PRESIDENT’S LETTER

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

Anthropology, or any other subject, cannot avoid the context in which it is done. And we cannot afford to be out of touch with our times. Paul Bohannon

In the November 2006 issue of Anthropology News, Elizabeth Tunstall announces that American anthropology suffers from a “branding problem,” and she reports on preliminary research, which concludes, “the popular perceptions of anthropology are of a field engaged in the scientific study of primitive peoples (exoticism) or the distant past (dirt, bones, and Indiana Jones,” (Anthropology News 47(8): 17, 2006). More than a decade ago, Paula Rubel and Abraham Rosman observed that anthropology finds itself “in a stage of disintegration and fragmentation into myriad subdisciplines, subspecialties, and interest groups, all of which emphasize their differences and uniqueness rather than what they have in common” (Journal of Anthropological Research 50(4):335, 1994). It still does. Anthropology, it would seem, is not only misunderstood by what we like to call “the Other,” but roiling with internecine dissension and turmoil.

For several decades now, in fact, anthropology has suffered from what Paul Bohannon called a catastrophe in its epigenetic landscape (American Anthropologist 82(3):512, 1980). An epigenetic landscape is “one that changes and moves because of the very activity that goes on within it. A catastrophe takes place when the epigenetic landscape changes to the point that one of its valleys, wherein social action has been flowing, is blocked or diverted to new courses.” Such valleys are called chreods. Bohannon argued that historical forces have diverted anthropology into new chreods—and “we can’t do nothing.” He believed that “our salvation lies in altering our view of ourselves in relation to the new context of our professional activities” (ibid.).

Some two decades later, James Peacock, looking toward “The Future of Anthropology” (American Anthropologist 99(1):9, 1997), predicted that “Whether it survives, flourishes, or becomes extinct depends on an-
thropology’s ability to contribute: to become integral and significant to our culture and society without becoming subservient.” Roy Rappaport spoke to this very point in “The Anthropology of Trouble” (American Anthropologist 95(2):295, 1993). According to Rappaport, to survive, let alone flourish, necessitates “the relocation of both engaged and domestic research from anthropology’s periphery toward its center.”

Unquestionably, more and more American anthropologists are actively engaged in research and practice that matters both abroad and at home. But education and academic career paths in anthropology continue to favor “exotic” and “pure” research over “domestic” and “applied” research and practice (see Shankman and Ehlers, Human Organization 59(3), 2000). This happens despite the realities of both employment and research opportunities, which favor North America (ibid.:297). Departments and how they train their students must change, but before that can happen, the hearts and minds of anthropologists themselves must change. And that will be no mean feat.

To change others’ notions about anthropology will, according to Tunstall, require successful “rebranding” and marketing. And that will depend; it seems to me, on making ourselves intelligible and audible beyond the narrow confines of academic discourse and disciplinary interest.

According to Rappaport (1993:301): “It is one thing to make a discourse intelligible and quite another to make it audible. To publish a monograph on the plight of some ‘Other’ is seldom if ever sufficiently audible to call attention to the conditions afflicting the subjects. Anthropologists need to give thought to a deep theoretical as well as practical problem: how is information concerning the troubles of a system to be introduced into that system in ways that will help to avoid, ameliorate, or correct those troubles rather than to exacerbate them?”

Rappaport’s is the central question facing anthropology today.

To make anthropology more audible, we must make its discourse both more intelligible to nonanthropologists and more useful. We must disseminate our research findings more effectively filling lecture halls with undergraduates and scholarly journals with erudite prose will not suffice, if we want to be heard by those who shape our world. We must find new outlets and better ways of reporting our research that go far beyond those in which we were trained and in which we feel comfortable...We must become planners, administrators, politicians, and, yes, advocates who work not just with “the powerless,” but also with the “bourgeois institutions” that we so frequently rail against.

We can start by training our students--undergraduate and graduate alike--in different career paths. And respecting, if not encouraging, those who choose career paths that favor action over observation is another. Daniel Gross and Stuart Plattner (Anthropology News 43(8):4, 2002) are right to caution us not to confuse anthropology with social work, but anthropology can take a lesson from social work and prepare students for careers in addition to teaching and research. And those of us who have already chosen anthropology’s traditional career paths must change our course in significant ways if we want to be intelligible and audible beyond the narrow confines of our subfield or our discipline.

Society for Applied Anthropology
The time for wringing our hands because no one listens to us is long past. We must take action if we are to be heard and listened to. And that action can start, it seems to me, with the recognition that advocacy is vital to the very future of anthropology—if it is to have one. The courses it takes, and the causes it seeks to advance, are ours to choose. But advocate we must, if anthropology is “to become integral and significant to our culture and society without becoming subservient” (Peacock 1997:9).

FOSTER, GEORGE MCCLELLAND, JR. (1913-2006)

By Robert V. Kemper [rkemper@mail.smu.edu]
Southern Methodist University

Born in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, on October 9, 1913, George M. Foster died on May 18, 2006 at his home in the hills above the campus of the University of California at Berkeley, where he taught from 1953-1979 and was Professor emeritus from 1979-2006. He was preceded in death by his wife, Mary LeCron (“Mickie”) Foster who died on December 14, 2001. He is survived by his son Jeremy and daughter Melissa and their families. He leaves behind two generations of students and colleagues, and generations yet to come whose lives will be enriched through his vision and generosity.

Foster grew up in an affluent family in Ottumwa, Iowa. Expecting to follow his father’s career in engineering, Foster entered Harvard in 1931. After a year, he transferred to Northwestern where he did not prosper in his engineering courses but eventually had the good luck to enroll in an introductory anthropology course taught by Melville Herskovits. In that anthropology class, he not only discovered his life’s work but met the love of his life, Mickie.

Foster arrived in Berkeley in mid-August 1935 to begin his graduate studies, married in January 1938, and then spent ten months with Mickie in Europe. After completing his studies, Foster went to Soteapan, Veracruz, where he and Mickie worked to learn the language and understand the culture of the Sierra Popoluca Indians. Returning to Berkeley, he quickly analyzed his field data and wrote a slim dissertation published the next year as A Primitive Mexican Economy (American Ethnological Society Monograph 5 1942, 115pp).

With academic posts in anthropology very scarce, Foster was lucky to land a job as an Instructor in Sociology at Syracuse University for the 1941-1942 academic year. He re-crossed the country to take a Lecturer position at UCLA for the 1942-1943 academic year to replace Ralph Beals (a fellow Berkeley Ph.D.), who had gone to the Smithsonian Institution to work with Julian Steward. Like so many anthropologists during World War II, Foster took a position in Washington soon after the UCLA job ended. That bureaucratic experience set the course for the rest of his life. After a decade dealing with governmental agencies, Foster made the decision that - at age 39 - he should return to a university position, or abandon any hope of becoming a professor. Laying aside inquiries from other universities, Foster and his family traveled back to Berkeley in pursuit of a position there. Since his wife’s parents had moved from Washington to Berkeley in 1943, the Fosters often traveled there on family vacations. Thus, Foster had been able to stay in contact with the Berkeley Department of Anthropology.

Foster’s years at Berkeley and beyond are well documented in his autobiographical volume, An Anthropologist’s Life in the Twentieth Century: Theory and Practice at UC Berkeley, the Smithsonian, in
Mexico, and with the World Health Organization (Foster 2000). Assembled from a series of oral history interviews conducted in 1998 and 1999 by Suzanne B. Reiss of the Regional Oral History Office of the Bancroft Library at UC-Berkeley, this 413 page volume is remarkable for the candor and detail with which Foster tells the story of his personal life and professional career. In the sub-title of An Anthropologist’s Life, Foster rightly identifies the major elements of his career. In this appreciation of his life, I shall follow the path between theory and practice that he illuminated.

From Ethnographer to Administrator: The Early Years

Given Foster’s status as a pioneer in applying anthropological perspectives to human problems, reading through An Anthropologist’s Life provides some unexpected insights about the development of “applied anthropology.” For instance, in discussing how he left his one-year temporary teaching position at UCLA to go to Washington, D.C. to work as a social science analyst at the newly constituted Institute of Inter-American Affairs, Foster comments about how anthropologists came to be employed by various governmental agencies during the 1930s:

Anthropologists had worked in government relatively little. John Collier made major use of them in the Indian Bureau. A psychiatrist named Alexander Leighton, who was an anthropologist also, was in charge of some or maybe all of the cultural aspects of the Japanese relocation centers. And Elizabeth Colson on our Berkeley faculty, and a number of other anthropologists, worked in these centers studying the reaction of the people.

And anthropologists have been used in the American Southwest by the Department of Agriculture, beginning about 1934 or ’5. But this was classified as applied anthropology, which is not a field that anthropologists generally followed. In fact, we were trained to despise applied anthropology. The war had the positive effect of making American anthropologists aware of the possibilities. The Society for Applied Anthropology, for example, was established in, I believe, 1942, and it has been a vigorous organization ever since. But I didn’t join until about 1950. I would have nothing of it (Foster 2000:120; emphasis added).

This hardly sounds like the beginning of a long and brilliant career in bringing together anthropological theory and practice. A great believer in luck and serendipity, Foster often recognized new opportunities where others saw nothing but shadows. Especially in those dark days during World War II, Foster made the most of the opportunities that came his way. In the ten years between 1943 and 1952, he went from “despising applied anthropology” to working as an advocate for anthropological research on U.S. technical aid programs in Latin America. He went from being an ethnographer in the tradition of A. L. Kroeber, Robert Lowie, and Edward W. Gifford (his teachers at Berkeley) to becoming an analyst/interpreter of culture and behavior in contemporary societies. He did not abandon his ethnographic roots, but found new ways to blend theory and practice.

The Institute of Social Anthropology in Mexico: Training Students and Doing Fieldwork

Foster’s self-transformation did not occur intentionally, but through serendipity. After being declared ineligible for the military draft because of allergies, he was the first anthropologist hired by Julian Steward (who knew of Foster from Berkeley) to go to Latin America as a representative of the new Institute of Social Anthropology, created within the Smithsonian Institution in 1942. Sent to Mexico City to train students at the Escuela Nacional de Antropología e Historia (ENAH), Foster also was expected to take a group of students to the field - specifically, to the Tarascan region in the State of Michoacán, the home state of the powerful former President of Mexico, Lázaro Cárdenas. After a bumpy start in the Tarascan village of Ihuatzio, Foster, his assistant Gabriel Ospina, and several students moved their project a few miles to the mestizo town of Tzintzuntzan, four hundred years earlier the capital of the Tarascan empire. At that time, in 1945-1946, Foster had no idea that, decades into the future, Tzintzuntzan would provide him with the source of some of his best ideas - especially “the image of limited good” and “the dyadic contract.”
Reflecting recently on his now-classic monograph, *Empire’s Children: The People of Tzintzuntzan* (1948), Foster recalls that “we were just interested in doing a basic community study. Word pictures of the way of life, the people, all aspects, as many aspects as we could deal with” (Foster 2000:135). After leaving Mexico, he did not return to Tzintzuntzan until 1958, when he began a restudy of the community. Only in the 1960s, and thereafter, did Foster develop theoretical models to explain the impact of external forces (e.g., government programs, emigration, consumerism) on the community’s culture.

**Washington, D.C.: From the Institute of Social Anthropology to Public Health**

In the summer of 1946, after convincing his colleague (and fellow Berkeley Ph.D.) Isabel Kelly to replace him as head of the ISA program in Mexico, Foster went to Washington, D.C., where he took over the ISA from Steward, who was leaving to become a professor at Columbia University. In this new role as a government administrator and bureaucrat, Foster recognized the need to learn more about the Institute’s programs in Latin America.

On February 1, 1947, he went on his first ISA trip to South America. In Ecuador he visited Aníbal Buitrón, in Peru with Alan Holmberg and George McBryde, and in Colombia with John Rowe and Gregorio Hernández de Alba. On a second trip, lasting from February 14 to April 11, 1948, Foster traveled to Colombia, where he again saw Rowe and Hernández de Alba; to Ecuador and Peru, where he saw Holmberg and Jorge Muelle; and to Bolivia and Brazil, where he visited Donald Pierson and Kalervo Oberg.

In 1949-1950, Foster took a leave of absence from the ISA and, with a Guggenheim Fellowship, went to Spain to carry out a detailed study of acculturation. This field research served as the basis of his well-known book, *Culture and Conquest: America’s Spanish Heritage* (initially rejected without explanation by the University of California Press, but finally published by the Wenner-Gren Foundation in 1960), in which he elaborated the important concepts of “conquest culture” and “cultural crystallization.”

When Foster returned to Washington from Spain, he realized that the days of the ISA were numbered. He made his third (and final) ISA trip to Latin America between March 3 and March 28, 1951. He saw Richard Adams in Guatemala, Charles Erasmus and Duque Gomez in Colombia, and Ozzie Simmons and Muelle in Peru. Upon returning to the U.S., Foster made the strategic decision to attempt to save the jobs of the anthropologists working in the ISA program by shifting their focus from research and training to the evaluation of U.S. technical aid programs in Latin America. Given his earlier experience with the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, Foster determined that, of its three main divisions (agriculture, education, and health), only the area of health held much prospect for success.

So Foster went across the Mall to see the acting head of the IIAA’s Health Division. After some discussion, they agreed that the ISA anthropologists would work on health programs and the cultural problems they were encountering. Foster sent instructions to Kelly in Mexico, Adams in Guatemala, Erasmus in Colombia, Simmons in Peru, and Oberg in Brazil. After a couple of months they sent their notes to Foster, who assembled a 104-page mimeographed report titled “A Cross-Cultural Anthropological Analysis of a Technical Aid Program (1951).

According to Foster, “This paper was, you might say, a bombshell” (Foster 2000:159). The promise of the anthropological approach was so compelling that Henry van Zile Hyde, head of the IIAA Health Division, agreed to hire all of the ISA field staff for the coming year if they would focus their attention on the U.S.-sponsored public health programs in their countries.
In June 1952, a one-week conference was held in Washington to discuss the anthropologists’ work on the public health programs in Latin America. According to Foster,

And on one day, I presented our findings. That was one of the great days of my life and a great day, I think, for public health, too. You’ve never seen such enthusiasm. We were able to explain a lot of things that the public health personnel had been knocking their heads about (Foster 2000:160).

In reconfiguring the Institute of Social Anthropology, Foster transformed his own vision of the world. Always the ethnographer, he saw how bureaucracies had their own cultures and what later he would call their own “implicit premises” (Foster 1969:90-113).

**Berkeley: 1953-1979 and beyond**

Foster returned to Berkeley in 1953 as a visiting lecturer, hoping to land a permanent job - designed to be split one-third and two-thirds between public health and anthropology, respectively - but the arrangement never came to fruition. Fortunately, it happened that Gifford retired soon after Foster’s arrival and there was a need for a new Director of the Museum of Anthropology. As a result, Foster was appointed into Gifford’s position. In that role, he soon found himself in the role of liaison with the architects hired to build a new building, where the museum would be housed along with the departments of anthropology and art. After a three-year stint as “acting director” at the museum, Foster moved into the Department of Anthropology on a full-time tenured appointment in 1955. He served as chair of the department in 1958-1961 and then again from 1973-1974.

Aside from restarting his field research in Tzintzuntzan (with a grant from NSF) in 1958, Foster also took advantage of the opportunity to develop a major grant with the NIGMS (National Institute for General Medical Sciences). Over a period of fifteen years, from 1965-1979, he brought in some $3,000,000 (equivalent to more than $15,000,000 in 2006 dollars) to support about 100 students in the doctoral program. Surely, this is the largest graduate student training grant in the history of American anthropology. When the money ran out in 1979, Foster decided to retire - two years in advance of the statutory requirement.

During his years at Berkeley, Foster taught many different courses, ranging from regional surveys of “Europe and the Mediterranean” and “Latin American Culture” to his famous “Anthropology and Modern Life” (later called “Applied Anthropology”). In the fall term of 1968, I served as his teaching assistant for the applied anthropology course. I remember that it had well over 100 students, many of them graduate students in public health, education, social welfare, architecture, and other fields. We all had to rise early to be on time for this 8:00 a.m. class, where, with missionary zeal, Foster blended case studies and theories to teach us about culture and the “implicit premises” of peoples, professions, and bureaucracies. With his bow-tie in place, and his lecture notes typed out on 5” X 8” sheets, he presented a serious and formidable figure in the classroom. Yet, he was passionate about enlightening students to an anthropological way of seeing and understanding the world. About the course, Foster has written:

That was the most successful course, I suppose, that I ever gave. I mentioned earlier that I wrote two books on the basis of my lectures, *Traditional Cultures and the Impact of Technological Change* (1962) and then, of course, I had to rewrite my lectures. That gave rise to *Applied Anthropology*, after which I had to rewrite my lectures once more.
And that resulted in the revised edition of *Traditional Cultures* that appeared in 1972, under the mercifully shortened title of *Traditional Societies and Technological Change* (Foster 2000:201).

Among his many successful and critically acclaimed monographs and textbooks, his *Traditional Cultures* book was the best-selling, with well over 100,000 copies sold in English. It also was translated into Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch, and Farsi.

In his commitment to training graduate students, Foster was willing to risk taking them into the region of his own research – Tzintzuntzan, Mexico – where they could learn the basics of field work under his supervision. This was not a formal “field school,” students. On the contrary, a carefully selected group of graduate students worked on individual projects for which they began preparing in a seminar conducted during the spring term before the summer field work period. Then, in the following fall term, the students participated in a seminar to write up their results into papers that could be presented at conferences or submitted for publication. In a sense, this three-part involvement in the field work experience was Foster’s way of preparing his students to cope with the “culture shock” that he knew they would suffer in their dissertation research.

On June 16, 1979, Foster was presented with a *Festschrift* volume entitled *From Tzintzuntzan to the “Image of Limited Good”: Essays in Honor of George M. Foster* (Clark, Kemper, and Nelson 1979), which contained congratulatory letters from numerous colleagues and former students, a dozen articles written by former students, and a comprehensive bibliography of Foster’s publications from 1939 to mid-1979. Without a doubt, the most important piece in the *Festschrift* has proven to be that of Eugene Hammel and Laura Nader, titled “Will the Real George Foster Please Stand Up? A Brief Intellectual History.” This article is available at the Anthropology Emeritus Lecture Series web site, specifically the Fifth Emeritus Lecture delivered by Evon Z. Vogt on October 21, 1996: <http://sunsite.berkeley.edu/Anthro/foster/bio/fobib.html>. This web site also includes a link to the exhibit “Tzintzuntzan, Mexico: photographs by George Foster” <http://hearstmuseum.berkeley.edu/exhibitions/tzin/01.html>.

**Consulting with WHO and other Agencies**

Beginning with his participation in 1951-1952 on a USPHS- Institute of Inter-American Affairs Evaluation Team that assessed “The First Ten Years of Bilateral Health Programs in Latin America,” and concluding with a 1983 trip to participate in a WHO/EURO Workshop on the “Scientific Analysis of Health Care,” Foster accepted 36 international consulting assignments (see Appendix 1). His retirement in 1979 hardly slowed the pace of his international travels to work with WHO and other agencies. Although he served on some administrative commissions and did a few site visits at universities, Foster never did fieldwork-based consulting in the United States. In fact, his only fieldwork in the United States was his initial foray in the field as a graduate student, when Kroeber sent him to spend the summer among the Yuki Indians in Round Valley, California. All of his applied anthropology assignments were international, ranging from Latin America to Africa, and from Asia to Europe. Although many of his consulting projects were focused on public health issues, they often were labeled more broadly as “community development.”

The record shows that he was an excellent consultant, who listened carefully and took a positive approach to the people who worked in the sponsoring agencies. The stories of his consultancies have appeared in numerous anthropological and interdisciplinary journals. His international experiences also...
created for him a global network of contacts in diverse agencies, especially in the World Health Organization and other public health agencies. Early in his career Foster recognized the importance of understanding the cultures of these “innovating organizations” rather than focusing only on the cultures of the “target group.” One of his important contributions to applied anthropology was his realization that it was the “interaction setting” between change agents and the recipient peoples that determined much of the success (or failure) of development projects. This perspective is cogently presented in his *Applied Anthropology* (1969), generally considered to be the first textbook in the field.

**The Impact of Foster’s Work in Applied Anthropology**

Imagine for a moment that during his professional career of more than sixty years Foster had done no applied anthropology at all – no consulting around the globe; no reports, articles, book chapters, and journal articles related to public health and community development; no textbooks that helped to define the field of applied anthropology. Surely, the field would be very different.

On the other hand, Foster the anthropologist still would have been a highly respected scholar whose many outstanding contributions to the discipline and to the social sciences would have placed him in the National Academy of Sciences and would have brought him many of the same awards and honors that came his way. His work on acculturation, peasant economies, ceramics and technology, theories of illness and wellness, worldview, social structure, and symbolic systems would have been the envy of many of his colleagues.

Because of his accomplishments as a scholar and administrator, Foster was elected as President of the American Anthropological Association during the turbulent years of 1969-1970, and in 1980 he was recognized with the Association’s Distinguished Service Award. In 1990 Foster received an honorary Doctor of Humane Letters degree from Southern Methodist University, and in 2000 he and Mickie attended the inaugural “George and Mary Foster Distinguished Lecture in Cultural Anthropology” at SMU, a lecture delivered by Prof. Stanley Brandes. In 2005, Foster was awarded the Society for Medical Anthropology’s first Lifetime Achievement Award (which was renamed in his honor in 2006).

Given all that he did in his “regular” job, it is remarkable that Foster found the time and energy to add so much international consulting to his scholarly and family life. His record of publishing in applied anthropology is remarkable by any standard - with some 46 publications, ranging from textbooks to technical reports, many of which have been reprinted or translated into other languages (see Appendix 2).

**Foster and the SfAA**

Curiously, Foster rarely participated in the affairs of the Society for Applied Anthropology. Although he joined the SfAA in 1950, I can find no record that Foster ever held an office in the SfAA or regularly attended its annual meetings. In fact, his line-a-day diary suggests that he only attended three annual meetings: the 1969 meeting in Mexico City, where I was doing my dissertation research and took him to visit his friend Isabel Kelly at her home in the suburb of Tepepan; the 1981 meeting in Edinburgh; and the 1982 meeting in Lexington, Kentucky, where he presented the Malinowski Lecture.

Throughout his long career, he published only three articles in *Human Organization*. The first dealt with “Relationships between Theoretical and Applied Anthropology: A Public Health Program Analysis” (Foster 1952a); the second was derived from his talk to the SfAA on the occasion of receiving the 1982 Bronislaw Malinowski Award (1982d); and the last analyzed his consulting experiences with British colo-
nial administration in Northern Rhodesia in 1961-1962. Foster intentionally delayed publishing his findings until twenty-five years after the original consultation (Foster 1987c).

Conclusion
On May 19, 1956 - just one day short of fifty years before his death - Foster published a short essay whose title was taken intentionally from Franz Boas’s earlier book on “Applied Anthropology and Modern Life.” In this essay, he laid out in his typically clear-headed way the fundamentals of applied anthropology. The essay concluded with the statement that anthropologists’ “basic belief in the inherent dignity in human life [is] the sure guarantee that the applied anthropologist will make increasingly significant contributions to human welfare” (Foster 1956b:341). During a career spanning more than fifty years of applied anthropological research, consulting, and teaching, George Foster certainly made extraordinary contributions to human welfare - and his legacy will continue for generations to come.

Appendix 1 Major Consultancies, Seminars, Workshops in Applied Anthropology

1952 (May). Geneva, Switzerland. Technical Advisor to the American Delegation to the Fifth World Health Assembly.
1961 (Sept. - Oct.). Lusaka, Northern Rhodesia. USAID Consultant on Community Development.
1962 (Jan. - June). Lusaka, Northern Rhodesia. USAID Consultant on Community Development.
1963 (August). Mexico, Bolivia. OAS Consultant on Community Development.
1964 (October). Mexico. OAS Consultant on Community Development.
1964 (July-Aug.). Endicott House, Dedham, MA. MIT-USAID seminar “Problems of Agricultural Production in Developing Countries.”
1964-1966 Assn. Of American Medical Colleges. Member, Advisory Committee, Study of Medical Education in the Developing Countries.
1965 (July-Aug.). Katmandu, Nepal. USAID Consultant on Community Development.
1966 (November). New Delhi, India. Third World Conference on Medical Education.
1979 (Oct. - Dec.) New Delhi, India. WHO-SEARO Consultant on Health Education.
1981 (Aug. - Oct.). New Delhi, Bangkok, Jakarta, Colombo. WHO Consultant on Health Education. Organizer of the following meeting:
1982 (June). Bangkok. Participant, WHO-Mahidol University meeting on “Sociocultural Aspects of Food Safety.”

Appendix 2: George M. Foster - Publications in Applied Anthropology
Monographs, Articles, Book Chapters, Reports

Society for Applied Anthropology
1956a Working with People of Different Cultural Backgrounds. California's Health l3(l4):l07-l10 (January l5).
1968a “Commentary” on “Illness and Health Services.” In Social Sciences and Health Planning: Culture, Disease and Health Services in Colombia (Robin F. Badgely, ed.). The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly 46(2), Part 2:7l-l76.

Reflections and Histories of Anthropology:
1979c (With the above, in 1979a), "Introduction," pp. 1-3.
1979d (With the above, in 1979a), "Conclusion: the Long-Term Study in Perspective," pp. 323-348.


**Reprinted Works**


1979g The Cultural Context of Technological Development. In Society, Culture and the Filipino (Mary R. Hollnsteiner. ed.), pp. 28-35. Quezon City: The Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University. [Reprint of Chapter 1 of 1973].

1980c Applied Anthropology. ["Reproduced by UNISA 1980 with special permission of the author for educational and non-commercial use by students of the University of South Africa only.” This is a blue-bound paperback reprint of 1969].


_Society for Applied Anthropology_

**Translated Works**

1952c Influencia de las costumbres y creencias populares en los servicios de un centro de salud. Boletin de la Oficina Sanitaria Panamericana 33:283-297. [Spanish condensation of 1951].


1959 Influencia de las costumbres y creencias populares en los servicios de un centro de salud. México, D.F.: Impreso Técnico, Academia Mexicana de Pediatría 7:3-9 and 8:3-13. [Spanish translation with some modification of 1951].


**Appreciations, Death Notices, Festschriften, and Obituaries**

Anonymous

Clark, Margaret, Robert V. Kemper, and Cynthia Nelson (eds.)

Hammel, Eugene and Laura Nader

Kemper, Robert V.

Maclay, Kathleen
2006 George M. Foster, noted anthropologist dies. (http://www.berkeley.edu/news/media/releases/2006/05/26_foster.shtml)

Perlman, David

Rollewagen, Jack
1992 Tzintzuntzan in the 1990s: A Lakeside Village in Highland Mexico [video] (Module 1; Introduction, 22 minutes; Module 2, Change in Tzintzuntzan, 33 minutes; Module 3, part 1 Religious Calendar, 14 minutes). Brockport, NY: The Institute, Inc.

Weaver, Thomas

Whiteford, Michael

Zamora, Mario D. (ed.)
Margaret Lantis, recipient of the 1987 Malinowski Award of the Society and Past-President, died at Dayton, Ohio on September 8, 2006. She was 100 years old. She was born in Ohio, and grew up in Ohio, Minnesota, North Dakota, and Wisconsin. Her family included farmers, factory workers, businessmen, and a Professor of Rural Sociology--her father.

Lantis received a bachelor’s degree majoring in both Spanish and Anthropology from the University of Minnesota in 1930 and a Ph.D. in Anthropology for the University of California, Berkeley in 1939. At UC she took courses from Robert Lowie and A. L. Kroeber. Her dissertation was entitled *Alaskan Eskimo Ceremonialism*. Her Alaska research was done at various sites including Nunivak and Atka Islands and alternated between basic ethnography on ritual, folklore, symbolism and applied topics. Her Arctic research work was distinguished and continues to be used by scholars and native peoples. She was recognized by the Alaska Anthropology Association with a 1993 award for Lifetime Contribution to Alaska Anthropology.

The early portion of her career was spent working for public agencies. This portion of her career started with employment with the War Relocation Authority. She worked for almost a decade for the U.S. Public Health Service. She also did projects as a direct-hire employee or a consultant for the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of the Census, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Arctic Health Research Center and the Arctic Institute of North America. Her work in applied anthropology included research on Japanese-American relocates as farmers for the WRA, evaluation of a dental program that served poor rural farmers for the Farm Security Administration in Georgia, and evaluation of Inuit experiences at U.S. Public Health Service Tuberculosis hospitals in Seattle. In addition she was a very early contributor to disaster studies in anthropology with her work with the 1964 Alaska earthquake. Some of her perspective on this aspect of her career can be obtained by reading “Applied Anthropology as a Public Service” *Applied Anthropology* 4:20-32.

Lantis was a visiting faculty member at a number of universities including Alaska (Fairbanks), Washington, Minnesota, George Washington and McGill. She was appointed professor at the University of Kentucky’s Department of Anthropology in 1965. She taught among other topics a course entitled Applied Anthropology. She retired from this position in 1974. She remained an active member of the community of anthropologists at the University until she moved to Dayton a few years ago. The Department established the Margaret Lantis Graduate Research Award to honor her.

Lantis made significant contributions to the Society. She served as Regional vice-president, East, 1957; Member, Executive Committee, 1959-60, 1972-75; President, 1973-74. She was the third woman who served as President. Her Bronislaw Malinowski Award was in 1987 given at the meeting in Oaxaca. Lantis’ Malinowski lecture was published in 1987 as “Two Important Roles in Organizations and Communities” *Human Organization* 46(3):189-199.
2007 SfAA ANNUAL MEETINGS IN TAMPA

By Nancy Romero-Daza [daza@chuma1.cas.usf.edu]

David Himmelgreen
[dhimmelg@cas.usf.edu]

Michael Angrosino
[angrosin@cas.usf.edu]
Co-Chairs 2007 SfAA Annual Meeting University of South Florida

With the October 15th deadline for the submission of abstracts come and gone, we are now in the midst of putting together the final program for the 2007 Meetings. Some of the highlights for this year include a plenary session on Wednesday, March 28th in which Setha Low will address issues related to post-9/11 reactions that have fueled racism and paranoia and have led to the emergence of new gated communities around the world.

On Thursday, the special seminar on “Global Health in the Time of Violence” sponsored by the School of American Research (SAR) and chaired by Paul Farmer, Barbara Rylko-Bauer, and Linda Whiteford will bring together an outstanding group of international scholars and promises to draw a large audience. This session will be followed by the presentation of the prestigious SAR Staley Prize to Paul Farmer for his book “Pathologies of Power.” Thursday has also been designated as “Public Health Day” and will feature a plenary session chaired by Patricia Mail, the current President of the American Health Association. The Public Health Day will also highlight a series of sessions related to issues of practice and policy in Applied Anthropology and Public Health at both domestic and international levels. It will involve researchers, activists, and public health practitioners from inside and outside academia.

Our co-sponsors (COPAA, CONAA, SUNTA, NAPA, and PESO) have organized a large number of sessions and special events that will make this a truly exceptional meeting. For example, for the third year COPAA is organizing a panel discussion on issues related to tenure and promotion for applied anthropologists. This year, the emphasis will be on the perspectives of those in decision making positions (e.g., deans, department and T&P committee chairs, etc.). PESO has organized a three-part session on Anthropology’s response to global climate change, and NAPA will address issues of empowerment of women in the face of HIV/AIDS. Likewise, several workshops have been proposed including topics such as the use of SPSS and of Network Analysis in anthropological research, the basics of fundraising, and the teaching of community-based research to undergraduates.

One of the main goals we had for this year was to increase participation of colleagues from outside of the United States. To that end, we were able to secure funding from the Wenner-Gren Foundation to sponsor researchers and community activists from Lesotho, Ecuador, and Honduras for whom this would be the first SfAA conference they ever attend. We also want to express our gratitude to all of you who have made a special effort to organize sessions and panels that involve international participants. In addition, we are interested in highlighting the work of graduate students, many of whom have years of experience in applied settings. In the last couple of days we heard of the establishment of a new student prize for posters related to tourism. This award, sponsored by Valene Smith, is a wonderful addition to other student-oriented competitions such as the Peter K. New Award, which was first offered in 1990.
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The Hyatt Regency Tampa will serve as the host hotel for our 67th Annual Meeting next March. The Hotel is centrally located in the Downtown Area. All of the sessions and receptions will be held at this Hotel. We have arranged a discounted rate for the meeting of $159/night (single) and $169/night (double). You may make reserve a room by contacting Hotel Reservations at either of the following numbers: (813) 225-1234 or (800) 233-1234. In order to obtain this rate, you must identify yourself as with the “Society for Applied Anthropology Meeting.”

A Student Poster Competition will be added to the 67th Annual Meeting in Tampa. The Competition will honor the path-breaking research of long-time member Valene Smith and will bear her name. The Competition will be limited to posters reporting research on "tourism". This Competition is open to all students (graduate and undergraduate). A first prize of $500 will be awarded; two additional prizes of $250 each will also be awarded. The customary deadline for receipt of poster abstracts has been extended to December 15. Please contact the SfAA Office <info@sfaa.net> if you have any questions.

There will be several workshops available at the Tampa meeting. Following are descriptions:

Workshop #1: Using SPSS to Analyze Anthropological Data, Wednesday, 9:00-5:00. DRESSLER, William and OTSH, Kathryn (U Alabama). This one-day course will provide an introduction to the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), and will cover data definition, data transformation, data analyses, and the production and interpretation of graphical output. To best embody the new knowledge and skills, workshop participants will do hands-on application with actual data sets (provided). Appropriate quantitative computer applications must be based on at least a basic understanding of statistical routines. To this end, some portion of the class will be devoted to the "five things one needs to know about statistics." Participants must provide their own laptop and copy of SPSS. Maximum number of participants: 15, Cost: $85 (post-PhD) and $55 (students), including lunch.

Workshop #2: Introduction To Social Network Analysis, Thursday 9:00-5:00. JOHNSON, Jeffrey C. (E Carolina U), MCCARTY, Christopher (U Florida). Social network analysis (SNA) is the study of the patterns of relations between actors (usually people). SNA is a way to operationalize social context in detail. In addition to providing data to test models that use social network measures to predict outcomes, network visualization provides a unique way to interact with respondents about that social context. Participants will learn about whole network analysis (relations within groups) and personal network analysis (relations surrounding individuals). This is a basic introductory hands-on workshop, employing examples (provided) germane to anthropological research. Whole networks will be analyzed using UCINET, NetDraw and Visualyzer while personal networks will be collected and analyzed using EgoNet. Participants must furnish their own laptops. Maximum number of participants: 15, Cost: $85 (post-Ph.D.) and $55 (students), including lunch.

Workshop #3: Teaching Community-based Research to Undergraduates, Thursday 12:00-1:30. ROSING, Howard (DePaul U - hrosing@depaul.edu) This interactive workshop will provide resources for university instructors considering developing or enhancing courses that integrate community-based research as pedagogy and as a means to address critical social issues. Participants will be guided through a series of topics that illustrate the benefits and challenges of educating students on community-driven and participatory approaches to applying anthropology. Handouts illustrating case examples will offer ideas about how coursework can be integrated with action research. These will incorporate advice on developing community partners and preparing students for research in diverse settings. Information will also be provided on turning course-based research into presentations and publications. Maximum number of participants: 15, Cost: $20.

Workshop #4: Becoming a Practicing Anthropologist: A Workshop for Students Seeking Non-Academic Careers, Friday 12:00-2:00. NOLAN, Riall (Purdue U - rwnolan@purdue.edu) This workshop shows students (both Master's and undergraduate) how to prepare themselves for practice, even within a traditional anthropology program. Six areas will be covered: 1) Practice careers; 2) Practice compe-
tencies; 3) Making graduate school count; 4) Career planning; 5) Job-hunting; and 6) Job success. The workshop is two hours long. Maximum number of participants: 30, Cost: $10.

If you haven’t registered yet, you may visit the SfAA web site at <http://www.sfaa.net> and register securely online. Just click on Annual Meeting and follow the instructions. Soon, we will be able to update you on the diverse tours and other special events we are planning for the meetings. We look forward to seeing you in Tampa.

GRAPPLING WITH TOUGH ISSUES: GLOBAL HEALTH, VIOLENCE, AND ANTHROPOLOGY

By Merrill Singer [Anthro8566@aol.com]
Hispanic Health Council

I spent the summer of 1977 studying a polygamous Mormon sect in the Salt Lake City area, as part of what, at the time, I thought would be my dissertation research. This idea did not pan out for two reasons. The first was that members of a rival group assassinated the leader of the group I was studying, just a few weeks after an interview I had conducted with him in the office where he practiced naturopathy. The second reason was that my graduate committee advisor returned from a trip to Israel with an idea for a new dissertation topic. Consequently, the following year I headed to Israel with the tongue-in-cheek explanation to friends that I was escaping the violence of Utah for the peace of the Middle East.

While I spent most of my time in a Negev Desert town that is home to Israel’s nuclear industry, during the later part of my stay in Israel—which encompassed the first Israeli invasion of southern Lebanon—I lived for a month on a kibbutz near the Mediterranean coast. One evening after a day of hard work in the chicken houses, I was invited over to the home of one of the kibbutzniks, an individual who once asked me if America is as violent as it is portrayed in American movies. During the evening, he told me about an article he had run across by an anthropologist that analyzed the symbolic meaning among American Jews of eating bagels and lox on Sunday morning. Looking sternly at me, my host, a veteran of several wars, demanded to know, “Don’t anthropologists have anything more important to study?”

Memory of this conversation came to mind as the airport shuttle dropped me off in early October at the School of American Research (SAR) in Santa Fe, New Mexico. I had come by way of invitation of SAR Advanced Seminar organizers and friends Paul Farmer, Barbara Rylko-Bauer, and Linda Whiteford to participate in several days of provocative discussion about Global Health in the Time of Violence, part of an ongoing SAR-SfAA collaborative initiative. In addition to the organizers, the intimate gathering of conferees included Philippe Bourgois, Carolyn Nordstrom, Kris Heggenhougen, and Jim Quesada. At times James Brooks the engaging new director of SAR also joined us.

From the first moment of my arrival it was evident that if anyone still doubted that anthropology addresses matters that really matter it was time to put those hoary misconceptions to rest. Violence, especially when you get very close to it or when it inflicts suffering and loss on those close to you can feel immeasurably important…so important that it is hard to feel up to the task of really saying something worthwhile about it...something that can have pragmatic impact on the debates and policies that shape global health and well-being.
something that can contribute to human dignity and equity, and something that can have pragmatic impact on the debates and policies that shape global health and well-being.

In approaching our task, we were filled with humbling questions: What new sense to make of an issue that is not new to anthropological assessment? What words to use to talk about it meaningfully, insightfully? What conceptions, new and old, borrowed and invented, to mobilize in bringing novel understandings to a doleful and difficult subject? What to make of assertions about justified violence or how to address emotionally overwhelming issues like ethnic cleansing or genocide? How to assess violent behavior in all of its confounding complexity relative to health at a time, at the global level, when the gods of aggression seem to be ascendant? What to do with our awareness that since the bloody end of World War II there have been at least 160 wars around the globe with as many as 25 million (and probably many more) people killed, most of them civilians and tens of millions more displaced by internal conflict and violence? What to say about all the other forms of violence short of war, from intimate partner violence to street violence, from sexual assault to the structural violence of poverty, stigmatization, and discrimination?

Confronting all of these questions was our challenge, our burden, and our potential generator of creative responses. Our task was perhaps made all the more difficult by our surroundings, for a more peaceful, more comfortable, and more pleasant setting than SAR is hard to conjure up. During a dreamy patch of late summer warmth and clear skies, in a place of great historic importance to our discipline, laid out in close harmony with the surrounding majestic beauty of the Southwest, and with the full and endearing support of SAR’s eager staff, we had come to share our thoughts and feelings about one of the cruelest and most brutal of topics we might imagine.

All attendees had prepared papers on a wide range of relevant topics prior to the gathering, and we had read these in advance of arriving in Sante Fe. In a spirit of open discourse, we reviewed our thoughts, expressed our heartfelt uncertainties and doubts, and listened to the productive suggestions of our peers. Needless to say, our conversations were lively and endlessly provocative. Over several days, a community of co-writers emerged, as the idea of individual authorship became an ever more precarious notion. For a fleeting moment, we glimpsed the best side of humanity as we deliberated its worst features. We laughed often, knowing only too well the alternative in light of our subject.

Weeks already have sped by since our uneager departure from Sante Fe to our widely dispersed homes and places of work. We have returned, as we knew we must to our respective lives, to the worlds of walking the dog and raising our families, as Jim Quesada remarked at the end of our time together. Like violence itself, however, to borrow Carol Nordstrom’s apt phrase, our work has a tomorrow. The first unveiling of the products of our efforts will be at a plenary session at the SfAA meeting in Tampa entitled “Global Health in the Time of Violence.” Soon after that, we are charged with completing a book to be published by SAR Press in their increasingly impressive list of topical volumes.

Further back on the burner, and perhaps never to reach the high flame, we shared thoughts of trying to reach a broader audience by way of expressive media, like a play. This idea reminded us of Mother Courage and Her Children by Bertolt Brecht, whose gripping poetry introduced our seminar. In Brecht’s drama, the character Anna Fierling, nicknamed Mother Courage, loses all three of her children to a war she hoped would bring her fortune. Through this device, Brecht sought to expose the
monstrosity of war and the corruption of virtue in “dark times.” How to reach a broader audience in our own “dark times” remains a challenge, one we share with all anthropologists whose focus is firmly on things that really matter.

RETHINKING COSMOPOLITANISM

By Kevin Hagopian
Penn State University

Fellow anthropologists,

Allow me to introduce my Penn State colleague, Kevin Hagopian from Media Studies. He did his Ph. D. in Communications at Wisconsin, with a specialty in Film Studies. His current research analyzes the Hollywood cinema of the late 1930’s and World War II years as institutional advertising for the film industry as a semi-official national cultural voice.

I know Kevin from other places, but I listened to his words at a Symposium entitled “Whose Media Is It? A Media Issues/Activism/Policy Symposium” that included the mayor of State College, Bill Welch; the organizer of a successful local movement to assert First Amendment rights in the face of the Patriot Act (and past president of the American Association of Librarians), Nancy Kranich; a city council woman, Elizabeth Goreham (for the purists, it’s not a city but a borough); a scholar of communications, Jorge Schement; and the editor of our area’s alternative newspaper Voices of Central Pennsylvania which was founded by Art Goldschmidt 13 years ago. Art is the author of the recently updated Concise History of the Middle East. For genealogists, Arthur Goldschmidt is the nephew of anthropologist Walter Goldschmidt and the editor of Voices is my wife, Suzan Erem.

I wasn’t on the panel and said nothing during the symposium, as I was too busy listening and learning not to shoot off my mouth. And I found that I agreed with most of what most the folks were saying and I couldn’t have said it better.

I am connected to each of these folks in different ways, but I found Kevin’s comments especially relevant, so I asked him if I could share them with colleagues in anthropology in this forum, and he agreed. The symposium lasted 2 days and explored links among local media issues, corporate interests, and Washington policy-making. Michael Elavsky of Penn State’s College of Communications organized the symposium and invited Ben Scott, policy director for the organization, Free Press, in Washington to discuss these issues. This is what Kevin said that I wanted to share with you. --Paul Durrenberger

As an activist, I’m the rookie here. I’m nervous about being on the same bill with local activists who have really made change, including my colleagues Elizabeth Goreham, Nancy Kranich, Jorge Schement, Suzan Erem and Paul Durrenberger; they’ve shaped this community in ways that will be felt for decades. Our town is measurably more democratic, small d, because of them. I’m in the beginning stages of moving from being a generic academic to becoming an academic-activist, so what I’d like to do is share my impressions about that process. As I chart my own progress in the direction from academics to activism, I hope it will particularly help those of you in academia - faculty, staff, and graduate students - to start to visualize yourselves as activists.
The first stage of activism consists of building a place out of which activism can grow, of preparing the ground, whether in a community or in a person. In my case, it started with dissatisfaction with my own position in the academy.

I was growing more and more sensitive to politics because of my research in the historical politics of American culture (my current research is on the manner in which the Hollywood cinema aligned itself with discourses of an affirmative American economic and cultural nationalism in the late 1930's), but I wasn’t having any particular impact on the political sphere, other than exhorting my students, vaguely, to uphold their responsibilities in the local political sphere. What those responsibilities really were, other than voting, I couldn’t really tell them, because I certainly wasn’t living them either.

I had been brought up to take great pride in political action. My first formal political activity had been as a 14 year-old campaign worker in the McGovern campaign. (I understand I still hold the record in solidly Republican DuPage County, Illinois for the most doors slammed in the face of a political operative under the age of 21.) What happened to that instinct to participate in real political activity?

What happened is that since then I’ve been “brought up” again, this time in academia, in an atmosphere of virtual rather than actual community; the network of people I can call colleagues includes people at places like Flinders University in Australia, New York University, and USC. Like many of you, I have stronger connections to my discipline all over the world than I do to colleagues in other departments at my own university. Historically, academia has always been built around distant and virtual communities - and that’s a good thing. That cosmopolitanism allows us to bring the resources of the world into our classrooms at Penn State. The mechanisms of that virtual academic community allow for what sociologists would call a cool commitment, one characterized by clinical attachment to data and ironic distance from the cultures we study. It isn’t surprising that E-culture grew out of an academic research environment; it is a culture perfectly adapted to cool commitments. In the words of Bryan Turner: “Modern societies probably need cool cosmopolitans with ironic vocabularies if they are to avoid the conflagration of nationalistic versions of political authenticity and membership (Turner 2002: 161).”

But cool communities are also gated communities of the mind, in which we only encounter those we have destined ourselves to encounter. Perversely, as e-contact becomes omnipresent, and replaces hot commitments of actual human presence, it makes these hot commitments more unique and therefore more valuable, politically. Any political activist will tell you that 10,000 e-mails to a Congressperson don’t stack up against 10 in-person visits to that same Congressperson’s office.

It was time for a shift in paradigm. I came to the belated realization that I didn’t just live in State College; I was a citizen here, in two ways. First, literally; I drank the water, breathed the air, and walked the streets, and so local governance governed me, whether I consented or not, and second, morally; I could not espouse a politically engaged view of culture and the media in the classroom without starting to live those ideals.

I looked for an experience in actual politics that would start to discharge my responsibilities to my actual community, and in which I would learn some tools of organizing. I wanted to do something that would take advantage of the technical skills I had in organizing educational experiences -- I’ve been a college teacher for 20 years -- but also one that would allow me to learn about my real community. Finally, I also wanted a political structure that could imagine itself as a governing force, not merely as an idealistic rhetorical foil at election time, because the day after the election, foil or no foil, real people were going to govern and be governed. (Translation: no more Quixotic third parties, built
around a single charismatic individual, who aren’t prepared to actually govern.) Third, media studies and cultural studies had shown me enough about American life to say “no” to, and an excellent philosophical framework to say no in; I wanted something to say “yes” to.

I discovered that hot commitments to local politics are an endangered species. A fraction of our citizens vote in local and national elections, and students are almost completely disinterested in political affairs; as cultural studies has shown, they feel that questions of political representation are better enacted in the cultural sphere of personal style rather than the agora of public activity. For the rest of us, we are increasingly content to be bemused onlookers at the American political spectacle.

I found local politics, at least in my party, to be primarily a social setting, with a small group of long-time party loyalists getting together to socialize, govern the informal structure of the party, and raise a small amount of funds among one another for limited and apolitical electioneering. That wasn’t good enough; I couldn’t learn anything from that, and I couldn’t make change, either. Simply put, my partner Rhonda and I wanted to bring politics back to a political party.

I got involved in some fairly conventional political activity based on hot commitments, including helping students organize and turn out an epochal registration and voting effort here in the borough of State College in 2004. My partner and I are now precinct committee-persons, in charge of a group of more than 50 volunteers who each talk to 4 or 5 of their immediate neighbors who are registered in our political party, reminding them about voting day wheres and whens; every Democrat in our precinct is reached this way, and only in person, no phone calls, no e-mails. It’s hard to imagine that I’ve reached a place where a political party office would seem anything more than hopelessly blasé - it certainly would have in graduate school - but I have, and it’s thrilling to be shaping electoral change in my state, my town, and my block.

Perhaps the most useful thing my partner and I have been involved with has been a monthly breakfast designed to politicize my political party by providing expert information about current issues. In two years, between 1000 and 1500 people have attended these breakfasts in one of several locations all around the county. We’ve had many guests, speakers, and panelists, but we’ve worked hard to link Penn State’s cosmopolitan intellectual talent with the community some of them never knew they had.

We heard about subjects as diverse as media activism, social security reform, the immigration debate, the Pennsylvania debate over creationism, Pennsylvania environmental initiatives, the role of unions in the current political scene, affordable housing in Centre County, an autobiographical account of a life spent in the Civil Rights movement by one of our most experienced activists, a profile of local organic farming and national food policy, the New Deal and the history of our party, student activism and the future of the party. We’ve met everywhere from country clubs to small town Lion’s Clubs. At our next breakfast, we’ll hear from a group called Concerned Voters of Centre County, a group who has been exceptionally effective in keeping alive the question of voting machine integrity. We’re currently planning a session on the Iraq War with veterans as speakers.

The breakfasts have become a gathering place for likeminded people, indirect effects-recruitment of volunteers, broad coalition building. Using basic e-technologies like e-mail, listservs, blogs, and webpages, establish a web of progressive communication, the effect of hot commitments can be magnified by giving this already solid political community added dimensions in which to act.
The lessons of my brief life as an activist seem to be these, so far: first, take charge and initiate change; don’t wait to be told what to do, or you’ll foul afoul of vested interests. Second, use the values of education to create a public sphere where none exists. Third, recognize that the most powerful movements create both social and ideological identity, forged out of interlinked hot and cold commitments. Paul Kleppner in his 1982 book, *Who Voted?*, looked back with nostalgia on the high degree of political participation in the U.S. in the nineteenth century. In those days, he said, “politics were not complex, intangible and remote, but simple, concrete, and directly related to the concerns of daily life (Crossen 2006: B1).” We must work to understand political issues and political work in that same concrete way.

Cultural studies say that culture is politics, but politics is also politics. Questions of public policy are patterns of discourse, as cultural studies has abundantly demonstrated, and subject to rhetorical analysis, deconstruction, and political critique, but policy is also policy, sets of real determinations about governance by real actors, affecting, in a vast way, real populations and real individuals -- including we cooly-committed academics.

In the media studies and cultural studies that are the points of intersection of many disciplines, we have a useful theory of modern political culture and participation. Social science has given us an abundance of behavioral studies touching on nearly every point of political culture. There are no more excuses. As Jacques Maritain put it, “The fear of soiling ourselves by entering the context of history is not virtue, but a way of escaping virtue.” History is made locally, as well as globally, as countless environmental and political activists here in Pennsylvania and in communities all over the nation have shown, and now it is our turn and our time to join the fray. To do so, we must balance virtual community with actual community, hot commitments with our traditional cool commitments, using the internet and inexpensive media technologies to enhance the link between hot and cool political commitments in the service of activism.

It’s time to get the quotes out from around activism, to recognize it not only as discourse, but also as duty. The great gospel singer Mahalia Jackson used to sing, “I want to live the life I sing about in my songs.” Like her, I want to live the life I teach about in my classroom.
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MINDING YOUR BUSINESS

By J. Thomas May [tom@sfaa.net]
Executive Director, Society for Applied Anthropology

The Treasurer (Diane Austin) and the Executive Director (Tom May) coordinate in the Fall the preparation of a draft budget for the coming year. The draft budget is prepared from information submitted by the committee chairs and the officers as well as with revenue projections from the SfAA Office. The draft is reviewed by the Finance Committee and subsequently submitted to the Board of Directors. Upon approval by the Board, this document serves as a guide for the coming financial year.

The draft budget for 2007 will be reviewed by the Board at the Fall Meeting on November 18. This budget anticipates total revenues of
$470,023 and total expenditures of $448,826. The revenues from the annual meetings form a significant part of the budget for 2007; we project revenues of approximately $189,400 or 40% of the total budget. This continues a pattern that was initiated ten years ago by the leadership.

The extent of the change (and the impact of the policy) may best be understood by comparing the projected figures for 2007 with comparable audit figures when the policy was initiated. In 1995, the Society realized total revenues of $241,611. The revenues that year from the annual meetings constituted $56,755 or 23% of the total budget. The following year (1996), revenues totaled $303,348 of which $76,530 (or 25%) was earned from the annual meetings.

The emphasis on the revenue-producing aspect of the annual meeting emerged at a crucial time. Previously, library subscriptions to Human Organization had been a major part of the revenue budget - they were the ‘cash cow’, as it were. However, as university library budgets stabilized and in some cases, declined, the budgets for periodical subscriptions suffered. The simultaneous emergence of digital and on-line journals seemed to offer libraries an alternative and one they thought was more economical. As a result, library subscriptions to HO declined.

The SfAA leadership anticipated this decline in revenues from library subscriptions and began to remold the annual meeting in a way that would capture additional resources, thereby offsetting the subscription revenue losses. The results have been impressive. The annual meeting revenues have reached the level where they offset the declining profits from the library subscriptions. In this equation, the principle beneficiaries are the SfAA members - the increasing revenue from the annual meetings has been sufficient to meet increasing costs to the Society, thereby obviating the need to increase membership dues (as other, similar professional associations have been forced to do in the face of changes in the journal/subscription universe).

REPORT FROM HO EDITORS

By David Griffith [GRIFFITHD@MAIL.ECU.EDU]
Co-editor HO
East Carolina University

Forthcoming issues of Human Organization, we believe, will prove to be as interesting and enlightening as the last, the fisheries issue (guest edited by Lisa Colburn of NOAA Fisheries) that is already receiving praise from within NOAA and from other agency personnel interested in fisheries around the world.

Our next issue leads off with Howard Bahr’s appreciation of ethnographer Thomas O’Dea, who worked with the Mormons on the Harvard Values Project in the 1950s. His insights into O’Dea’s openness with Mormon informants are relevant to anthropologists of today who work with literate peoples. Following his article are four on populations that have been marginalized through various measures that are, unfortunately, more and more common in a variety of settings around the world. These include Marta Maldonado’s discussion of Latino/a workers in Yakima Valley’s apple industry, Suzanne Schneider’s examination of midwives in Mexico, James Taylor’s investigation of grassland policy in Mongolia, and Jocelyn Grace and Richard Chenhall’s look at tuberculosis in northern Australia.

Two articles on ways that peoples attempt to keep culture close at hand take up much of the central portion of the issue: James Grieshop describes couriers from Oaxaca who carry foods and other
goods between Oaxaca and Oaxacan migrants in California and Anahí Viladrich describes Latino healers and herbal shopkeepers in New York City.

Finally there are two articles on social support and social networks, both with multiple authors. One investigates a cultural model of social support and the other examines how information flows through the social networks of seropositive people.

The first issue of 2007 should be equally compelling: guest edited by John Wagner of British Columbia, the issue examines property relations and ecology in Oceania. It is an especially culturally rich collection that is sure to make an enduring contribution on how we look at property in the future. More about that issue next time.

REPORT FROM PA EDITORS

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

Jeanne Simonelli [simonejm@wfu.edu]
Wake Forest University

If you've ever run a summer field school, you know that the planning for one season begins almost before the last one has ended. If it's in an international setting, local colleagues are critical collaborators, making contacts, planning for guest speakers and setting up field placements for the students. While you're home recruiting participants, and collecting money, they are making sure that it all works out when you get there. Planning for programs in Chiapas, where the Zapatista rebellion began in 1994 and continues to morph and push at the edges of its own definitions, required particularly astute and competent in-country personnel. For the WFU/Clark U Maya Summer Program, this key role was filled by sociologist Natalia Arias Leal and her political scientist partner Eduardo Serrano Gonzalez. Long time Chiapas NGO workers, they were instrumental to both research and student programs for me and colleague Duncan Earle beginning in 1997.

This summer called on them to be particularly good at what they did. They'd helped to plan a field season involving fourteen students, centered on field placements in a number of Zapatista communities. Then, on May 3, the Zapatistas declared a Red Alert, and all communities were closed to foreign visitors. With students arriving in early July, it was back to the planning process for Natalia and Eduardo. Drawing on more than twelve years of participation in applied programs and projects, they constructed an alternative itinerary that provided a solid, comprehensive introduction to community based projects and research in Chiapas. We had complete confidence that they could do so. They always had; they always would.

I first met the couple in 1997 when Natalia worked in the Comitan area with a UNHRC funded program for Guatemalan refugees. She was one of many scholar activists trying to reconcile their political commitments to the Zapatistas with the mandated need to keep UN resources in refugee projects. They worked creatively to assist communities in one of the EZLN autonomous municipalities by trying to facilitate international connections, resulting in our subsequent program, projects, and research in collaboration with the Zapatistas.
I often encouraged the pair to write something for PA, but they were too busy working on programs and proposals. For the last two years they worked with CIAM (Centro de Investigacion y Accion de la Mujer Latinoamericana, AC) on programs in communities in remote parts of the state. Eduardo’s specialty was *masculinidad*, and he designed curriculum and did workshops with indigenous men. His work proceeded from the notion that it is easier to promote women’s rights when they are part of a basic human rights platform, and when the men they live with understand their role in perpetuating the colonial experience. Natalia worked with educational methodologies, and helped to design programs to provide education opportunities for indigenous women in a way that fit into their traditional lives and schedules.

For us, an equally important part of Natalia and Eduardo’s contribution was helping us to design and fulfill a service-based research methodology that centered on community-authored projects and the notion of informed permission. They were key in making sure that what we proposed and what we did with our students worked within the context of Zapatista protocol for international involvement.

The 2006 Maya Summer Program ended on August 12th. During our closing ceremony and fiesta we were already planning for the next year and the next step in a newly crafted medical exchange with the Zapatistas. But on August 16th, while taking a welcome rest at a hot springs in Vera Cruz, Natalia and Eduardo were overcome by sulphur fumes and died together, instantly.

We don’t often think about the fact that the people who are our closest colleagues in the field won’t always be there...for our students, for their families, for the communities they work in, for the NGOs they’ve guided. With Natalia and Eduardo’s passing, we’ve lost good scholars, solid practitioners, committed activists; but most of all, wonderful and caring friends. The next issue of PA focuses on the training of new applied practitioners, and is dedicated to the memory of their work.

![Political scientist Eduardo Serrano Gonzalez (left) and sociologist Natalia Arias Leal (right) were long time Chiapas NGO worker.](image)

**Call for Practitioner Briefs from LPOs**

The *PA* editors invite practitioners to send short submissions (approximately 500 words) to us for publication in a new section of *PA* that seeks to highlight the activities of practitioners and/or Local Practitioner Organizations (LPOs). These briefs, envisioned to be similar to “Reports from the Field,” will provide *PA* readers with timely summaries about the topics, methods, successes or shortcomings of practitioners. Practitioners who use this forum will be able to reach a broader audience, and we hope the submissions will add value to our goal of making *PA* an important teaching resource. Please send your submissions to either one of us.
STUDENT COMMITTEE REPORT

By Angela Leggett [ocotilloangel@yahoo.com]
University of California Los Angeles

Right now, the Student Committee is working to increase student attendance at the meeting, and encouraging a continued student interest in the SfAAs. In anticipation of the busyness of the upcoming holiday season, we are getting an early start seeking applicants for this year’s annual Student Endowed Award. The award pays for one year of the winning student’s SfAA registration fees and associated publications, and provides a small travel stipend to help offset the expense of attending the upcoming Tampa meetings.

Last year’s applicants were nothing short of stellar. I think I speak for the entire student committee when I report that we were awed by the caliber of students’ essays and curricula vitae. The 25 applicants ranged from first-year undergraduates to doctoral candidates, and they were undertaking a tremendous diversity of applied research. Andrea Frantz, who at the time was an undergraduate at Bloomsburg University, won in a close race. It was truly difficult to assess which of all these students most deserved the first annual award, and we expect even more applicants this year.

Since this is only the second year we’ve offered the Student Endowed Award, we are learning as we go. First, we are looking for listservs where we can electronically announce the award. Marketing the award is a big job unto itself, as there are so many university departments and student organizations with Web sites where we might post an announcement. Of course, there are other ways we elicit applications, such as asking our own professors to announce it to their classes, and posting the award announcement on departmental bulletin boards.

Second, we realize that when students read about this award, it might be the first time they learn about the SfAA itself. Last year we found that the award attracts students who otherwise might never have known about out our organization.

It is important to our committee that we maintain the traditional student-friendly environment that the SfAA fosters. One way we help do this is to continually staff the student registration and information table adjacent to the main registration table. Last year was the first time we tried this, and students said they found it helpful that there was a person at the table to provide insight about student-specific sessions, parties, luncheons, and the like. We’re not quite at the point of planning the student sessions we sponsor annually, but we are certain that we want to help students have the best time possible at the conference.

Again via listservs, we are beginning to reach out to Florida university students who might want to host visiting students, or who at least know where students might find less expensive food and sleeping arrangements near the conference hotel. We had great success with this approach in Vancouver. Regional students helped visiting students find hostels and even escorted them to fun, inexpensive local attractions. Together, students based in Vancouver and visiting students built a new networking community that would not have existed were it not for the annual meeting.
Welcome to the TIG for IPR news column - or should I say, welcome back. I’ve been on hiatus from writing the news column for some time, and I am happy to be back and writing again.

The main reason for my absence has been law school. The law school experience tends to consume everything in its path, and I decided (with some reluctance) that I would resume writing the TIG for IPR news column once things settled down and I’d be better able to keep this commitment. I graduated law school in May and I now work as a practicing attorney, so I feel the time is right to continue writing for the SfAA Newsletter.

During my time in law school, I thought a lot about the many ways in which anthropology and law cross paths, and the potential good that can come out of practitioners in anthropology and law working together to solve societal problems and break down cultural barriers. I also devoted much thought to how insular the world of law can be. Special language, special rules, unclear legal precedents, multiple ways to frame an issue, confusing courtroom procedures, jurisdictional issues - no wonder it takes additional training and passing a special exam (or exams) to be admitted to the legal profession!

Often, for those with whom anthropologists work - usually those who are at the margins of society - the legal system is entirely inaccessible. As discussed in the book by James Donovan and H. Edwin Anderson II, Anthropology and Law, there are tremendous opportunities for anthropologists and attorneys to work together. Such collaboration between anthropologists and lawyers can lead to fruitful results, making a difference in the lives of ordinary people.

I feel that the role of the TIG for IPR can expand its scope to examine the topic of indigenous peoples and the law in general - in no small part because, over the past ten years, the field of indigenous intellectual property rights has expanded and matured considerably. Intellectual property rights over communally-held knowledge, as an issue, intersects with so many other issues - indigenous ecological knowledge, indigenous land rights claims, issues inherent in cultural heritage and preservation, the performance of traditional music and dance, indigenous art and media, rights to control access to archaeological resources, rights to control access to genetic resources - the list goes on.

The one thing common to all of these is the issue of control: who gets to access this knowledge, and who gets to use this knowledge for ends not defined by the indigenous groups themselves. Likewise, because the issue of indigenous intellectual property rights crosses boundaries into other areas of law dealing with the legal rights of indigenous peoples, I believe that this column is an appropriate forum for expanding the discussion to include indigenous legal rights overall. Issues and dilemmas in using formal means (the legal system) to promote indigenous rights can be included in this expanded discussion.

In upcoming news columns, I hope to try some new things that will be of greater benefit to interested readers. In addition to my reporting on continuing developments in the field of indigenous IPRs, information on conferences, etc., I also want to report more on what individuals are doing “on the ground” to promote the recognition and strengthening of indigenous rights (as well as indigenous IPRs). These reports may be in the form of interviews with anthropologists, professors, scientists, attorneys, community development workers, activists and other practitioners who are working towards this common end.
In addition, I will include reports on new initiatives, legal developments, courses offered, and publications dealing with issues in indigenous rights and IPRs. Specific topics within the field of indigenous rights law - including how the legal system itself can be both a help and a hindrance to indigenous peoples seeking justice - will also be reviewed, in upcoming months. I also want to address the topic of how anthropologists and legal practitioners can work in collaboration towards the common goal of solving problems and helping others through their work. While anthropologists and lawyers, at first glance, may seem to have little in common, it is also true that both are trained to advocate on behalf of the people they work with. By and large, lawyers work on behalf of clients; anthropologists work on behalf of communities. But the common threads of advocacy and service run through both professions, albeit in different ways. Much can be built on this common ground.

And, as always, I am very interested to hear your thoughts, ideas, questions and comments. Feel free to send me an email with your feedback. I look forward to hearing from you.

Reference

WAPA NEWS

2007 Praxis Award

By Will Sibley [shadyside1190@comcast.net]
Past President, SfAA and Past President, WAPA

On Tuesday, December 5, 2006, WAPA will celebrate its 30th anniversary! The meeting reception will be held at the Sumner School, 17th and M Streets, NW, in Washington, D.C. The Sumner School is across the street from the National Geographic Society headquarters. Out-of-town visitors will be welcomed. This year the WAPA program has a somewhat different look. There will be fewer formal monthly meetings, and instead there will be an organized series of more topic-focused sessions mainly at members’ homes.

Since 1981, the Washington Association of Professional Anthropologists (WAPA) has presented the Praxis Award, recognizing outstanding achievement in translating anthropological knowledge into action as reflected in a single project. Anthropological knowledge is interpreted in its broadest meaning, encompassing theory, data, and methods. Nominations for the award, therefore, need to demonstrate the effectiveness and relevance of anthropology to contemporary social problems.

WAPA encourages anyone holding an M.A. or Ph.D. in any subfield of anthropology to apply for this prestigious award. Should a large and diverse pool of competitive candidates apply, WAPA will consider making two awards in 2007. One award, if merited, would be weighted toward a promising professional relatively early in her/his career; the other award would be for a more established professional with a history of successful work. The 2007 award will be presented at a special reception during the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association.

Individuals, groups or organizations (wherein at least one anthropologist worked on the designated project) may apply themselves or nominate others. All applications will be judged by the same criteria.
The anthropologist’s contribution to the project’s success is critical and should be indicated clearly. Recognition of this contribution by other major participants or contributors should be acknowledged in the nomination. Nominations will be judged by an independent panel of accomplished professional anthropologists.

**Application deadline for the 2007 award is June 1, 2007.** The winning applicant(s) receives a cash award of $500. Award recipients may be asked to contribute a chapter to future editions of the volume *Anthropological Praxis: Translating Knowledge into Action*.

Full application materials may be found at the WAPA website: <www.wapadc.org>. For further information contact: Praxis Award Chair Willis E. Sibley, 1190 Cedar Avenue, Shady Side, MD 20764-9153, Tel/FAX (301) 261-9404 or above Email, or contact Bob Wulff, Co-Chair Praxis Award Email <rwulff@hazelland.com>.

**WAPA TURNS 30**

By Shirley Fiske [shirley.fiske@verizon.net]
Past WAPA President

The Washington Association of Professional Anthropologists, WAPA, turns 30 this year and is celebrating with a gala on December 5. The first local professional organization for anthropologists, WAPA remains vibrant. WAPA was organized in 1976 by the late Conrad Reining, Gretchen Schafft, and a small group of anthropologists primarily from The Catholic University of America. Most WAPA members work outside the academy, but WAPA includes and welcomes academically based anthropologists as well as students.

WAPA has hosted monthly meetings for 30 years that have given professional anthropologists an opportunity to learn, network and build their careers. Beyond that, the organization has met important needs in our community for training and for recognition:

- WAPA presents the prestigious Praxis Award, one of the earliest awards given to an anthropologist who has demonstrated excellence in the use of anthropological method and theory to solve a real world problem.
- WAPA sponsors publications, including “Stalking Employment in the Nation’s Capital: A Guide for Anthropologists, edited by Adam Koons, the late Bea Hackett, and John Mason, which is still a classic guide to employment outside the academy, especially in Washington, D.C. The Praxis Award winners and honorable mentions were featured in the successful book, *Anthropological Praxis: Translating Knowledge into Action*, edited by former WAPA presidents Shirley Fiske and Robert Wulff.
- Career and skill development workshops, such as starting your own consulting business and writing resumes successfully, have been offered for many years at AAA, SfAA, and NAPA meetings. And WAPA offers skill development workshops (e.g., PRA, and evaluation) locally for professional anthropologists and students.
- WAPA has provided a job service that has launched many successful anthropological careers outside the academy, providing advice, job leads, resume workshops, and moral support.

Please join us at the Sumner School, 1201 17th Street, NW, Washington DC, on December 5 from 6-8:30 pm to celebrate our rich past and continuing support to our profession.
On Sunday, October 29th, I spoke to members of Chicago’s Local Practitioner Organization, CAPA (Chicago Association for the Practice of Anthropology). I was asked to comment on new developments within the American Anthropological Association, and the discipline at large. It wasn’t hard to do. I had just received the final report of the Practicing Anthropology Work Group (PAWG), prepared for the AAA Executive Board. Written by the PAWG committee members - familiar names to us all - (Linda Bennett, T.J. Ferguson, J. Anthony Paredes, Susan Squires, Judy Tso, and Dennis Wiedman) the report nicely summarized the “state of practicing/applied anthropology” and made some specific recommendations to AAA that, if adopted, should lead to greater recognition of non-academic anthropologists and their contributions to our field.

It has been known for a long time that more than one-half of anthropologists work outside of academia. Others, such as myself, straddle the line with work in two domains. For all of us, finding our place in our work setting and in our disciplinary context is not always easy. Whether we call ourselves “applied” or “practicing” anthropologists, we generally share a similar set of concerns about how we can ensure that our perspectives are acknowledged and our expertise shared, especially our knowledge of how the “real world” works. Through our work we have built the pathways along which anthropologists are right now contributing to the public discourse on important issues such as health, the environment, education, immigration, violence, and peace.

As I prepared for my talk to CAPA, I thought back over the approximately 25 year history of NAPA’s evolution, and its shared agenda with SfAA and its divergences. NAPA does now have a strong voice within AAA, and more and more NAPA members are taking high level leadership roles on the AAA Executive Board and on important AAA committees. NAPA leadership is consulted regularly for input on how to address the concerns and needs of anthropologists employed outside of the academy, and the statistics tell us that over the next years there will be even more reason to do so. Applied and practicing anthropologists already have demonstrated the value of the anthropological perspective through our interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary collaborations, as well as the importance of expertise in multiple methodologies. We have been challenged for our lack of theory, but increasingly we have been able to show that practice is not without theory, and that new theory is emerging from the world of practice everyday. By being part of AAA, NAPA has had the advantage of an “insider’s” seat at the anthropology table. I think we have used it well.

In just a few weeks I will be turning this responsibility over to Dennis Wiedman, NAPA’s President-Elect. I have truly enjoyed being able to share my thoughts with the members of SfAA, despite the challenges of the blank screen every three months or so, and I have appreciated the feedback and comments I have received. I hope Dennis has as much pleasure as I have had in opening my mind to the possibilities before us. My thanks to SfAA for that gift.
CONSORTIUM OF PRACTICING AND APPLIED ANTHROPOLOGY (COPAA) NEWS

By Linda A. Bennett [lbennett@memphis.edu]
Chair, COPAA

At the AAA meetings in San Jose, COPAA will hold a lunch-time discussion of “Accomplishments and Future Aspirations” of the Consortium with Linda Whiteford and Linda Bennett as organizers. The meeting is scheduled for Thursday, November 16th, 12:15-1:30. Everyone interested in how we can best “collectively advance the education and training of students, faculty, and practitioners in applied anthropology” is warmly invited to attend and take part.

For the 2007 SfAA meeting in Tampa, COPAA will serve as a co-sponsoring organization. Departmental representatives in COPAA have organized four sessions. First, Nancy Romero-Daza (U. South Florida), Sherlyn Briller (Wayne State U.), and Sunil Khanna (Oregon State U.) have organized a panel discussion entitled “Tenure and Promotion for Applied Anthropologists: Deans’ and Chairs’ Perspectives.” Second, Lisa Henry (U. of North Texas) has organized a panel presentation on “Skills Education and Training for Applied Anthropologists.” Third, Susan Hyatt (Indiana U. Purdue U. Indianapolis -IUPUI) has organized a roundtable on “Institutional Review Boards and Applied Research.” And fourth, Satish Kedia (U. of Memphis) and John van Willigen (U of Kentucky) have organized a panel discussion on “Preparing Applied Anthropologists for the 21st Century.” More details about these sessions will be forthcoming in the next SfAA Newsletter.

Also, the Consortium will hold its eighth annual meeting in Tampa. In the meantime, please check out our website <www.copaa.info> for helpful information about applied anthropology for students, faculty, and practitioners. We always like to hear from readers about their feedback on the website and COPAA in general.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Position in Agricultural Sustainability and Society
The Community Studies and Development Unit, Department of Human and Community Development, University of California, Davis, announces an opening for an academic year (9 month), tenure-track position at the Assistant Professor level to teach and conduct research on agricultural sustainability and community development. Fiscal term employment (i.e., 11 month) will be offered and continued based on academic personnel review. Candidates should have a Doctorate or equivalent in anthropology, geography, planning, political science, rural sociology, or sociology, and a record of research in the social science of agricultural sustainability. Appointment is expected before July 1, 2007. Applicants should begin the application process by registering online at http://recruitments.caes.ucdavis.edu. Review of the applications will begin January 1, 2007. The position will remain open until filled. Inquiries about this position should be addressed to the Chair of the Search Committee, Stephen Brush (sbbrush@ucdavis.edu). For technical or administrative questions regarding the application process please email the Search Committee Coordinator, Jeri L. Sorensen <jlsorensen@ucdavis.edu>. The University of California is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer.
Recently I wrote about the death of George M. Foster, who was a pioneer in applied anthropology. In this column, I want to write about another anthropologist of Foster’s generation who recently died. Andrew Hunter Whiteford (1913-2006) passed away on October 16 in Temple Terrace, Florida. He was the father of three anthropologists—your faithful Newsletter editor, Linda (the immediate Past President of the SfAA), and Scott. (Another sister, Laurie, is trained as an urban planner.)

Dad started off his career as an archaeologist. As an undergraduate at Beloit College (Beloit, Wisconsin), he participated in a field school run at the Starkweather Ruin in New Mexico. After graduation, he headed off to the University of Chicago to continue his education. His graduate career included a several-year hiatus while he worked as an archaeologist for Madeline Kneberg at the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), which work formed the basis of his MA thesis.

Sometime during his graduate career he came under the influence of several cultural anthropologists and became fascinated with the questions they were asking and the issues they were studying. In time W. Lloyd Warner invited him to become involved in some work that he, William Foote Whyte, Everett Hughes, Allison Davis, and Burleigh Gardner were starting in a Chicago factory. While he did not regard himself as an applied anthropologist, Dad’s Ph.D. research focused on union-management issues in Chicago, and one of his early publications appeared in *Applied Anthropology* (the first peer-reviewed publication of the Society for Applied Anthropology and the predecessor of *Human Organization*).

In the late 1940s, Dad began doing research in Latin America. Robert Redfield had urged him to work in Mexico, but it was through serendipity that he first went to Colombia in 1948 at the request of the president of Beloit College. During that trip he visited Popayán, an important urban center in the south of the country, where he established contacts with a handful of Colombian anthropologists who became colleagues and friends for the rest of his life.

From 1949 until 1974, Dad regularly returned to Popayán. His research there was important in a couple of respects. First, it took place in a city—something not commonly done by anthropologists in the 1950s; they still focused much of their attention on rural communities. Second, Dad was interested in social class interaction, again studying a topic long before it became fashionable in social anthropology. His book on the topic ( *Two Cities of Latin America: A Comparative Description of Social Classes*. 1964. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday) became required reading for a generation of Latin Americanists in anthropology, sociology, and political science. It was as a result of Dad’s work in Latin America that Linda, Scott and I grew to share his love of the region.

Dad taught at Beloit College from the time of the Second World War until his retirement in 1976. For most of this period, he served as the Chair of the Department of Anthropology, one of the best undergraduate departments in the country. For many years the department was a point of destination for students who chose Beloit specifically because of its anthropology program. Margaret Mead, never one to mince words or suffer fools, was an unpaid recruiter. When asked by inquisitive youngsters where they should go to study anthropology, she responded without hesitation, “Go to Beloit College”.

Toward the end of his career, Dad’s hearing problems made it difficult for him to continue doing the type of social anthropology he cared so much about. After retirement, he and Mom moved to Santa Fe, New Mexico. There he resumed his work in material culture, something he never completely abandoned; all the time he was at Beloit College, he was the Director of the Logan Museum of Anthropology.
ogy. For almost two decades he enjoyed affiliations with the School of American Research, the Wheelwright Museum, and the Laboratory of Anthropology. During this period he published extensively on Native American art.

After suffering a stroke in the late 1990s, Dad and Mom moved to Tampa, Florida. For six years they enjoyed the proximity of Linda, her family, and her colleagues at the Department of Anthropology at the University of South Florida. Even though he was no longer doing research—although I think his last publication came out a year and a half ago—he continued to read voraciously and was always eager to engage in conversations on topics ranging from the arts to science to politics.

He died on the morning of October 16, surrounded by his family. We will miss him.

Mike Whiteford [jefe@iastate.edu]
Iowa State University
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