15—noon.
Please check your AAA Program Guide on-site at the meeting
itself. The above times and dates are, for the moment,
tentatively set.

In terms of local news on Native American issues, there
is quite a lot going on at present. A full committee hearing
on Alaska Natives hunting and fishing rights is set for
November 1, 2001 at 10:00 a.m. (SR-485) before the Senate
Committee on Indian Affairs in Washington, D.C. More
information can be found at www.senate.gov/~scia/nsindex/
html.

More reports are making it into the mainstream news
that counterfeit Native American art is commonly sold, to
the detriment of Native American craftsmen and artisans.
An article recently reported through the Associated Press
(AP wire service) on a conference of Navajo weavers coming
together to discuss the problem of commerce in fake Navajo
rugs. The article is titled “Navajo weavers upset by rug
knockoffs,” dated October 23, 2001, and can also be found

The ASU Indian Legal Program and the Heard Museum
presents a symposium on NAGPRA “The Issue of
‘Culturally Unidentifiable’ Remains” at Arizona State
University College of Law, Nov. 30 - Dec. 2, 2001. Contact:
Rebecca Tsosie <rebecca.tsosie@asu.edu>, or Sunny
Larson <sunny.larson@asu.edu>. This symposium will bring
together political leaders, cultural leaders, and attorneys representing Native people from throughout the United States to discuss the issue of the treatment of those ancestors who are currently designated as “culturally unidentifiable” for purposes of disposition under NAGPRA. For more information on this symposium, please consult website http://www.law.asu.edu/Programs/Indian/NAGPRA/.

Additionally, a symposium on Kennewick Man, titled “Kennewick Man and the Peopling of the Americas” will convene on February 22, 2002 at the Frank Lloyd Wright Marin County Civic Center in San Rafael, California. Details are posted at http://www.clovisandbeyond.org/symposium.htm.

Finally, the TIG for IPR would like to do another Round Table at the upcoming SfAA's Annual Meetings in Atlanta, Georgia (March 6-10, 2002). Please let me know if you have any ideas for a Round Table Discussion by sending any correspondence to: Mary Riley, Urban Studies Program, Calumet College of St. Joseph, 2400 New York Avenue, Whiting, Indiana, 46394, or e-mail me at address above.

UPDATE FROM THE INTERNET COMMITTEE: ASSESSING TECHNO-TRENDS

By Edward Liebow (Co-Chair) <liebow@policycenter.com>
Environmental Health and Social Policy Center

I was part of a long-range planning team for an elementary school district here in Seattle recently, having been asked to join the group well after its work was underway. I was surprised when I reviewed an interim report and found it lacking any strategic goals specifically related to computers and Internet technology. I expected to see such a section because strategic thinking drives budgeting priorities, and investment in these technologies is not cheap.

When I voiced my surprise, however, the response from the planning czar signaled for me how rapidly our thinking about computers and Internet technology has changed. He said that we should begin to think about the schools’ computers, networking, and Internet connections just like the plumbing or electricity. There was a time when these might have been novel architectural features, but we now expect that school buildings have indoor plumbing and electricity.

Glaring exceptions remain, and there are substantive issues of policy and practice embedded in the rhetoric of the so-called “digital divide.” However, for the SfAA Office’s operations, just like the plumbing and electricity, computers and telecommunications have become so fully and seamlessly integrated into the organizational fabric that their oversight and guidance is nothing short of the business of the Board as a whole.

As recently as 1997, it was the cat’s pajamas to have a couple of modem-connected pc’s set up in the main schmoozing lobby of the Annual meeting, so people could check their e-mail. SfAA published its first web site to coincide with publicity for that 1997 meeting.

Fast-forward four short years, to 2001. Thanks largely to our techno-guru, Neil Hann, in the past year the web site has been overhauled and enhanced immensely. This flagship publication (that you are currently reading) has gone electronic. Human Organization’s web site has been brought back onto the same server as the rest of the Society’s Internet operations. The Annual Meeting registration process has been streamlined at a significant savings.

With this latest round of annual dues payments—themselves now handled online if people prefer—we are giving people a chance to opt out of an electronic membership directory, if they so request. The Society will be compiling this directory soon, and making it available as a benefit to members.

The SfAA Student Committee is using one of the web site discussion channels. We are now able to handle online publication sales for volumes in the occasional monograph series (e.g., the Classics in Practicing Anthropology and Intellectual Property Rights volumes).

Where is this all headed? In the coming year upgrades will continue, and the Internet Committee will be examining technology trends for their implications to SfAA’s operations and outreach.

As recently as 1997, it was the cat’s pajamas to have a couple of modem-connected pc’s set up in the main schmoozing lobby of the Annual meeting ... Fast-forward to 2001 ... This flagship publication has gone electronic.

Consider for a moment the changes in digital technology, whose pace is sure to continue for the foreseeable future. Take your wildest guesses about the performance that can be expected in ten years from that desk-top box, that glass screen display device in your family room, that pocket-sized phone gizmo whose conspicuous use you deride today. At today’s eminently sustainable rate of change, these guesses and expectations will almost certainly be exceeded by what we actually witness.
Suspending judgment for a moment about what it all means, or whether such barely-imaginable change is good, it is worth taking a quick look at some aspects of digital technology that are relevant to the SfAA, and the possible uses that are currently in varying stages of commercially available development.

In 1998, I singled out five key technological trends for consideration; it does not appear to me that any of these is less substantial than it was then.

- Bandwidth and processing speed will increase
- Cost of memory storage will decrease
- Availability of ancillary equipment will increase (e.g., desktop video, audio input devices) as their cost decreases
- Accessibility of content will increase rapidly in non-traditional venues and to non-academic audiences
- Micro-transaction cost-recovery for publishers will become commercially feasible

Greater transmission capacity will make it possible to broadcast digitized audio, video and text data in ways that will startlingly transform research project administration, basic Internet access, video conferencing, distance learning, photo and film archives, visually-oriented museum collection catalogs, electronic software distribution, publication of data, research findings, commentaries.

As the cost of memory decreases, the increased ability to have that box do more things at once will become a reality for more people. It doesn’t take too great a stretch to envision multi-tasking devices of the future (combination video player, web connection, conference and distance learning terminal, data processor and repository) so affordable that practically any classroom can afford to have one. Similarly, as data storage costs decrease (e.g., read/writable compact disks that today store 700 floppy disks worth of information for the price of 1 disk), there is a corresponding increase in ability to maintain publication archives for personal and local use.

The increased affordability of such applications as Geographic Information Systems, language translations, and multi-user simulations and distributed work groups help visualize data and join people to share data and specialized insights for common problem-solving applications.

Anthropology’s survival as an intellectual discipline may well rest on its outreach activities (e.g., delivery of ethnographic data and research findings via distance learning, audio and video presentation formats, and so forth) aimed at elementary school social studies curriculum, adult learning situations, on-the-job corporate training, and other non-traditional venues.

In a world where anthropological research is becoming just as much a professional service as it is a service to society, cost recovery for publication is an unavoidable issue. The digital notion of publication “subscription” is likely to undergo a remarkable transformation over the next few years, making possible a form of electronic commerce in which publishers can create user accounts and recover minuscule user charges for accessing digital content. Up to now, unlimited internet access has been free to most university-based users, and to users outside the academy, access is available for a fixed monthly charge, usually under $20. Content providers generally do not charge fees to access a particular site or database (the main exception is for sexually-oriented content), but sometimes require users to “register” before gaining access. User registration information can then be resold to marketing database firms, helping content providers to recover their capital and operating costs.

The main cost recovery mechanism, however, has been advertising. The convention today is to attempt to measure Internet traffic volume at a given web site, and sell advertising space based on this volume (for example, advertisers pay $50 for every 10,000 site “hits”). However, this advertising-based business model has not delivered. There is only so much screen “real estate” available for advertising space before the web site’s content becomes unintelligible, and advertisers themselves are not confident that this is a cost-effective method to reach qualified customers or clients.

A considerable effort is being directed toward technological innovations that will increase security for online transactions and to keep track of “micro-transactions” for later billing. Because the technology is being developed for other commercial purposes, it WILL be available for cost recovery purposes by electronic publishers of all stripes, including the SfAA.

Amidst all the techno-hype, we must retain some skepticism in light of substantial barriers to the adoption of new technologies.
Rate of Change in Technology and Standards. Electronic communications technology is changing so rapidly that many individuals and institutions are bewildered by the upgrading choices available. Just when mastery of a particular operating system or application appears to be within one’s reach, it is surpassed by the next generation of enhanced functionality. Additionally, standards are still being developed for hardware and user interfaces. For example, standards that specify data description and transmission technologies (here is one for future historians: a single Instant Messaging standard has yet to emerge). While still under development, the uncertainty about the outcome among competing standards causes people to delay technology upgrades.

Financial Resources. New electronic technology is not cheap. It requires substantial capital outlays to connect and equip users with a minimum standard package of information and communications technologies and to provide the training necessary to exploit these resources. It also requires a substantial ongoing investment in timely and responsive technical support for hardware, software, and network connections. Financial inequities create widening gaps between the information rich and the information poor. Additionally, the longer productive researchers and teachers wait to convert text and images from non-digital to digital formats, the more daunting and costly the task appears.

Intellectual Property. Some scholars and practitioners resist the use of electronic publications technology because of significant challenges to protecting intellectual property:

- Digitization offers an easy and inexpensive method to produce an indefinite number of perfect copies.
- Information in disparate media can be converted into a single digital stream and easily manipulated to create a variety of new works.
- Digitized information can be distributed to and downloaded by thousands of users of the network.

We struggle to apply current legal protections to this emerging domain of intellectual property. If implemented, threats to eliminate the fair use exemption in the current Copyright Law would prevent many users from making copies or even reading on-screen materials to which they have access today without paying fees for each use. Limited financial resources and the evident increase in per-use marginal costs would likely lead to diminished access to a wide variety of materials and information if this solution to the problem of intellectual property rights protections is put in place.

Privacy Protection. Many users are concerned that the headlong rush into the electronic frontier outstrips the technical means for protecting user privacy. Attempts to remove privacy protections pose a barrier to adoption of new technologies.

Assessing these trends in greater detail will be the Internet Committee’s charge over the coming year, with a report to the Board about capacity-building needs that will help put this technology to work in supporting the Society’s mission. We will welcome all members who would like to contribute to this assessment. For more information, please get in touch with Committee co-chairs Satish Kedia <skkedia@memphis.edu> or Ed Liebow at the addressee above.

FROM THE SECRETARY: SPOTLIGHT ON SFAA POLICY

By Willie L. Baber <wilber@uncg.edu>
North Carolina State University-Greensboro

Two policy issues were raised in Merida. From the floor of the SFAA Business meeting (held on Friday, March 30, 2001 in Merida) a motion was made that advocated change in the Mexican Constitution and support of the peace process in Chiapas. A policy item raised on Wednesday, March 28, 2001, concerning the World Bank’s resettlement policy revisions, was discussed by the SFAA Board and referred to Joe Heyman and the SFAA Policy Committee with a strong suggestion that the SFAA Policy Committee act quickly.

SFAA Board Supports Peace Process. Lucy Cohen appeared before the SFAA Board’s Saturday morning meeting. She described the sentiment of the motion, and requested appropriate action from the SFAA Board. The motion as revised on the floor of the Business Meeting was motivated by two factors. First, negotiations involving the indigenous peoples of Mexico and the government of Mexico broke down in 1996. The present and new president of Mexico has contributed to renewing the dialogue, and the result of this has created political space for indigenous peoples to address Congress. Second, there was great interest in having the government initiate legal reform, possibility constitutional reform, to give greater political space to indigenous peoples and their contributions. The background for this situation is article 27 of the Mexican Constitution that defines indigenous land, the communal lands of Mexico, which was done away with in the previous presidential administration.

Lucy Cohen placed the following statements before the SFAA Board as motions:

[A]”The Society for Applied Anthropology expresses it solidarity with the indigenous peoples of Mexico as they..."
engage in a renewal of the dialogues for peace and negotiation with the national government, through the initiatives of President Vicente Fox Quesada.”

[B] “The Society further supports the indigenous peoples of Mexico in their present quest for legal recognition of their rights and cultures to be enshrined in constitutional reform.”

The Board cautioned that talking to a foreign government about its constitution may be overstepping the kinds of boundaries that work effectively. Mexicans may perceive such action negatively, and should the SfAA Board, an American association, engage at that level? Members of the Board proposed to send a statement to Mexican colleges, and they can determine whether or not, or how, to use SfAA’s supporting statement.

A member of the Board raised the question of an institutional partner here. SfAA’s supporting statement would be sent through what Mexican institution? Lucy Cohen stated that individuals attending Friday’s Business Meeting wanted a statement sent to the President of Mexico and the National Congress. After further discussion, Noel Chrisman noted that there was support from the Board on whatever we say, to our colleagues and Mexican anthropologists, that when they do act institutionally they will act and include SfAA support, and that they would be in touch with Noel about their actions.

Members of the Board expressed reservation about item B, above; though an equally poignant observation was “we all support peace,” and that something more substantive could be done.

Linda Bennett: moved that the first statement, first paragraph [A above], is sent through Francisco Fernandez Repetto; so moved by Linda Whiteford, second by Mike Whiteford. Motion passed unanimously.

Lucy Cohen stated that item A is a supportive response and that item B is really something for the longer haul, and the Society will have opportunities to do more in the future. Noel Chrisman thanked Lucy Cohen for her assistance.

World Bank Revises Involuntary Resettlement Policy. Paul Durrenberger described Dana Clark’s e-mail, which noted that the World Bank has posted a revised draft version of the Involuntary Resettlement Policy on their web site. Bank management plans to send this policy to the full Board of Executive Directors for approval in the near future. According to Dana Clark there are numerous substantive and procedural changes in the draft that will have serious adverse impacts on local people who are affected by World Bank projects, in spite of Bank Management’s claim that the revised draft reformats a previous draft. A member of the Board noted that Ted Downing has already replied to the revised draft version of the Involuntary Resettlement Policy.

Noel Chrisman requested a motion that Joe Heyman explore this issue as quickly as possible and, with John Young, Ted Downing, and Tony Oliver-Smith, consult, construct, and submit quickly to Noel Chrisman a policy recommendation to be placed before the Board; so moved by Mike Whiteford, second by Stan Hyland. Motion passed unanimously.

Effective Policy. The above policy-related actions place due emphasis on the SfAA Policy Committee, and its role in addressing policy issues. Barbara Rose Johnson reminds us in her widely circulated e-mail concerning the World Bank Involuntary Resettlement issue that policy statements from disciplinary organizations are more effective than the individual comments of various social scientists working in various fields of study. Individuals are too easily and routinely blacklisted. Joint policy statements put forth by SfAA and AAA, Barbara notes, would carry even greater significance.

REPORT FROM THE PA EDITOR

By Alexander (Sandy) M. Ervin
<ervin@skyway.usask.ca>
University of Saskatchewan

It is a special privilege to have collaborated in the editing of the next issue of PA. It reports on a massive, multifaceted applied research project, titled “Investigation of The Present Situation and Development of Ethnic Minorities in China.” The project is remarkable in the history of anthropology because it uses a common research design to document changes that are occurring with over 80 million people living in 60% of China’s territory. The findings are meant to contribute to policies directed at development among non-Han nationalities. Since the opening up to the West and major economic reforms of the early 1980s, the pace of change and economic development in the highly populated regions has been astonishing. Yet, social and economic planners are searching for ways to maintain some equity in dealing with the minorities of more remote regions—a major challenge requiring the services of a revitalized Chinese anthropology.

Compiled by Guan Jian and John Young, PA, Vol. 24(1), 2002, consists of five papers devoted to a sampling of project components. Hao Shi Yuan of the Institute for Nationality Studies, Chinese Academy of sciences, the project’s director provides a brief history of Chinese anthropology and an overview of the research design governing both the larger project and its components. Li Bin, also of the Institute for Nationality Studies, writes about migration patterns among
Korean Chinese, resulting from the economic reforms begun in the 1980s. Long Yuan Wei, of the same Institute, gives us fascinating glimpses into the choices made by Zuang farmers in Guangxi because of the reforms toward economic liberalization. These presented opportunities and challenges both for farmers and previously protected state economic enterprises, such as sugar and tobacco factories dependent on agriculture. Some dimensions of a social impact assessment are described by Naran Bilik, as illustrated by the changes resulting from the building a railroad through remote regions in Southwest China. Finally, some women’s health and economic issues are discussed through Meng Yanyan’s article “Analysis of a Questionnaire Survey of Minority Women in Yunnan.”

Our standard departments—The Real World column, Sources, and some book reviews will be in the issue, and also a few individually submitted articles from our large backlog.

The addresses and phone numbers for the editorial office of Practicing Anthropology are: Department of Anthropology and Archaeology, 55 Campus Drive, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, S7N 5B1, Canada; the office telephone number is (306) 966-4176; my home number is (306) 343-5944; the departmental fax number is (306) 966-5640; my e-mail can be found above.

CONSORTIUM OF PRACTICING AND APPLIED ANTHROPOLOGY PROGRAMS

By Linda Bennett <lbennett@memphis.edu>
University of Memphis

The Consortium of Practicing and Applied Anthropology Programs (COPAA) will hold an open forum at the upcoming meetings of the American Anthropological Association in Washington, D.C. You are all welcome to attend and participate. A topic that we will focus on is short-term faculty exchanges between programs committed to education and training in applied anthropology. Ann Jordan <Jordan@scs.cmm.unt.edu> is collecting information in advance around these issues: (1) models for ways in which faculty exchanges might work in your department; (2) particular periods of time that would suit your department; (3) the semester/trimester/quarter/summer term structure of your university within which exchanges might be organized; (4) how such an exchange might be organized that you think would work best for your department in terms of direct exchanges or drawing from a pool of possible exchanges. The open forum will be held on Thursday, November 29, 2001, from 12:15-1:30 in the Eisenhower Room, Mezzanine Level, Marriott Wardman Park Hotel.

Steering committee members of The Consortium of Practicing and Applied Anthropology Programs are organizing two workshops for the upcoming 2002 SfAA meetings in Atlanta. The first is on The Basics of Business Anthropology and is being organized by Ann Jordan and Elizabeth Briody with Linda Catlin, Tracy L. Meerwarth, Susan Squires, Tomoko Hamada, and Donna Romeo. Linda Whiteford and I are organizing a second workshop on Divergent Strategies for Training Applied Anthropologists with other steering committee members participating. You will hear more about these and other Consortium activities in the next SfAA Newsletter. In the meantime, please write to me if you would like to learn more about the Consortium or if you have some suggestions. The Consortium’s mission is to collectively advance the education and training of students, faculty, and practitioners in applied anthropology.

STUDENT COMMITTEE REPORT

By Chad Morris <chadmorris1@aol.com>
University of Kentucky

From grief counseling to debris removal to relief fund donations, the question “how can I help?” has been answered in a multitude of ways since the events of September 11, 2001. As the initial shock of the events began to fade in the weeks following the hijackings, as governments around the world have responded to the events in various ways, and as new acts of supposed terrorism have emerged, a growing number of student anthropologists have continued to ask of anthropology as a discipline “how can we help?” The role of an anthropology that seeks to apply its knowledge base to foster equality among individuals is indeed a role whose importance is magnified in light of recent events. The application of the specialized toolkit of the applied anthropologist – a toolkit that provides means of cross-cultural understanding to a nation, if not a world, that suddenly finds itself identifying an increased need for such knowledge – will be met with success proportional only to the number of people who receive that message.

Student anthropologists are highly observant when it comes to noticing professional anthropologists in the limelight. It is, after all, student anthropologists who are often asked by parents and other acquaintances to justify our field, and thus our decision to pursue that field, as worthwhile to the world. Further, many of us are engaged in the process of seeking a niche in the field whereby we can justify our own decisions to be anthropologists. In seeking
these niches, anthropology students are taught to think critically about our world and the information presented to us. It is important, however, not to let our tendency to objectively critique, and thus our fear of critique, prevent us from making our own statements to the world. The challenge before us is not an altruistic one, for the dissemination of our knowledge has benefits that have been proven through countless applications of our methodology. “How can we help?” Student anthropologists can help through letters to newspaper editors decrying mistreatment of Islamic peoples in America. We can help by contacting state and federal policymakers, encouraging them to consider equality in the face of legislative proposals that may ultimately undermine that equality. We can help by espousing the message of cultural understanding in our conversations with friends, colleagues, and students. In short, we can help by seeking to make ourselves heard.

On an ostensibly different note, the Student Committee is hard at work planning for our role in the upcoming Atlanta meetings. We anticipate the continuation of the discussion above, and look forward to empowering students through activities designed to offer expert career training, as well as opportunities for student anthropologists to network with veterans of the field. While our next Newsletter article will highlight these events in greater detail, for the time being please consider the always-popular careers in anthropology panel and individual counseling workshop for students, for which pre-registration is required. This event matches students one-on-one with seasoned professionals offering sound career advice. Also note the availability of a new workshop devoted to teaching in the anthropology of tourism. This event will be of interest to current and aspiring instructors of anthropology. Finally, students interested in serving as volunteers during the meetings should contact Andrew Gardner. Volunteer service at the meetings should contact

The Student Committee will be meeting during November’s AAA conference in Washington, D.C. We invite all interested parties to join us (e-mail for information on meeting time and location). In the meantime, let us move forward with renewed interest in applying our knowledge of the role of culture to the world.

LPO NEWS

By Carla Littlefield <clittlef@compuserve.com>
Littlefield Associates
Denver, Colorado

The “High Plains Society for Applied Anthropology” (HPSfAA) held its annual Fall Retreat at Ghost Ranch in Abiquiu, New Mexico, on October 5-7, 2001. Howard Stein, immediate Past President, coordinated the retreat with assistance from members Leni Bohren and Merun Nasser. Ed Knop organized a program entitled, “Northern New Mexico: Environment, Traditions and Challenges of Change.” A local panel discussed Hispanic life style preservation, initiatives in holistic land management and continuities in community rituals. As part of the program, Dr. Knop arranged for the local museum’s paleontologist and archeologist to present a long view of the natural and social environments of the region.

HPSfAA is making plans for its Spring Conference/Annual Meeting to be held in Estes Park, Colorado on April 19-21, 2002. Kurt Montoya of Nebraska is organizing the conference. Harold Prinz of Kansas State University will be the keynote speaker. Dr. Prinz’ interests include Native American rights and visual documentation. For more information about HPSfAA’s activities, contact HPSfAA President, Emilia Gonzales Clements, at <dsaiintl@aol.com>.

SfAA will hold its annual LPO luncheon at the Annual Meeting in Atlanta, Georgia in March 2002. The goal is to bring together representatives from all active LPOs for informal discussion about common areas of interest. To communicate about LPO news and issues, please contact the SfAA-LPO Liaison, Carla Littlefield, at the e-mail address above.

WHOSE PUBLIC IS IT, ANYWAY?

By Jeff Longhofer <jxl102@po.cwru.edu>
Associate Editor, Human Organization
Case Western Reserve University

The American Sociological Association will soon introduce (Winter, 2002) a slick new magazine, Context, and maintain a related, consumer-friendly Web site. The effort is motivated by what the association feels is a general failure to communicate and by a belief that sociological research is more often than not ignored or misconstrued. Claude S. Fischer, professor at the University of California at Berkeley and co-author of Inequality by Design: Cracking the Bell Curve Myth, a rejoinder to The Bell Curve by Charles Murray and the late Richard J. Herrnstein, will serve as inaugural editor. The publication, to feel and be edited like a magazine, will feature short, lively articles, review essays, research briefs, and stories of general interest. The
audience, as described on the ASA Web site, will be “researchers, teachers, survey researchers, program officers, academic or private foundation administrators, graduate students…policy makers, journalists and others in the media, social critics, public intellectuals, and the ‘educated citizen’”.

Time and again there is an outcry, mostly among academics, about the failure to reach our “public,” or about the failure to reach a “broader public.” Whose public is it, anyway? Who is responsible for communicating with those publics? And who exactly counts as a public intellectual? How are we to communicate with our respective “publics”? Why do we presume that the public(s) has a need to know something that we must communicate? What will the Context reader need to know?

Debates about our publics make an occasional reappearance, especially in the social sciences and humanities (less so in the natural and physical sciences, and applied social sciences). Recently, intellectuals, in a flurry of activity and output, are re-imagining the golden age of the public intellectual, just as Russell Jacoby did in his controversial 1987 book, The Last Intellectuals: American Culture in the Age of Acadeeme (Basic Books). Witness the February 2001 conference convened in New York by John Donatich, publisher of Basic Books, or take a look at the citation indexes and the recent spate of articles (I last counted 70 in just the last year) on the subject.

An illustrious group was assembled at the Basic Books Forum (no one among them from the applied social sciences, of course): Russell Jacoby (UCLA professor and author of The Last Intellectuals), Bethke Elshtain (University of Chicago), Stephen Carter (Law, Chicago), Herbert Gans (Columbia), and other equally notable figures. Donatich set the tone for the gathering: “How do we battle the gravitation toward happy consensus that paralyzes our national debate? A new generation of public intellectuals waits to be mobilized. What will it look like? That is what our distinguished panelists will discuss.”

So it would appear that we have reached yet another longing, another time for imagining a vanguard of educated writers, public intellectuals, bringing knowledge to educated readers. This cadre, it seems, comes with the volume of cultural capital necessary for the production and dissemination of knowledge and with literary skills for translating ponderous prose for those among us yearning to convert national complacency into vibrant civil societies.

Whose public is it, anyway? Surely they are many and diverse and most are not longing to hear the voices of those longing to speak directly to them. One might suppose that the problem with this formulation is that we have been for too long mystified by the very idea of the “public intellectual.” And thus we fail to recognize that public engagement, discourse and reflection, and social change, comes not from the ruminations of intellectuals but from the tedious generation and application of knowledge in places where people grow food, irrigate fields, fish, husband, and where healers and sufferers teach us about the limits and potential of knowledge, ours and theirs; and from the pubs and corner groceries where they debate recent events in New York City.

The application, communication, or dissemination of knowledge, thus, is not the task of the vanguard, but the efforts of us all to make our world a better place. It is possible that the public intellectual, especially those inspired by Jacoby, Hitchens and others, feels ignored, not because of something awry in academe, but because others have moved into the vacuum left by the academic left, writers with much larger audiences and growing constituencies (the late Alan Bloom, Irving Kristol). They are not being heard.

The dissemination and application of knowledge takes place through the continual suasion of public policy and debate, from public agenda setting to implementation. Applied anthropologists, for example, work at various sites along this continuum, in setting agendas for public debate, to public policy formulation and legislative action, to policy implementation and evaluation and in many worlds beyond. Applied scientists have always and necessarily engaged in communication and dissemination of information attempting to influence action at various points in this process. That’s how the job gets done. Yet not everyone along the continuum has equal access to points of influence. And it is in this way that practicing scientists speak to multiple publics with widely differing views, differential access to power, and with different kinds of knowledge.

What is next for Human Organization? First, we have improved the HO Web site (http://www.sfaa.net/ho). This was the first step toward making the publication available to the broader public and much remains to be done. And we must continue to use this technology to reach increasingly specific audiences (across the spectrum of the policy making process and beyond) and to connect scholars and practitioners to various constituencies, public and private.

(continued on page 10)
Our next step is to more effectively network with radio, television, and print media. Toward this end, with support from the staff in Oklahoma City, we will develop a database of media contacts and increase our efforts to place the press in contact with authors. However, we have learned that the best press contacts are developed and maintained at the local level.

The media is more likely to pay attention to local scholars and practitioners. We will, therefore, be asking our authors and readers to help us develop and maintain relations with the press. You can begin by sending names and addresses of media contacts to Jeff Longhofer, at <jxl102@po.cwru.edu>. We select article(s) from each issue that may be of particular interest to various constituencies and help authors compose press releases and offer instructions on how best to work with the press once contacted. It is in this manner that we can improve our communication with the public and broaden the interest in applied anthropology.

In the meantime, you’ll find ye olde editor and I at the local saloon; and we won’t be waiting for the enlightenment. And I’ve just cut a check to the ASA. Maybe this “educated reader” can find a way, with Context, to stay abreast of debates in sociology.

CHAN KOM: A VILLAGE THAT CHOSE ANTHROPOLOGY

By Hendrick Serrie <serrieh@eckerd.edu>
Eckerd College

One of the high points of the SfAA meetings in Merida was the opportunity to visit Chan Kom with Mary Elmendorf, who has carried out field research there since the late 1960s. SfAA antropólogos filled three large buses to make the pilgrimage. We walked around this interesting Mayan village and met the current presidente (mayor), Angel Ceme Ek, who first met Mary when he was three years old.

Chan Kom is one of the most famous ethnographic communities in the history of anthropology. In 1931 Robert Redfield began field research there, publishing Chan Kom, a Maya Village (1934, with Alfonso Villa Rojas) and The Folk Culture of Yucatan (1941). In 1948 he returned, subsequently publishing A Village That Chose Progress: Chan Kom Revisited (1950), The Little Community (1955), and Peasant Society and Culture (1956). Redfield’s work initiated the anthropological investigation of peasant villages, which even now comprise half the population of the world, and the relationship of such villages to urban centers and the nation state.

Alfonso Villa Rojas, a young self-taught Mayan who had become the first schoolteacher in Chan Kom, served as Redfield’s research assistant and co-author of the 1934 monograph. Later, as Redfield’s protégé, Villa Rojas pursued graduate studies at the University of Chicago and went on to become one of Mexico’s most famous anthropologists.

Mary Elmendorf was one of a group of volunteers in the American Friends Service Committee, doing relief and reconstruction work in Europe during and after World War II. Their efforts were honored with a Nobel Prize for Peace in 1947. In the 1950s Mary was director of CARE in Mexico, involving 27 NGOs and the Instituto Nacional Indígena (INI) in providing technical assistance and child feeding programs. During this period her husband John Elmendorf was director of the Mexican American Cultural Institute and, later, Dean of Mexico City College (now University of the Americas).

In 1952 Mary met Alfonso Villa Rojas, and in 1968 with his encouragement she visited Chan Kom. She chose Chan Kom as the site for her groundbreaking research on indigenous women and gender roles, with Villa Rojas serving on her Ph.D. committee. Her research was first published in Spanish with the title La Mujer Maya y el Cambio (1973) and later in English as Nine Mayan Women: A Village Faces Change (1976). Her book was sent by the Mexican government as a gift to the Organization of American States

Barbara Pillsbury, Mary Elmendorf and the current mayor of Chan Kom, Angel Ceme Ek, grandson of Eusaquio Ceme, the first municipal mayor.
(OAS), and through Gonzalo Aguirre Beltrán and the Ministry of Education it was sent to public schools all over Mexico.

ENVIRONMENTAL
ANTHROPOLOGY TIG UPDATE

By Rick Stepp, T.I.G. coordinator <rstepp@uga.edu>
University of Georgia

Although winter is just now beginning to set in down here in Georgia we are already making plans for the spring and the annual meetings that will be held in Atlanta. As you probably know by now, the theme is “Environment and Health.” The deadline for submission of abstracts has been extended so if you have not already sent something in, please consider doing so right away. There has been a lot of interest in putting together an environmental anthropology field trip during the meetings, and there are many possibilities within 1-2 hours of Atlanta. I am exploring some of these options right now and will hopefully have some more details in the next newsletter. In the meantime if you have any interest in participating, please e-mail me at the address above, and I will add you to the list. I will also be posting notices to our listserv Ambientnet, please contact Tim Wallace <tmwallace@mindspring.com> to subscribe.

SOCIETY FOR APPLIED
ANTHROPOLOGY ORAL HISTORY PROJECT: GUIDANCE FOR VOLUNTEER INTERVIEWERS

By John van Willigen <ant101@pop.uky.edu>
University of Kentucky

What is the purpose of the SfAA Oral History Project? We want to document in the form of transcribed interviews applied anthropology. The focus of the SfAA Oral History Project is broad, including reflections on experiences of applied anthropologists in the past, the history of specific projects, applied anthropology training programs as well as the history of the Society and other organizations relevant to applied and practicing anthropology. It is not limited to the history of SfAA.

Does the Project Provide Tapes? The project does not provide tapes. You will need to purchase tape for your interviews. The tapes we recommend you use should be a name brand (Sony, Memorex, BASF, Scotch, etc.) because these seem to be more durable. The length that we recommend is sixty minute or perhaps 90 minutes. Do not use 120 minute tapes as they are thin and prone to stretching and breakage. There is no need to purchase tape that is manufactured for better sound reproduction. In technical terms normal bias, ferric oxide tape will do just fine. The project is based on cassette tapes rather than micro cassettes.

Every tape you submit should have a label attached that includes your name, the name of the person you interview, and the date. In addition it is good practice to record the same information at the beginning of the interview. In doing the interview be careful with sound quality, especially balance between the two participants. It is often useful to practice recording with the equipment you will be using to make sure it works.

Is a signed release form required? It is important to fill out the release form that is provided. This form transfers the copyright of the tape. It is possible to put conditions of use on the tape and transcript. There may be reasons to delay public access to the content for a period of time. While this is not something we encourage it will be done if requested.

Who can I contact if I have any questions? Get in touch with a member of the SfAA Oral History Project Committee. These include John van Willigen (Kentucky) <ant101@pop.uky.edu>, Linda Bennett (Memphis) <lbennett@memphis.edu>, Judith Freidenberg (Maryland) <BM_1_JFREIDEN@anth.umd.edu> and Mike Angrosino (South Florida) <angrosin@chuma1.cas.usf.edu> who will be coordinating the project.

What do I do with the tape after the interview? When you are finished send the completed tape and signed release form to John van Willigen, Department of Anthropology, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506.

What happens to the tape? The completed tape will be transcribed and made available for scholarly use at the University Library. The transcription will be produced by a professional transcriber and then reviewed by an editor familiar with the content so as to improve the accuracy of the transcription.

Is there a project-specific interview guide? No. We do not intend to produce a general interview guide for the project except to say it is often useful to start the interview with some “grand tour” questions about the person’s career. That said, it is important to develop a specific plan referenced to your knowledge of the interviewee’s experience. The SfAA Oral History committee would be willing to give advice on this aspect of the interview if desired.

The interview, once completed, transcribed, reviewed and made available for study, becomes something that you, the interviewer can cite as a kind of publication. At the end of this Newsletter you will find a form for obtaining the appropriate release.
INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE IS ACTIVE AND THRIVING

By Gisele Maynard-Tucker <gmaytuck@aol.com>
UCLA

Carla Guerrón-Montero
<cguerron@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU>
University of Oregon

The Society for Applied Anthropology is the largest national organization of its kind, but its boundaries are not confined to the United States. In fact, there are more than 260 international members in the Society (specifically, members with an international address and not counting international members who live in the United States). For them and for all the members interested in international issues, the International Committee was created in 1997 at the Annual Meeting in Seattle, Washington, thanks to the initiative of Dr. Alain Anciaux (Université Libre de Bruxelles). Since then, its members have been actively involved in welcoming international visitors by hosting a well attended and celebrated reception and a hospitality table every year. In addition, the committee’s goals are to organize an international panel where practitioners and scholars bring their international expertise and discuss important issues related to the SfAA meetings’ theme.

We also send out an electronic newsletter to the registered members with information on international issues as well as the activities of the committee. For the Atlanta meeting, scholars and practitioners will discuss the impact of environmental changes on local communities, populations and governmental power in the panel “Changing Environments in Transitional Societies: International Views on Conflict and Resolution,” organized by Carla Guerrón-Montero and Gisele Maynard-Tucker. The panel will bring important resolution on issues related to the role of anthropologists as advocates of change or prisoners of political correctness in determining the effects of environmental change in transitional societies. Next year in Atlanta, do not forget to visit our hospitality table (available the first two days of the meetings), and join us for our social gathering. We also extend an invitation to everyone interested in hearing our panel. For more data and information about becoming an international member, please visit the International Committee’s website (http://www.ulb.ac.be/project/feerie/AA11.html). See you in Atlanta.

SFAA ENVIRONMENTAL ANTHROPOLOGY PROJECT

By Rob Winthrop <rwinthrop@msn.com>
Director, SFAA Environmental Anthropology Project

Initiated in 1996, the SFAA Environmental Anthropology Project is completing its fifth and final year, funded under a cooperative agreement with the Environmental Protection Agency. Some thirty anthropology fellows and interns have been funded through the Project, applying their skills and insight to a wide range of environmental challenges, from minimizing the human costs of ecological restoration in south Florida, to identifying organizational solutions, to the conflict between housing development, and ground water protection for the Elwha-Klallam tribe in Washington state.

In this last year, a number of important studies have been completed. Carmen Burch finished her study of the social and cultural dynamics of ecological restoration at Zuñi Pueblo. Sara Breslow completed an analysis of the implications of a fisheries habitat conservation program for farmers in Skagit County, Washington. Patricia Townsend authored an extensive study of the role of faith-based groups in assisting communities to deal with serious toxic waste hazards identified for Superfund cleanup.

The final product of the Environmental Anthropology Project will be a series of five profiles highlighting themes and issues in environmental anthropology, primarily illustrated by work sponsored under our cooperative agreement. The profiles were researched and written by Barbara Rose Johnston (who directed the Project for its first four years), and Gabrielle O’Malley and Ed Liebow of the Environmental Health and Social Policy Center. They include an overview essay on the need to understand cultural models and community structures for effective environmental management, “Human Dimensions of Environmental Policy,” and four more narrowly focused pieces:

- Out of the Classroom and Into the World: Applied Anthropology Internships
- Restoring the Florida Everglades: Social Impacts
- Environmental Stewardship in Indian Country
- Community Participation in Watershed Management

The profiles run about 3000 words in length, and are illustrated with maps and photos. While production decisions have yet to be finalized, I hope it will be possible to provide copies to SFAA members, as well as to Environmental Protection Agency staff and interested environmental professionals.
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

By Paul Durrenberger <epd2@psu.edu>
Penn State

Take a step into the near future. A guy from a Zapotec village in Oaxaca comes up to the Rio Grande where he’s going to cross into the United States to get a minimum wage job doing agricultural, janitorial, or construction work. He can cross legally since the U.S. has dropped all the barriers to workers coming north. The border patrol person takes a drop of blood and asks him to wait a while. In a few minutes, the official comes out with forms for him to fill out. One form tells him that 2 cents of every dollar he earns will be deducted before he is paid to go directly to the DuPont Corporation.

At first he can’t understand. He thinks maybe his English isn’t that good. He thinks he’s being informed that two percent of his wages are automatically going to the DuPont Corporation. When he asks, the guard shows him to the line waiting to see a social worker. Half a day later, the social worker explains that it’s intellectual property. The blood test shows the tell-tale trace of DuPont corn. The DuPont Corporation patented the corn that made the tortillas that were the mainstay of his diet, and since he is a product of proprietary corn, he owes two percent of his value to the DuPont Corporation. “It’s just like beef,” the social worker explains, bored with having to go through this for the hundredth time today. “You feed your cattle DuPont corn, you gotta pay the DuPont Corporation when you sell the beef. Two Percent. Same deal.”

The worker protests that he’s not a side of beef. Maybe not, thinks the social worker, but you are Mexico’s chief export. Labor on the hoof.

“Look, I don’t make the law,” the social worker reasons. “It’s just the law. The farmer had a choice. He didn’t have to feed DuPont corn to his cattle. If his cattle got fatter faster and he made money, then he owes part of that to DuPont. Farmer uses the seed, gets a better crop, he can pay DuPont some of the difference. He has a choice. Nobody’s making him do it.”

The worker is thinking about his neighbor’s corn field that was pollinated by DuPont corn. The court said he had to pay royalties, even though he never planted DuPont corn. That farmer had no choice. Not sure his English is up to that, he drops it.

“Your mom had a choice,” the social worker says, “she didn’t have to feed you tortillas made from DuPont corn. If you grew up to be healthy and strong and able to work, well... you owe it to Du Pont. Part of everything that comes from that corn belongs to DuPont. It’s the law. Like I say, I didn’t make the law. You want to go on or go back?”

If you’re hearing the theme song from The Twilight Zone and expecting a voice-over from the ghost of Rod Sterling, you’re in the same boat with a lot of Mexican farmers, ranchers, and consumers of corn these days. DuPont has a patent all but approved in the European Community for a variety of corn that’s nearly identical, some say identical, to one that many Mexican farmers grow. Feed it to cattle, DuPont claims a percentage. DuPont’s patent on a common variety of beans that many Mexican farmers plant gives the corporation the right to a percentage of each sale.

You grow it, you sell it, you pay DuPont. Why? Because they’ve patented the genetics of your beans. They own the intellectual property rights.

Adam Smith and Karl Marx agreed that the market price of commodities would converge on how much it costs to produce the next one. That cost includes the price for labor, rent, machines, raw materials and any other costs of production. They couldn’t imagine a commodity that people could produce with no labor or raw materials. If the machines and rent are paid for, that makes the marginal cost of production zero. That is an oxymoron—a commodity that you would... what? Give away? But commodities are things you sell. You don’t give them away. But what about this 0 marginal cost commodity? If you have such a thing, how can you sell it and make a buck? A government has to make it possible through policy.

Can you own an idea? Maybe not. But you can own a specific statement of it. Romeo and Juliet was an old story when Shakespeare stole it. Then there was Westside Story—same story, different statement. If the government says so, you can own it. That’s what intellectual property is all about. That’s what DuPont is claiming—ownership of the genetic code of varieties of corn and beans even if they were in common use before the patent—and they want a fee for every use.

A recent law case brought by the National Writer’s Union decided that if you write something, you get the copyright to it, and any time anyone reproduces and sells it in print or electronically they have to pay the writer. What’s (continued on page 14)
the marginal cost of producing the next one? The price of photocopying, or if it’s electronically done, nothing at all. Individual writers could never have enforced that. It took collective action to make it work for writers like it does for corporations.

You write a song and anyone who sings it has to pay you for the use of it. It’s easier for corporations to enforce than song writers. So if they’ve bought the song from the writer they can put the kaibosh on outfits like Napster that would give away their 0 marginal cost product.

What happens when you put major money into developing a 0 marginal cost product and then someone else comes out with a different but equivalent product. A different version of Romeo and Juliet, a different drug that does the same thing, a different song with the same message, a different genetic code for the same corn. The only way to recover costs and make an honest buck is through monopoly practices—controlling the market.

Toward the end of August, 2001, the Wall Street Journal reported that geneticists are on to a gene for longevity. How’s that going to work if that ever gets made into the kind of life prolonging drug they were talking about? You pay Merck two percent of your pension for every year of life after you start taking their drug? Seems reasonable don’t you think? And what happens if someone brings out an equivalent one? Then figure out a way, by hook or by crook, to make everyone buy your product.

So our future worker starts to sign the paper, but the social workers says, “Jeez, look, the blood test shows DuPont beans too, and they didn’t give you the form for deduction of 2% of your wages for that. You’ll have to go back to the first line and get that form too.”

The worker knows the sense of futility that generations have known as they gave their rulers flowers and candles and wished them well and well gone, but he says, “What the hell is this, the United States of DuPont?”

A puzzled look crosses the social worker’s face as he answers, “No, not at all, I mean Sony, AOL-Time-Warner, Disney, Pioneer Seed, Monsanto, ADM, Dow Chemical, IBM, Microsoft, Merck, Johnson and Johnson—they got rights too you know.”

---

**WAR, PLAY AND OTHER DANGEROUS THINGS**

By Cindy Dell Clark <cdc9@psu.edu>
Penn State Delaware County

Every high school student should have a teacher as inspiring as the one who first introduced me to anthropology in 1970. Ms. Z. convinced me, in an era of Viet Nam protest, that war could not be avoided unless we appreciated the impact of cultural diversity and symbolic ways of knowing, including language. Everyday activities of a social group as well as its patterns of discourse contained crucial evidence about violent conflict and what sustains it.

In 1999, as Americans debated the decision to send troops to Kosovo, these lessons reverberated. I watched the debate about armed engagement on the televised PBS News Hour —starting with video discussions on February 4, 1999, through the beginning of U.S. air-strikes (on March 4, 1999) to the signing of a peace agreement on June 9, 1999. What I heard drew my attention, somewhat chillingly, to discourse. I noted a familiar pattern of metaphor, in which war was treated as “play” or “game.” I obtained written transcripts for the programs across this period, and did an analysis.

My coding identified a broad variety of metaphors employed on The News Hour during discussions about the war. Not all of the metaphors used derived from play or games. But a substantial number of metaphors were play-related. Across the 54 programs in which the Kosovo conflict was featured on The News Hour, 26 programs (or 48%) contained one or more metaphors drawing a parallel between war and play.

Several play-related themes were linked to war. In a general sense, participants in the war were repeatedly referred to as “players” (such as when Secretary of State Madeline Albright or other guests referred to the diplomatic parties negotiating a settlement as “players.”) Participating in the war was repeatedly spoken of as being “in the game” or “playing the game.” Successful victory was described as a matter of “winning” as when “winning the game.” NATO countries were called upon to “cheer” the efforts of NATO. Approachable areas for warfare were said to be “fair game.” The location for fighting was referred to as the “playing field” or perhaps the “theater.”

The term “end game” was appropriated from play to be used to refer to the strategy by which NATO forces would end the war. Airmen were referred to as a “team.” And on two occasions, speakers on The News Hour were heard to tell the story of how a soccer stadium in Pristina was used as a site for Serbs to hold male civilian prisoners, recognizing the real life poignancy associating play and war.
There were also specific ways in which a particular sort of play was drawn upon for metaphorical association during The News Hour discourse. One overriding category was the metaphor “war is a card game” or even a high stakes card game. Diplomatic and military specialists talked of “calling the bluff” of the opponent. Holding some advantage in the negotiations or conflict was equated to “having a card to play” or “holding the cards.” Gaining advantage was also equated to “trumping” the opponent. Gambling metaphors from card games included “upping the ante” when war activities escalated, “folding” when one side suffered a downturn in events, or “calling the bluff” of an opponent thought to be feigning advantage. Taking a risk to wage war took on a gambling reference of “betting the ranch.”

Another category of play in The News Hour discourse was the notion that “war is a baseball game.” Actually, President Clinton lampooned this concept in the statement paraphrased by a News Hour guest: “You don’t say to a bully like Milosevic ‘We’re going to meet you on the battlefield but we’re only going to take baseball bats, not guns.’” Despite this derisive comment on the feebleness of baseball vs. combat, baseball was a recurring metaphorical comparison spoken about the Kosovo war. One guest compared the size of a particular bomb to a baseball. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright remarked that in negotiations, the United States should “keep our eye on the ball” and not lose sight of the main goal to return refugees to Kosovo. Opponents of President Clinton were said to want Clinton to “step up to the plate” by sending ground troops. After a peace agreement was negotiated, one commentator discussed how the people of Kosovo would need to “play ball and do what they were told.”

In this way, guests making war-related appearances on The News Hour drew their figurative speech from play including, as well, football, hockey, Nintendo, dominos, and even hiking. Play metaphors were used by both male and female speakers. But there were some identifiable limits on such talk. Generally, play metaphors were not used by military personnel during briefings or interviews. And participants did not use play metaphors in referring to the vivid, tragic plight of the refugees who were leaving Kosovo in huge numbers.

Midway through the period of these newscasts, the high school shootings in Littleton Colorado took place, occurring even while the sanctioned violence in Kosovo continued. Coverage of the Littleton events did not include any play metaphors while discussing the violent shootings in Colorado. Indeed, for several days following the Littleton shootings, play metaphors were also absent during reporting and discussion of Kosovo. Play metaphors were also absent for two days following the bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade by American planes, and on other scattered days. Still, as mentioned earlier, 48% of programming days did include play metaphors applied to the Kosovo conflict.

Play metaphors are impactful because they frame a situation that is apart, abstract, and horrible in terms of concrete, familiar, enjoyable situations (Pancake 1993). Play treats competition as delineated, temporary, and with contained consequences—in the process stowing away war’s messy overflow and punishment of non-contenders. Suited up in the metaphor of play, war carries strength and preparedness, the glory of winning, and the shame of defeat (Lakoff 1991) rather than a more ambivalent mixture including guilt or flawed preparedness.

Metaphor leaves hidden much of what is important about war. Yet metaphor influences the thinking of foreign policy makers and citizens alike. My old teacher, Mrs. Z., would argue that Americans should look beneath the facade of discourse, and hold up for scrutiny metaphors backed by bombs. Language holds perverse power, not just in scripted oratory, but in everyday discursive practices.
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POSTMODERNISM HAS A PLACE IN APPLIED ANTHROPOLOGY

By Nancy R. Rosenberger <NRosenberger@orst.edu>
Oregon State University

Paul A. Shackel <PShackel@anth.umd.edu>
University of Maryland

Entering the debate about postmodern thought in the SFAAA Newsletter, we wish to explain a few postmodern concepts that are useful in this arm of the discipline. When postmodernism hit the scene about two decades ago, it created its own vocabulary, very much like those who introduced the “scientific approach” a generation earlier. A new vocabulary is a strategy used by any new paradigm to
declare that a different set of ideas that vary from entrenched views is being introduced to the discipline. Just as Jacquetta Hawkes wrote in 1968 that the jargon of the New Archaeology was “esoteric,” “unhelpful” and “grossly inflated,” so some scholars today critique postmodernist terms without fully appreciating their usefulness. As anthropologists continue to use concepts from postmodernism there exists considerable tension in the field, with risks of Balkanization.

The traditional strength of anthropology is understanding people and cultures and for a long time anthropologists have been dealing with the issues of multivocality and representation, reflexivity, power relations, agency, the social construction of knowledge and hegemony.

We believe that the line dividing positivists and postmodernists is sometimes too sharply drawn. Postmodernism poses newly formed and newly articulated questions and concepts that echo ideas that anthropologists have used in the past, but they are specifically crafted to be useful or applicable in this time and space in which we find ourselves. Some form of postmodernism is here to stay, however, for many of us have integrated its concepts into our everyday research. In our opinion, applied anthropologists should attempt to understand postmodern concepts and incorporate those that are useful into their research.

Postmodernism is a reaction against modernism, which is grounded in Enlightenment philosophy. Postmodernists argue that science is not objective, but embedded in the social ideas of a time and place; science is not based on absolute and true laws. Some will also argue that rigid positivism in anthropology has dehumanized the discipline. Much of the reaction against postmodernism focuses on the hyperrelativists who practice extreme postmodernism. The hyperrelativists reject all truth, suggesting that we are unaware of our own biases or underlying motives. This group comprises a small subset of anthropologists, but they have received almost all of the attention of the discipline.

Moderate postmodernists believe that they can study culture and the past. They do not reject all knowledge but rather develop interpretations of knowledge as “situated”—the product of its social and historical milieu. Different points of view result in different interpretations of knowledge, with no absolute truth.

Postmodernists would argue that a situated study is necessary in our “postmodern” age of disequilibrium and dislocation in which various truths collide. Thus, if we take the example of a Mexican Oaxacan woman working in a cannery in Oregon, one coherent point of view would not tell the story adequately. We would need to understand the points of view and historical background of her Anglo boss, the labor contractor from central Mexico, her mother in Oaxaca, and her husband picking strawberries in Oregon as well as the history, politics and economics of Oregon and Oaxaca. Such a study would not aim at objectivity but at interpretations embedded in a social and historical context.

The study of power and power relations is at the core of postmodernism. Hyperrelativists would conclude that in this polyphony of truths no political stance is possible, but feminist critiques of postmodernism help applied anthropologists here. For instance, feminist scholars have helped some postmodernists to maintain the commitment to the idea that although there are many voices and all have parts of the truth, some voices have more power and others need justice. This version of postmodernism argues that it is vital to recognize unequal power relations and empower those lacking power. Moderate postmodernists believe that interpretations themselves can empower or disempower disenfranchised groups; they believe that we should reveal inequalities within the current social structure and challenge dominant views.

Postmodernists study ideology: the naturalization of the unequal distribution of power and resources which legitimates the current social structure. Power is taken a step farther in the study of the “hegemonic”—a concept that posits power as embedded and integrated in our thoughts, acts and relations of everyday life. Thus, working as fast as she can for long hours during a limited season, the Latina cannery worker herself reproduces certain relations of power.

“Deconstruction” is a way to illuminate concepts that underlie power relations. Although it appears destructive, by pulling apart the strands of arguments that appear true but rest on unquestioned assumptions, we can see relations and ideas more clearly. This can help us to build toward new ways of relating and talking that do not carry on the old unquestioned assumptions.

It is here that the word “other” has emerged to indicate groups of people who are stereotypically set up as opposite inferiors. So the Latina cannery worker—female person of color doing manual work—shores up the superior feeling of the manager—Anglo, male doing mental work. Thus, we
deconstruct this relationship and we also look inside of “essentialized” concepts that exist as unexamined black boxes. If anthropologists do not deconstruct these stereotypical boxes by talking with many Anglo managers and many Latina workers, we have essentialized them both and would not be effective as a mediator.

Further, the anthropologist’s voice is only one of many. Postmodernists insist that the bias and power inherent in the anthropological enterprise be acknowledged. “Self-reflexivity” can go too far, but it is important. Self-reflection has become more important with global diversity because we have become more aware of the differences between us simply because the world of information has become so much smaller. In the cannery study, sympathy for the workers’ cause might make us ignore the complexities of the experiences of the managers. Readers need to know how this has affected the study and our ability to mediate differences.

Extreme positivists who practice in cultural anthropology and archaeology treat causes of culture change as external to social relations, and often regard human beings as passive objects molded by external factors. Change does not occur only because of external forces such as the environment in ecological models or the economic or religious system in functional models. Although there is debate as to what extent individuals can be effective amidst powerful forces, postmodernists believe that individuals are active participants in creating change.

They express this as “agency.” In this paradigm, actors take on certain habits in their everyday routine that develop within a pre-existing structure. They reproduce the structure, but also make choices with reference to others that create conflict or tensions and may eventually shift the structure. Thus, with an eye for conflict and change within power relations, postmodernists study the practices of groups or individuals that subvert pre-existing structures. In the cannery study, postmodernism might highlight the agency of Latina workers who talk on the job about their working conditions and contact the farm workers’ union for help.

Many postmodernists see positivism as anti-historical. In the 1960s a trend developed in American society that reinforced a contempt for what was not practical, and historical studies were lumped into this category. The historical viewpoint proposed by postmodernists views each culture as unique, requiring study on its own terms. It is important to understand cultural traditions, since these beliefs play an active role in structuring change. Cultural traditions influence economic and social change and they are reshaped by change. In American archaeology practitioners are abandoning the idea that prediction is the only form of explanation. Global conditions and the recognition of diversity makes us look at history in a very different way. Cultures are now seen as very diverse and parallels between cultures as difficult to extract. We cannot predict all features from a universal logic; different cultures produce different social and political strategies. We need to take into account idiosyncratic behavior and to assess cultural conditions.

While staunch supporters of the scientific approach in our discipline refuse to acknowledge any benefits from a postmodern approach, it is apparent that an increasing number of anthropologists accept and practice a version of it. Post modernism has helped to systematize and give language to some things that anthropologists have discussed for a long time. For instance, when we address issues that explain various viewpoints (like dealing with repatriation and considering American Indian oral traditions), or when we acknowledge a multicultural perspective (such as making museums relevant to local communities and descendant groups), we are using ideas that are grounded in postmodern philosophy. There appears to be no one coherent paradigm driving anthropology today. Some may see this situation as bleak, but we believe that this situation is full of stimulating potential with postmodernism making valuable contributions to the discipline and to society.

Acknowledgments: The authors would like to thank Erve Chambers and Linda Bennett for their insightful and thoughtful comments on an earlier version of this paper.

INSTITUTIONALIZED RACISM AND THE ACADEMIC INSTITUTION

Merrill Singer <anthro8566@aol.com>
Hispanic Health Council

The 300th anniversary of one of the premier universities of North America was jarred recently by the release of a historic study delineating troublesome academic linkages with the institution of slavery. Entitled Yale, Slavery and Abolition, the study by Yale graduate students Anthony Dugdale, J. Fueser, and J. Celso de Castro Alves, shows that many of the alumni Yale has chosen to honor by naming residential colleges after them were either slave owners or defenders of that nefarious institution. By contrast, the study reveals, abolitionist leaders on the roster of Yale alums have generally been overlooked when the university has conferred its highest honors.

According to the study, during both the 1930s and 1960s Yale officials were faced with the challenge of identifying worthy namesakes for new undergraduate residential colleges. In total 10 individuals were so honored, all were men and nine had been slave owners or slavery advocates during their lives. Prominent on this list were U.S. Vice President John Calhoun (1782-1850), a slave owner (continued on page 18)
and vocal critic of racial equality, Samuel F. Morse (1791-1872), the inventor of the telegraph and a staunch defender of slavery, and the famous philosopher Bishop George Berkeley (185-1753), who preached both in support of African servitude as well as the forced removal from their families of Native American 10-year old boys so that they could be raised as Christian missionaries at a seminary in Bermuda and then returned to the U.S. to convert Native Americans to Christianity.

The degree to which Yale has tended to ignore or even disguise the vexatious side of its honorees is exemplified by its portrayal of Berkeley. In 1999, when it renovated Berkeley College, Yale engraved an account of the Bishop (whose donations from the profits of slavery funded Yale’s first scholarships) in the floor of a public meeting area in the basement of the college. The engraving reads:

“Westward the Course of Empire takes its Way” George Berkeley, 1726 Berkeley wanted to establish “a College or Seminary” in Bermuda-known also as the Summer Islands. This College, in the next year (1725), given the name of St. Paul’s College in the King’s Charter, was part of a great missionary effort . . . (emphasis added)

In an interview with local reporters, Yale spokesman Thomas Conroy voiced a commonly expressed position about the social celebration of slave owners at Yale. Stated Conroy, “No institution with a history stretching long before emancipation is untainted by the evil of slavery.” This is certainly true and perhaps especially true at Yale, whose first endowed professorship, the Livingstonian Professorship of Divinity, was funded initially through the buying and selling of slaves from both African and the Caribbean.

The first endowed chair in law at Yale’s Ivy League rival Harvard University was paid for with earnings from slave plantations in the Caribbean. Brown University was founded with the profits of the slave trade. Princeton University had its own slaves prior to emancipation. Many southern universities had intimate ties to slavery, slave owners, and the defense of human bondage. However, the issue not addressed in such statements is why Yale chose its line up of honorees during the 20th century, long after the harsh realities of slavery were made manifest.

One academic rationale is that these men had outstanding achievements during their lives that were worthy of commemoration. Without overlooking such achievements, the question that must be asked in response, is: were they of such magnitude that they outweigh the importance of their direct involvement in and public support of behaviors that resulted in the murder of at least a million individuals (during oceanic passage) and the grossly inhumane treatment of many millions more? The infamous face of institutionalized racism on and off university campuses long has been marked by its willingness to downplay atrocities committed against what Samuel F. Morse, like many of his peers (including early anthropologists), referred to in his publications and speeches as the “barbarous races”. The writing and teaching of American history has demonstrated repeatedly that famous white men are not marred in their greatness by their inhumanity toward people of color, women, or even children.

A second academic rationale for Yale’s actions was expressed recently by John McWhorter of the University of California, Berkeley, a prominent conservative black scholar. According to McWhorter, it is “inappropriate to render a moral judgement on the worth of a person’s life based on moral standards which didn’t exist at that time.” This statement might seem fair, except that as uncelebrated abolitionists, like James Hillhouse, Samuel Hopkins, Simeon Jocelyn, and James Pennington (a Black man denied regular entry into the university but allowed to audit classes), who attended Yale affirm such moral standards did exist at the time. During slavery many people recognized the evils of slavery, fully and completely! Certainly black abolition activists like Harriet Tubman and Frederick Douglas were unambiguous and profoundly articulate in word and deed in this regard. So too were leaders of slave rebellions like Denmark Vesey and Nat Turner. What of their moral standards?

It is of note that our own discipline of anthropology has been no less scarred by its early endorsemen of racist concepts than has Yale by its honoring of slavery supporters. But, anthropology no longer celebrates such attachments. Through the efforts of Franz Boas and W.E.B. Du Bois, among others, our field has undergone a paradigmatic shift (although, as Lee D. Baker shows in his new book From Savage to Negro: Anthropology and the Construction of Race, 1896-1998, that we seem even now unable to fully embrace Du Bois as a direct contributor to anthropological thought on the issue of race shows how incomplete our shift might be). While Yale has established institutes of enlightened understanding of slavery, like the Glider Lehman Center for the Study of Slavery, Resistance and Abolition, it appears that it (like the American academy generally) remains unable to fully confront the issue of slavery and its role in that peculiar institution and in the broader issue of institutional racism.

As applied anthropologists part of our practice must always be to see beyond and beneath conventional rationales of oppressive behaviors and ideas, and to act accordingly. As scholars, we have a special responsibility to bring this practice to the academy by working for the kinds of social changes that have earned us the title of the “most humane of the sciences.” To do less—whatever the rationale—is a sacrifice of our heritage and evidence of our irrelevance.
The responsible departments are now admitting that there are no jobs in teaching,” says Bill Young, managing editor of Anthropology News.

Fortunately, private-sector jobs are more than picking up the slack. Sapient, a company that develops software and electronics, has more than two dozen anthropologists on staff. House anthropologists can also be found at such companies as Intel, Kodak, Whirlpool, AT&T, and General Motors. Hallmark, for instance, hired an anthropologist to go into people’s homes and study family relationships.

Detroit’s Wayne State University reorganized its anthropology department for survival during a 1980s recession. Now, doctoral students in its Business and Industrial Anthropology program are often lured away by high-paying jobs.

“A new PhD just got a job paying $76,000, working for a big tech firm,” says Marietta Baba, chair of the department. “That entry-level salary used to be unheard of for an anthropologist.”

What do anthropologists have that companies want? Is it, as the AAA says in one of its brochures, “social ease in strange situations”? When Dr. Johnsrud started working to find practical applications for new technology, she says, “Everyone would look at me and scratch their heads and say, ‘What’s an anthropologist doing here?’”

Three things set anthropologists apart: They’re trained to look at a larger context, they have a multicultural perspective, and they use a technique called “participant observation” (e.g. studying monkeys by joining their clan) that exposes what people do and want in a way surveys and focus groups do not.

“Engineers look at technology without looking at the broader social or cultural context, so they are often surprised when something fails” in the real world, Johnsrud says. “Anthropologists take a ... more holistic approach. We help people make connections....”

General Mills had heard from moms in focus groups that they wanted to serve their families whole-grain breakfast foods. But when it hired a team of anthropologists last year to look deeper, it got quite different results.

The team went into homes to watch the breakfast routine. Instead of whole-grain foods, they found multicolored cereal. Or snacks eaten in the minivan on the way to school or work.

As a healthy and portable alternative, they came up with Go-Gurt, a yogurt packaged so that it doesn’t require a spoon and can be frozen or refrigerated. It has enjoyed national success, says Dr. Squires, who was one of the consultants.

(continued on page 20)
Ed Liebow, who wrote his dissertation on the urban Indian population in Phoenix, now runs a research and consulting firm that helps government agencies and private companies liaise with local communities. His firm has developed Web sites where the public can learn how contamination affects them, or where welfare recipients can see how their finances will be affected if they go to work.

“There’s this classic role to play as a culture broker,” Dr. Liebow says. “We know something about private industry and the local community and can bridge the gap.”

That cultural sensitivity has become especially important with the rise of the diverse workplace and global marketplace.

“Most business students have never taken a cultural course,” says Phil Gardner, director of the Collegiate Employment Research Institute at Michigan State University. “Some of the stupid mistakes that corporations have made cross-culturally have raised an interest in people who understand those differences.”

Anthropology in the corporate world. The current wave of jobs for anthropologists outside of academia is not the first in United States history, as this selective timeline shows:

1930s: During a time of labor-management unrest and union formation, anthropologists try to help by using their people skills to reduce conflict within companies.

World War II: Anthropologists are called upon to help industry become more productive.

1940s-1960s: Working in companies as organizational consultants is an accepted part of the field of anthropology.

1970s-1980s: Applied anthropology falls out of favor with the rise of US involvement in the Vietnam War. “There was the fear that they would be used as spies in Vietnam, collecting data under the cover of being a researcher,” says Marietta Baba, chair of the anthropology department at Wayne State University in Detroit. “If we get the reputation of hurting people, we won’t be able to talk to the people any more.”

The mistrust of applied work extends to industry. The American Anthropological Association’s ethical guide includes a provision that any research performed by an anthropologist has to be public, which essentially bans working for a corporation. Dr. Baba says (the provision would later be removed). Most academic departments support that stance, sometimes warning students off jobs in the corporate sector.

1990s: The number of anthropology majors rises significantly. A split evolves between the academics who still discourage working at corporations and those who want to go where the problems (and money) are.

With a global business climate and a greater sensitivity to cultural differences, businesses recognize anthropologists as ideal “cultural brokers” who can help with product design, marketing, and communication with local populations. Major corporations employ staff anthropologists. University departments add more applied courses to their anthropology programs to better prepare graduates for work in the private sector.

2000: Listings on the Internet job board Monster.com for jobs in information technology include want-ads for anthropologists. Anthropology PhDs can earn starting salaries pushing six figures working for corporations.

FROM THE PROGRAM CHAIR

By Ben G. Blount <bblount@arches.uga.edu>
University of Georgia

The program for the meetings in Atlanta this coming March (6-10) is beginning to take shape, with proposals for interesting and exciting sessions on a wide variety of topics, especially on health and medical issues and on environmental concerns. Plans are also well underway for pre- and post-conference tours and for self-guided tours to historic sites and other places of interest within Atlanta. The host institutions in the Atlanta and Athens area are looking forward to an intellectually vibrant set of sessions, and we also expect that the meetings will be fun and enjoyable.

The hotel, the Sheraton Midtown Atlanta at Colony Square, is in an excellent location, on Peachtree Street in midtown. The Sheraton is across the street from the High Museum of Art, and restaurants and coffee shops can be found in the hotel complex and along Peachtree Street. A major city park, Piedmont Park, is only a couple of blocks away from the hotel. For those who want to venture farther, to the downtown area or to restaurants and centers of entertainment in Buckhead, a station for the rapid transit system, MARTA, is only three blocks from the hotel. There is also a MARTA station at Hartsfield Airport, making transportation from the airport to the hotel and back easy and economical.

If you have not yet forwarded your proposal for a session or for a volunteered paper, you are in luck. The deadline has been extended to November 15. We have ample space on the program for more sessions, and we encourage you to submit proposals and to plan to attend the meetings. Please do your part to help make the Atlanta meetings successful.
ANNOUNCEMENTS

Forum on Federally-Employed Anthropologists. On July 25, 2001, the Applied Research and Methods team of the U.S. General Accounting Office sponsored a meeting, “Convening of Federal Agency Anthropologists.” Thirty-six anthropologists from sixteen governmental agencies discussed the common interests and challenges they face working in the federal government and proposed initiating an effort to form a network of federally employed anthropologists. During the 2001 annual AAA meetings, this group will sponsor a discussion forum open to all anthropologists working in any government agency as well as those interested in topics related to this area of anthropological practice. Look for specifics on the day and time of the forum at the AAA meetings.

University of Memphis. Department of Anthropology, invites applications for a tenure-track, Assistant Professor position in Anthropology with a specialization in Applied Anthropology to begin Aug 2002, pending available funding. The University of Memphis BA & applied MA Anthropology program offers concentrations in urban anthropology, medical anthropology, and public arch. Qualifications: PhD by June 2002; specialty in areas such as (but not limited to) urban anthropology, Education, African/African-American Studies, American Communities, strong methodological skills, demonstrated excellence in research, outreach, & teaching. Culture area open, but must demonstrate a commitment to develop local research in the region. The U of Memphis is an equal opportunity/affirmative action educator and employer. Submit cover letter including statement of teaching & research exp & interest, full vita & names of 3 references, including phone/fax/email to: Stan Hyland, Committee Chair, Department of Anthropology, Memphis, TN 38152-3390; (901) 678-2080; fax (901) 678-2069.

California State University Hayward. The Department of Anthropology seeks applicants for tenure track, Assistant Professor position, to help build new Applied Anthropology M.A. program in beautiful San Francisco Bay Area setting. Applicant must have expertise in applied anthropology and any of the following: immigrant and/or minority studies; anthropology of education; urban health; evaluation research; policy analysis. In addition to research and publishing, the candidate is sought who has hands-on experience in a multicultural non-governmental organization (NGO), or in a public school system/education agency. Preference will be given to candidates who have worked with U.S. immigrant and/or ethnic minority communities; otherwise, geographic area is open. Candidates must have demonstrated ability to teach and advise students from diverse educational and cultural backgrounds and the skills to develop research and community involvement opportunities for a diverse student population. Ph.D. must be in hand to be considered.

At California State University Hayward, the usual teaching load is three courses per quarter; this position also entails supervision of M.A. internships/thesis writing. Please send letter of application, current vita, and the names/contact information of 3 referees to: Chair Search Committee; Department of Anthropology; 25800 Carlos Bee Boulevard; Hayward CA 94542-3039. Review of applications will begin on January 3, 2002, but position will be considered open until filled. For additional information about the department, please visit our website www.csuhayward.edu. California State University Hayward is an Equal Opportunity Employer and does not discriminate on the basis of age, race, color, national origin, sex, sexual orientation or disability. The University is committed to the principles of diversity in employment and to creating a stimulating learning environment for its diverse student body. Position # 02-03 ANTH-APPLIED-TT.

FROM THE EDITOR

This will be the second issue of the Newsletter that, unless you’ve told the Business Office otherwise, will come to your electronic mailbox instead of your US postal mailbox. The transition should not have caught anyone by surprise, and I hope it has worked out for you. In addition to saving the Society countless (they actually have an approximate figure) dollars in printing and postage, you should be receiving the SfAA’s flagship publication in the month that appears in the masthead — something that pleases us to no end. I think the ultimate measure of success will be to learn if members are reading this missive. A year ago I mentioned that we would be moving to an electronic-only version and asked for some reaction. I heard back from three individuals. One response was very enthusiastic about the pending transition, the second liked the idea of have a paper copy arriving in the mail —arguing (quite understandably) that she received far too much e-mail anyhow, and the third person really didn’t care. Now that we’ve done this a few times, what is your reaction?

Tucked between the pages of more scholarly treaties in this issue is a copy of an article that appeared just after the first of the year in The Christian Science Monitor. To most readers (several of whom were quoted in the article) of this Newsletter, the chatty and engaging piece may say nothing really new or profound. But it’s a wonderful advertisement for the often-unsung virtues of anthropology. Here at Iowa State we e-mailed the web site for the original article out to all of our undergraduate majors and graduate students and got some very enthusiastic responses.

(continued on page 22)
SfAA fellow Lenore Manderson, Professor of Women’s Health and Director of the Key Centre for Women’s Health in Society of the School of Population Health, in the Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry, and Health Sciences, at the University of Melbourne has been awarded one the most prestigious and publicly-funded fellowships ever in Australia. The Government’s Federation Fellowships are designed to attract and retain Australia’s elite researchers. The Fellowships bring home six Australian researchers currently holding some of the world’s most prestigious research posts in the USA, Europe, and Asia. Congratulations, Lenore.

Like the groundhog, Punxsutawney Phil, the next issue of the Newsletter will emerge from the winter shadows in early February. We hope to hear from many of you before then. Please note that the deadline for submission of materials will be January 25, 2002.

Mike Whiteford <jefe@iastate.edu>
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