SfAA PRESIDENT’S LETTER

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

As I sit down to write, I realize this will be my last column during this century. That’s a rather sobering thought. What do I have to say to you, SfAA members and friends, in November 1999, as we anticipate January 2000? I don’t know about you, but I am actually getting used to writing “2000” without thinking more than twice about it.

One question I would like to urge us to reflect upon as we approach the 21st century is how we will personally and as a Society balance the efficiency of using advances in communications technology and the critical need to have face-to-face contact with people. Daily, if not hourly, I am impressed with the benefits of quick access to e-mail and other internet resources, and frankly I can’t imagine carrying out my duties in my job and in my position as SfAA president without e-mail. Furthermore, recently I discovered the major advantages of e-mail as I helped do the final edit of a 30-authored manuscript virtually 100% via e-mail. That would have been unimaginable not many years ago. And I know that when I finish this column, I can conveniently “log-on,” e-mail our SfAA Newsletter editor Mike Whiteford, and send him this text in an instant. That is a really helpful convenience, and one I have grown to rely on.

With all these convenient technological advances, I find that when I actually need to call someone long distance for professional reasons I really have to stop and think about the timing of the call and whether I am in just the right frame of mind to conduct a real live conversation. Even so, voice mail and answering machines have provided us a convenient way to leave pleasant, but short and to-the-point messages without ever talking directly to the person. And I rely upon that convenience a great deal not only in my professional work, but also increasingly in my personal life. Sometimes I feel like I have become a past master in communicating entirely without being in direct contact with actual people.

Almost twenty years ago, a colleague of mine from Zagreb, Croatia, was in Washington, D.C., and we were meeting with anthropologists and others at the Smithsonian Institution regarding the possibilities of undertaking a bilateral anthropological project. After completing a very pleasant and productive meeting with the director of international programs, my colleague from Zagreb asked me how long I had known the director. I said that I had never met her previously, but that we had had several conversations on the telephone. He couldn’t believe that such a positive and friendly relationship was established only through a series of telephone conversations, and with no face-to-face contact. In point of fact, when I was in Zagreb, we often spent a great deal of time traveling around the city to meet with colleagues involved in our research, never expecting that only telephone conversations would suffice. I must admit that I really enjoyed and benefitted from this personalistic manner of working in Zagreb, but I was also rather pleased with our “American style” of communication such that we could establish friendly and effective relationships often through only telephone contact.

In the last decade of the twentieth century, though, we have hit yet another and much more elevated level of fast, efficient, multi-targeted, and distant communication.
Daily, if not hourly, I am impressed with the benefits of quick access to e-mail and other internet resources, and frankly I can’t imagine carrying out my duties in my job and in my position as SfAA president without e-mail.

really urgent (and probably that I was “losing it” as well), but fortunately they were understanding. I believe that all of us have learned the necessity of “forgiving” gaffes in communication via e-mail.

My long-winded point about all this is not that we shouldn’t be using e-mail and internet generally. Certainly not while I am SfAA president since I don’t think I could manage without it. But we anthropologists and applied social scientists know very well that one of our “claims to fame” in doing what we do is our insistence upon face-to-face contact with those people to whom we are addressing our research, education, consulting, etc. As I have worked with colleagues from other disciplines over the years, one feature about an anthropological perspective that has forcefully emerged is our understanding that being there on site and meeting with people personally is so very critical to comprehending both the wider context and the particular happenings in that context. Repeatedly I have found this to be ever so true, even if the contact is for a short period of time. There is just no substitute for being there and talking and seeing the people with whom we are working.

To see some clear evidence of this, please take a look at the fall 1999 issue of *Human Organization*. As we read the wide variety of articles in this *HO* issue, this pattern of reliance upon personal contact with the people in the research setting is really notable. For example, the point is made in Christian E. Downum and Laurie J. Price’s article on “Applied Archaeology” as they note that “Applied archaeology calls for an expanded definition because of its extensive involvement with the interpretation of ruins and other public education activities....The continued health of archaeology depends on attention to applied pursuits, including public outreach and education.” (58 (3): 227).

In a very different type of article, David M. Abramson’s “Critical Look at NGOs and Civil Society as a Means to an End in Uzbekistan” entails a close examination of two events, a training seminar in Uzbekistan and an international conference that took place in Washington, D.C., as well as extensive interview materials. I would not want to claim that an appreciation of the importance of such first-hand contact is only a province of anthropologists. It isn’t. At the same time, an anthropological perspective does seem to emphasize this much more consistently than we find in many other disciplines that focus on work with human beings.

As we grow increasingly reliant upon advanced technologies for communication, let’s not lose sight of the absolutely critical role of seeing and talking directly with other people. Thank goodness for the annual meeting, an opportunity to see each other and to talk about our field work.

In spite of this “message for the new millenium,” I am very glad to have the opportunity to point you in the direction of the new SfAA Web site <www.sfaa.net>.

If you haven’t looked at the SfAA Web site lately, you will be surprised about the breadth of information available. I’d like to draw your attention to two specific pages that I believe you could benefit from reading. “Current job openings” is a terrific resource that should be used more than it appears to be. Second, the entire current version of the SfAA Mission and Goals that was discussed in my August column is now on the Web. Neil Hann, the SfAA Web master, can be contacted through e-mail address <neil@mmcable.com>. If you have any job openings, for example, please send the information to him. Our Internet Committee, co-chaired by Ed Liebow and Satish Kedia, in conjunction with Neil Hann and their committee members, will be reporting new resources available to you via our Web site.

In my last column I wrote about the current Nine Long-Range Planning Goals. One reader wrote in response that he was “surprised to see that education was

[However,] one feature about an anthropological perspective that has forcefully emerged is our understanding that being there on site and meeting with people personally is so very critical to comprehending both the wider context and the particular happenings in that context.
selected from a much broader set of possible goals. All of these goals are to be focused on in the undertakings of the SfAA, and all are seen as being very important.

I need your feedback on two of these goals in particular, one of which directly deals with education. The promotion and expansion of services to various member constituencies, especially students at all levels (goal four), is to be addressed in the proposed consortium of applied anthropology programs, one of my initiatives. This winter we will be holding an initial “brainstorming” meeting with a small group of leaders from applied anthropology M.A. and Ph.D. level programs, to be followed by an open forum on this topic at the SfAA annual meetings in San Francisco in March 2000.

I would really appreciate your thoughts on what you think could be the possible benefits as well as any concerns you have regarding the formation of such a consortium and, very importantly, some of the projects that would be worthwhile to organize through such a program. For example, some members have suggested that short-term faculty exchanges between different program and inter-program coordination of student practica and internships would provide major advantages for our students. Please do send me your thoughts as we begin serious discussion and planning of the consortium. Plus it would be very helpful to hear from SfAA members who would be interested in taking part.

Our sixth goal in long-term planning is to strengthen our “international constituency and endeavors.” Under the determined and committed leadership of Alain Anciaux in Belgium, the committee is reportedly somewhat atypical, relying upon the continuing interest of members such that they attend the annual meeting and take part in activities sponsored by the committee. From the vantage point of the SfAA and the international committee, maintaining a truly active agenda involving an international constituency and advancing international agendas is a major challenge.

SfAA, along with several other American anthropological organizations, will have a good opportunity to advance our international efforts. In October 1999, I participated in a meeting of several leaders of American anthropological organizations at the National Academy of Science-National Research Council (NAS-NRC) in Washington, D.C. that was called with the intention to establish a United States National Committee for the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (USNC/IUAES) within the NAS-NRC. At least 16 American anthropological organizations are represented by the anticipated members of the committee. Assuming that the committee is approved by the NAS-NRC, it appears that it will help to promote collaboration between anthropologists in the U.S. and those abroad in research and education, among a wide variety of objectives. As these efforts become formalized, I will keep abreast of developments. I am very pleased to be part of this initial organizing group, and I believe that our participation will provide a really good opportunity to advance our international efforts.

Looking forward to seeing you (hopefully in person) in 2000 and hoping most of you plan to be in San Francisco at our annual meeting.

SfAA MEETINGS – SAN FRANCISCO 2000

By Laurie Price <laurie.price@nau.edu>
Northern Arizona University

“If you’re alive, you can’t be bored in San Francisco. If you’re not alive, San Francisco will bring you to life.”

William Saroyan

In addition to the city itself, the upcoming SfAA meetings in San Francisco (March 21-26) offer an exciting lineup of sessions and forums, an impressive array of topics, and several compelling special events. Thanks to everyone who has submitted session, paper, poster, abstracts and forum or workshop plans! A preliminary program listing will be posted on the SfAA Website no later than mid-December, with a more final program available in early January <http://www.sfaa.net/>.

Among the conference’s special events is a plenary session on culture and violence, late Thursday afternoon with a reception following. Participants include Philippe Bourgois, Peggy Sanday, and John DeVine; NGO and political leaders will provide a valuable community perspective. A second special event is the Friday afternoon panel on “engaged anthropology”—its purpose is to dialogue, and hopefully, discover common ground between applied anthropology and “public anthropology” (a recently emerging campaign in academic anthropology). A book signing “meet the author” event also is planned. If you have written a book that you would like to see included in that event, please contact me (see e-mail above), no later than Jan 15.

If your interests include visual anthropology or video production, check the program for screenings of both ethnographic films, and targeted videos, used in applied projects and for advocacy. It is not too late to get a video screened at these meetings; please contact me. Information on special neighborhood tours and advance subscription workshops will be sent out to conference registrants early in the year 2000. If you know you are interested in one of these events, be sure to respond quickly, as they often fill up fast.

The organizations that are co-meeting with SfAA this year are: the Society for Medical Anthropology (with its plenary on Wednesday afternoon), the Political Ecology Society, and the Society for Community Research and Action (a division of the American Psychological As-
Your conference program will indicate which sessions are sponsored or co-sponsored by each of these organizations. This meeting also continues a tradition of collaboration with a variety of affiliated special interest groups: including business meetings, receptions and cash bars, student sponsored events (e.g. Students and Past Presidents Luncheon), and the SfAA International Information table and reception. When time permits, remember, the Cathedral Hill Hotel is just a short bus/trolley/taxi ride to: Chinatown, Fisherman’s Wharf (with ferry tours of the Bay), North Beach, Fort Mason (Mexican, African-American, and Folk Art Museums), the Presidio, South-of-Market (with San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, many music clubs), Union Square, Haight-Ashbury district, and Golden Gate Park (Strybing Arboretum, Asian Art Museum, Steinhart Aquarium). For a Sunday expedition, you are within comfortable distance to Berkeley and Sausalito, Point Reyes National Seashore, the wine country, and even Carmel and Monterey Bay/Aquarium.

MINDING YOUR BUSINESS

By J. Thomas May <tom@sfaa.net>
SfAA Business Office
Oklahoma City, OK

The SfAA Office has been implementing over the past two years a program to improve electronic communication. This followed a mandate from the President and the Board in 1997. I will describe the most recent innovations and then include some of the earlier activities.

We began to use e-mail in 1996 to communicate with annual meeting registrants. The original SfAA Web site was established that year. In November 1998, the Board designated Neil Hann as the official Webmaster and provided the resources to expand this activity.

In October 1999, SfAA began using the services of a new Internet Web host. No longer on the “Telepath” server, SfAA now has its own Internet domain name, sfaa.net. The new server provides many advantages. In particular, the new Web host gives SfAA more opportunities for e-mail, secure online transactions, Web site search, and other capabilities that will become apparent in the near future including electronic discussion forums. In just two weeks following the debut of sfaa.net, the home page received over 1,000 “hits” and more than 8,000 on all the various pages of the SfAA Web site. In addition to enhanced services, members should see better access speeds and greater reliability. Please visit the new site at <http://www.sfaa.net/> and take note of our new main e-mail address <info@sfaa.net>.

REPORT FROM HO EDITOR

By Jeffrey Longhofer <jxl102@po.cwru.edu>
Associate Editor and Webmaster
Case Western Reserve University

On October 29, the Net turned 30. And though it started as a Government-financed network, Arpanet, for the military and universities, today it has more than 200 million users around the world. Only months after the first synapses fired, the nodes increased geometrically, first from two, connecting UCLA with Stanford, then to four, connecting these with the University of California at Santa Barbara and the University of Utah. The rest is history. The aim was to encourage Defense Department researchers at universities to share computer power; the result was a vast public access system of communication and information.

Originally built and supported by the Defense Department’s Advanced Research Projects Agency, the Internet today links doctors to patients, businesses to consumers, students to teachers, libraries to patrons, politicians to constituencies, revolutionaries to the masses, the public sphere to the private, and the domestic sphere to the commercial and public spheres. It drives stock markets and global financial transactions. For many it represents the democratization of information. For others it is a daily nuisance of information overload, an intrusion into privacy, a dangerous form of exclusion, a source for moral panic and hysteria, commodity fetishism, or personal addiction; and for some it is an insidious form of labor exploitation.

We now have a second generation of the Net, Internet2, reinvented for university use. The cost to universities is high, and though for now the National Science Foundation is helping with the bills (universities pay from $500,000 to $1 million per year), that support is expected to disappear early in the next century. Internet2, with a much larger bandwidth, promises to deliver data to the desktop at 10 megabits per second—200 times faster than a modem with the capacity for 56,000 bits per second. And MCI has recently offered a comparable technology, vBNS+. Among other things, Internet2 promises an advanced form of virtual reality, or tele-immersion, where users at multiple sites will interact in real time, in shared simulated environments.

Though it is not clear to me where Ye Ole Editor,
Donald Stull (possibly a crypto-Luddite), stands on the network, this Associate Editor saw the future in the warp and weft of the Web and insisted that HO take the plunge. Together, the computer, with its associated technologies, and the Net along with its new social relations have transformed the ways we access, code, read, process, store, and convey information.

For the world of publishing, scholarly and otherwise, the Net has been revolutionary. Paper and binding costs, not to mention environmental costs, will soon make manuscript modes of presentation obsolete. With the natural and physical sciences leading the way, we will very soon live in a world where the printed manuscript will go the way of the slide rule – nostalgically mentioned but obsolete.

Some of us are still catching up with technology (see recent studies showing the techno-generation gap, especially for those nearing or over 45) and others, myself included, believe that the use of all technologies must be forced to a much higher level of reflexivity; that is, we must constantly evaluate the developers, marketers, designers and the end-users of the technologies to determine how they are used and to what ends. For it is clear that the information superhighway is not dominated by benevolent forces.

David Rothkopf, former Clinton Administration Deputy Secretary of Commerce (now with Kissinger Associates, a consulting company run by Henry Kissinger), writes “for the United States, a central objective of the Information Age foreign policy must be to win the battle of the worlds’ information flows, dominating the airwaves as Great Britain once ruled the seas” (see, Foreign Policy, 107, Summer 1997, pages 39-49). In his recent book, Digital Capitalism: Networking the Global Market System, Dan Schiller offers new areas for research and reflection:

The networks that collectively comprise cyberspace were originally created at the behest of government agencies, corporate military contractors, and allied educational institutions. However, over the past decade or so, many of these cooperating networks have begun to serve end-users located principally in and around corporations. This shift in end-users suggests that the underlying logic of the Internet is also being transformed. As it comes under the sway of an expansionary market logic, the Internet is catalyzing an epochal political-economic transition toward what I call digital capitalism—

and toward changes that, for much of the population, are unpropitious. (Schiller 1999:xvi-xvii)

The opportunity for applied anthropological research on emerging digital capitalism is limitless.

The social sciences, especially psychology, are making progress toward electronic publication, user-friendly access to databases, and the development of efficient search engines. Anthropology is far behind. Have you tried using Eureka recently? And the humanities have a very long way to go.

To be or not to be on the Net is not the question for Human Organization. We’re on the Net, and we are attempting to effectively use the technology to assure that applied anthropology and social science flows to the benefit of authors, subscribers (institutional and individual), readers (subscribers and readers are not always the same), students, researchers, agencies, NGOs, and other more diverse constituencies. We should, as applied social scientists, set a goal achieved long ago by the Journal of the American Medical Association and the New England Journal of Medicine: though the public is not likely to come to us, we must go to them. And so they did. With a vengeance they exploited the media, representing authors, professional societies, medicine, and research, to the broader public and public officials.

Foremost, the Net for HO should function to move information quickly to those who can most benefit. Toward that goal, we have recently introduced several innovations. Following the lead from JAMA and NEJM, each quarter we are selecting articles that have an immediate and compelling public interest. For these articles we are sending press releases, e-mail and hardcopy, and posting a précis and press release on our Web site. Though this first foray has produced only modest results (the author of our first quarterly feature was interviewed by the Voice of America), we will intensify these efforts during the upcoming year. And we are seeking advice from our readers on how best to reach the press. If you can be of help, or want to volunteer, please send e-mail to <jxL102@po.cwru.edu>.

We are also sending to agencies and NGOs current and forthcoming tables of contents and abstracts with special emphasis given to their concerns. As well, we are writing each abstract as a separate HTML page so that search engines work effectively to connect readers and researchers to authors, research, HO, the SfAA and the WEB. Also, we send to readers, at their request (though they must first answer an on-line survey), the current and forthcoming tables of contents and abstracts; we will now send, only two months after posting the option, more than 100 to non-subscribing members and agencies. And I am exchanging daily e-mail with readers, researchers, and applied scientists from around the world.

Finally, on our WEB site <http://www.cwru.edu/affil/human/> you can browse through HO abstracts. Volumes 53-58, 1994-1999, submit rejoinders, on-line book
reviews and commentaries, read the précis of the most recent quarterly feature article, contact the editors and editorial board, link to a subscription form, and read the complete HO guide to authors. If you have ideas for HO WEB development, please let us know.

REPORT FROM PA EDITOR

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

Welfare “reform” in Florida is the theme for the first PA issue (Vol.22, No. 1) of the new millennium. It is, nonetheless, a sobering theme. The reference point is 1996 U.S. Federal Legislation, which limits lifetime social assistance eligibility to five years, reduces benefits, and forces recipients to seek employment retraining and jobs.

This legislation is known as the “Personal Responsibility and Work Reconciliation Act.” The Florida version was actually established a few years before and with even more draconian expectations—including forcing single mothers to seek jobs up to fifteen times a week. It has an equally Orwellian “newspeak” ring to it—“Work and Gain Economic Self-Sufficiency” or WAGES. The object seems to be to save money and download responsibilities to local communities. There, volunteer boards, half of which must be business people, administer the programs. Some of the programs have already been privatized—even the aircraft giant Lockheed Martin is involved in these operations.

It seems bizarre that corporate interests should have any place in managing a state or country’s social safety net. Forgive my lack of neutrality, but this issue of PA has astounded me more than any of the other twelve I have edited. It also reminds one of the desirability for more extensive anthropological or sociologically styled research on American society and culture from the outside. Major updates on the empathetic but objective observations of de Tocqueville, Myrdal, and Hannerz are needed.

Al Wolfe, our guest editor, leads a group of Florida anthropologists engaged in research and advocacy and practice on the impact of WAGES at various levels—as professors, as students of the University of South Florida applied anthropology graduate program, as private consultants, and as government employees. Besides Wolfe, the authors include Catherine Sugg, Beverly Ward, Rosemary Mathias, Claude Hendon, Glen Brown, Nancy Redfern-Vance, Annie Ngana-Mundeke, Ronald Habin, Angela Gomez, Jennifer Hardin, Ruth Ott and Michelle Olgive. The topics include American value systems and welfare, an overview of the administrative dimensions of the WAGES program, evaluations of employment readiness programs, the nature of the job market in the Tampa region, impacts on Haitian refugees and single mothers, and the implications of the reforms on trans-portion, child and family well-being, housing and health care.

We can thank these Florida anthropologists for the observations. Perhaps those of us in other states and countries can be on the alert as these “innovations” diffuse toward us. This situation, again shows the value of anthropological analysis in social policy issues. Here informed anthropological advocacy seems very urgent.

The addresses and phone numbers for the editorial office of Practicing Anthropology remain: Department of Anthropology and Archaeology, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, S7N 5A5, Canada; the office telephone number is 306/966-4176; my home number is 306/343-9140; the departmental fax number is 306/966-5640; ervin@sask.usask.ca is my e-mail address.

(Editor’s note: Sandy has asked me to inform our readers that his wood-burning computer crashed just before Halloween. Humm! He has lost his e-mail address book and much of his on-going correspondence with authors he was working with. If you haven’t heard from him in a while, please contact Sandy).

LPO NEWS

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

The “Northeastern Anthropologic Association” (NEAA) participated in SfAA’s annual LPO luncheon in Tucson last April. This regional organization was founded in 1961 and currently boasts about 250 members. Their Web site includes a recruitment letter from past president, John Omohundro, who spells out NEAA’s special characteristics. The organization is 1) integrated, welcoming members from all the subfields of anthropology; 2) collegial, bringing together educators and students from universities and colleges as well as practitioners from government, nonprofit and commercial sectors; 3) inexpensive, with emphasis on low cost conferences, a newsletter, and an internet discussion list; 4) international, with members hailing from a broad northeastern area stretching from New Jersey and Pennsylvania to Ontario and Newfoundland; and 5) informal, operating on a small budget and enthusiastic volunteers. NEAA will conduct an annual meeting at York College, City University of New York, April 13-15, 2000. See their Web site for details related to current officers, the Student Paper Prize to be presented at the 2000 Annual Meeting, and membership information: www.neaa.org.

The “High Plains Society for Applied Anthropology” (HPSfAA) conducted its annual fall retreat in October at Ghost Ranch near Abiquiu, New Mexico. Over 40 members attended, including educators, practitioners, and
students from several states in the western region. Archivist, Carla Littlefield, presented a retrospective of organizational milestones dating back to 1980, annual meeting themes and issues from 1981 to present, and national and international events, which impacted the profession during the same 19-year period. Reed Riner (NAU) led a lively discussion of challenges/changes envisioned for the new millennium and the role for applied anthropologists. Moving northward from the desert to the Rocky Mountains, HPSfAA has scheduled its annual meeting April 7-9, 2000 at YMCA of the Rockies, Estes Park, Colorado. See their Web site for annual meeting and membership information: www.colorado.edu/AppAnth/HPSFAA.

To submit information for the LPO News column or communicate about LPO issues, please contact SfAA-LPO Liaison, Carla Littlefield <clittlef@compuserve.com>.

TIG FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

By Tressa Berman <Tressa.Berman@asu.edu>
Arizona State University West

The PR TIG is looking for other TIGS who may want to serve as co-sponsors of sessions for the annual spring meetings. Please contact any IPR TIG “point person” to do so. The AAA will host an invited session on Intellectual Property Rights and new ways of approaching the law and indigenous rights. The session will take place on Sunday morning, November 21, beginning at 8. Some TIG members also participated in the recent Native American Art Studies Association conference held in Victoria, B.C., and titled, “Indigenous Arts and the Politics of Possession.” Please contact NAASA treasurer, Bill Mercer at the Portland Art Museum, 1219, S.W. Park, Portland, Oregon, 97205 for program and membership information. Of interest to IPR was Natalie Drache’s presentation of an internet site that features the International Working Group on Indigenous Affairs. Please check out Web site <www.dialoguebetweennations.com>. Let the TIG know about relevant conference news!

On related topics to biodiversity, the Institutional Dimensions of Global Environmental Change has published a recent Science Plan. To obtain a copy of Plan, contacting the International Project Office, Dartmouth College, 6214 Fairchild Hall, Hanover, NH 03755, e-mail <IDGEC_IPO@Dartmouth.EDU>. The IPR TIG is interested in your publications or any you come across related to our subject matters in: IPR, repatriation, cultural property, biodiversity and indigenous rights. Please submit news for future column news to me at the above e-mail address.

MEDICAL ANTHROPOLOGY AND FEDERALLY FUNDED RESEARCH

By Merrill Singer <Anthro8566@aol.com>
Hispanic Health Council, Hartford, CT

With the year 2000 rapidly descending upon us, stock-taking and forecasting have become national pastimes. For anthropologists, like other applied social scientists whose work (at least in part) is supported by the federal research budget, an issue of perennial concern is the future availability and accessibility of grant monies from various federal institutions. What does a gaze at the crystal ball suggest for medical anthropologists seeking support from the National Institutes of Health or the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) in the coming century (or at least in the first decade thereof)?

Not surprisingly, funding forecasting, like its better known cousin, weather forecasting, is a tricky endeavor because multiple factors come into play, many of which are not fully visible “on the ground” or at any point in time. Some of the important influences on future federally funded health-related research have not yet occurred and cannot be thrown into the analytic mix. Moreover, a quick glance at recent events on the funding scene suggests that there are contradictory (good and bad) signs “in the air.” The key, of course, is getting a handle on which way the strongest winds seem to be blowing. For anthropologists, who are sometimes insecure about their predictive abilities, trying to determine what to pay attention to in drawing conclusions about future direc-

The goal ... was to develop a set of useful recommendations to assist qualitative researchers in writing fundable NIH grants and to build understanding of the nature and role of qualitative methods among non-qualitative researchers who serve on grant review panels.

tions is no mean feat. That said, I will plunge in anyway (recognizing that the risk of coming up all wet is great).

On the positive side, it is encouraging to notice the flurry of recent federally supported conferences and workshops focused on issues like qualitative research and community-based intervention strategies (as opposed to the more traditional focus on changing individual beliefs and behaviors as a means of improving public health). The value of qualitative approaches, including ethnography (which, as we know but others often do not, is a mixed methodology that always includes but is not limited to a qualitative focus), has come to be
recognized as a valuable approach by a number of NIH institutes. In part, the hard work of a growing number of anthropologists, sociologists and other qualitative researchers employed at federal research institutes and offices in the greater Washington, D.C. area have achieved this recognition.

Notably, for example, there is the Trans-NIH Qualitative Research Interest Group (CQRIG). CQRIG is a formally recognized body that seeks to promote awareness of the roles of culture, ethnicity, and racial and class categories on health and disease. Composed of qualitative researchers on the staffs of various institutes, including the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA), the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), the National Institute on Drugs (NIDA), and the Office of Behavioral and Social Science Research (OBSSR), CQRIG seeks to build support for qualitative research within NIH and in the NIH-funded extramural research portfolio, as well as to promote greater public awareness of appropriate and rigorous qualitative methods in health research.

Toward this end, in September 1999, CQRIG supported a workshop on “Qualitative Methods in Health Research: Opportunities and Considerations in Application and Review.” Invited participants included a number of anthropologists, including Sue Estroff, who was asked to chair the meeting. The lead organizer of the event was another anthropologist, Suzanne Heurtin-Roberts of NIAAA. Other anthropological participants included Genevieve Ames, Byron Good, Janis Jenkins, Marjorie Kawaga-Singer, Mark Luborsky, Claire Sterk and me. Robert Trotter was also invited (and wrote up a report for the meeting), but his involvement in another federally-sponsored applied research effort (on AIDS prevention in minority communities) forced him to be in Miami at the time of meeting.

Over the course of the two-day gathering, which opened with welcoming remarks from Norman Anderson, Director, OBSSR, and Ellen Stover, Director, Division of Mental Disorders, Behavioral Research and AIDS, NIMH, participants shared their experiences with writing and reviewing federal grants based on qualitative methodologies. The goal of this highly productive meeting was to develop a set of useful recommendations to assist qualitative researchers in writing fundable NIH grants and to build understanding of the nature and role of qualitative methods among non-qualitative researchers who serve on grant review panels. Work on these recommendations is continuing and will ultimately lead to a document that can influence the quality of the writing and reviewing of ethnographic and other anthropological grant applications.

In June, 1999, NIMH sponsored a small conference on “Context and Culture in HIV/STD Intervention: Ecological Strategies for Enhancing Community Impact” in Washington, DC. Participants from various disciplines attended. Anthropological participants in the meeting included Philippe Bourgois, Jean Schensul, Robert Trotter, and me. The meeting was designed to consider methods for enhancing the community-level impact of AIDS initiatives, to explore the value of community collaboration, and to review qualitative approaches to knowledge generation and health intervention. Renewed interest in qualitative approaches at NIMH signals an important potential funder for anthropological research initiatives.

In October 1999, NIDA published the volume, Integrating Cultural, Observational, and Epidemiological Approaches in the Prevention of Drug Abuse and HIV/AIDS based on an earlier NIDA and Wenner-Gren supported conference developed to examine the interrelationship between ethnography and epidemiology in HIV/AIDS and drug use research. Edited by three anthropologists, this volume (available without cost from NIDA, see their Website) brings together a series of policy-oriented papers that highlight the contributions and value of anthropological approaches in the AIDS epidemic. Richard Needle, who until recently served as Chief of the Community Research Branch at NIDA, played an instrumental role in garnering NIDA support for the conference and the volume it produced.

In July 1999, the Behavioral Intervention Research Branch of CDC sponsored a meeting entitled “Models of Behavioral Change in Community-Level Research: Applications for HIV Prevention” in Atlanta. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss models and methods in community-level research on HIV-related behavior change, especially how behavior change takes place through community-level health interventions. Participants included anthropologists, sociologists, psychologists, and others concerned with public health at the community level. As in the other meetings noted above, movement beyond the individual level to social and community factors in risk and risk prevention were issues of key interest. Without question, the shift from a narrow emphasis on individual behavior change to social/community structures and processes in risk reduction bodes well for the involvement of anthropologists, anthropological conceptions, and ethnographic methods in CDC funded HIV prevention/intervention research.

All of these events suggest the growing presence of anthropologists and anthropological concerns on the federal health research scene. Significantly, as an equally important marker of this success, during federal hearings on the NIH budget in October 1999, the Senate expressed concern that NIH has never fully included behavioral and
social science research in its core public health mission. Support was urged for a review of all institutes concerning their incorporation of the behavioral and social sciences in NIH research and training activities.

More problematic is the direction that has been proposed for the Center for Science Review (CSR), the body charged with reviewing many of the research grants submitted to NIH, including to those institutes that traditionally have funded the largest number of anthropological researchers (i.e., NIMH, NIDA, NIAAA). To assess its review structure and the types of review panels it needs to carry out its grant review mission, CSR established the Panel on Scientific Boundaries for Review. Recently, the Panel released its recommendations for reorganizing the Initial Review Groups (IRG) at CSR.

Because of the important role anthropologists have played in AIDS research, one of the immediate concerns caused by the Panel’s recommendations is its proposal to eliminate the eight HIV/AIDS review committees now functioning at CSR. Additionally, the general thrust of the Panel’s recommendations is toward a narrow biomedical focus on health, with most of the 21 proposed IRGs being centered on the disciplines connected to the study of particular bodily systems (e.g., cardiovascular science, endocrinology, digestive sciences, pulmonary sciences, brain disorders). Only three of the proposed IRGs would potentially be open to grants from the vast majority of anthropologists (health of the population, risk and health behaviors, and behavior and biobehavioral processing). Clearly, the Panel did not listen very well to the interest of members of the U.S. Senate in fully incorporating the social and behavioral sciences in health-related research.

Where are things headed? How will anthropologists be impacted? While there is plenty of reason to be cautious, there are several signs that anthropological researchers should fare well in directing their research applications to NIH and CDC for the immediate future. At the same time, considerable organizational work is needed to publicize and promote issues of concern to anthropologists at both NIH and CDC. Of immediate concern is the fuller inclusion of anthropologists on NIH peer review panels.

**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE REGULATIONS: A MANDATE FOR HUMAN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS?**

By Barbara Rose Johnston, Project Director
<bjohnston@igc.org>
SIAA/EPA Fellowship Coordinator

This article briefly summarizes those environmental justice principles, policies, and methods mandated by the U.S. federal government, especially those that require the involvement of applied social science. This summary is drawn from the “Final Guidance For Incorporating Environmental Justice Concerns in EPA's NEPA Compliance Analyses” released by the US Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Federal Activities, April 1999 (hereafter termed “the EPA environmental justice guidance document”).

In 1994, President Clinton issued Executive Order 12898, “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations.” Executive Order 12898 instructs all federal agencies to analyze environmental effects, including human health, economic, and social effects, of federal actions, including effects on minority communities and low-income communities, when such analysis is required by the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA). Executive Order 12898 also provides that environmental human health shall include diverse segments of the population in epidemiological and clinical studies, including segments at high risk from environmental hazards, such as minority and low-income populations and workers who may be exposed to substantial environmental hazards; and that environmental human health analyses, whenever practicable and appropriate, shall identify multiple and cumulative exposures.

This represents a significant opportunity for anthropologists and other applied social scientists. Any and all action involving the use of federal funds require determination of whether an EA or EIS is needed — and thus require consideration of sociocultural and other human environmental impacts.

The EPA environmental justice guidance document notes that in implementing Executive Order 12898, “the goal is not to shift risks among populations, but to identify potential disproportionately high and adverse effects and identify alternatives that may mitigate these impacts.” Procedural methods for conducting Environmental Justice Assessments begin with the determination of whether an environmental justice assessment should be undertaken.

Analysts review baseline demographic, socioeconomic, and environmental conditions, assess the types of impacts that may be imposed upon all human and natural resources (e.g., air, water, soils, wildlife), and determine how these impacts may translate into human health concerns. Given the difficulty in determining the point at which stress levels become too great and affected communities exceed risk thresholds, the EPA environmental justice guidance document encourages comparative analyses —comparing the cumulative effects of multiple actions with appropriate community, regional, state, or national goals and standards to determine whether the total effect is significant. In considering direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on natural resources, analysts must identify and assess the patterns and degrees to which the affected communities depend on natural resources for its economic base.
Once a determination has been made that an environmental justice assessment is needed, analysts employ an analytical framework that explores whether there exists a potential for disproportionate risk; whether communities have been sufficiently involved in the decision-making process; and, whether communities currently suffer, or have historically suffered, from environmental and health risks or hazards. Addressing these questions requires consideration of demographic, geographic, economic, and human health and risk factors.

The EPA’s guidelines for implementing environmental justice regulations present multiple avenues for anthropological input. Anthropological research can generate baseline information useful in the analysis of a wide variety of environmental health and socioeconomic variable factors.

- We can develop databases that identify and describe sources of information, data, and knowledge pertaining to historical conditions and sociocultural groups in a given region.
- We can use applied ethnographic methods to develop sociocultural profiles of current communities in ways that constitute a “baseline” data base — documenting different cultural and social group behavior, conditions, and consequential concerns that might affect cumulative and indirect impacts.
- We can document and articulate subsistence patterns and lifeways that might contribute towards increased vulnerability.
- We can work with vulnerable communities to understand environmental threats, to understand “high-risk” behavior, and to generate culturally appropriate strategies for reducing risk.
- By using applied ethnographic techniques to conduct baseline surveys we can facilitate educational outreach and informed participatory involvement in environmental planning and decision-making processes.

I believe we can do all this and more in response to (and sustained by) federally funded mandates for considering the sociocultural dimensions of environmental impact analysis.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Past Presidents Syndrome

By John Young <JYoung@orst.edu>
Oregon State University

Having recently experienced the ignominy of becoming a Past President, I can sympathize with one of my predecessors who expressed his discomfort at “being ignored.” (Anthony Paredes, SfAA Newsletter, May 1999). I did not read far before finding out that I was one of the culprits. Paring to contemplate the situation, I reached the conclusion that, despite Mike Whiteford’s acknowledgement in the previous issue, I should have mentioned Paredes in my November 1998, President’s Letter. Paredes was the first among us to vent his frustrations with computers, and consistent with his convictions, wrote his column on a manual typewriter. His ideas about the concentration of wealth associated with the advance of information technology and the costs of computers for human society, though humorously phrased, must be taken seriously. I have always held this view.

In my own defense, I must point out that I wrote my 1998 column with a different purpose in mind. Although my opinion of computers is similarly uncharitable, I disagree with Paredes’ assessment that my commentary and his piece written four years earlier had the “same underlying theme.” He wrote about the impact of computers as a global issue. Soon thereafter he appointed a committee to oversee future studies of the depredations of “informational capitalism” on humankind. (This committee went “moribund” before I became President).

In contrast, I wrote about the issue of cost-effectiveness related to increasingly rapid change in computer technology, first from a personal perspective and second from an organizational perspective. Symbolic protest by individuals, no matter how sincere, and postmodern spin-doctoring, what Paredes calls “tips” from Escobar, provide no practical solutions to our immediate problems. It would not be a wise move to restock the SfAA Business Office with manual typewriters and politically correct typists.

Like the telephone, Internet technology is here to stay. The stark reality is that the Society stands to lose if it does not make effective use of the Internet. The Internet Committee is not about “going native.” Perhaps the side-effects of Past Presidents Syndrome prevented Paredes from noticing that I appointed Committee members to use their considerable expertise to serve the best interest of SfAA, not to be mindless cheerleaders for Bill Gates.

Strategic Planning Rituals

By J. Anthony Paredes <Tony_Paredes@nps.gov>
Florida State University/National Park Service

After reading Linda Bennett’s latest president’s letter, I had thought about doing a critique of the whole
idea of strategic planning, but didn’t have the energy. Since Carol Hill’s presidency I have tried to temper enthusiasm for the strategic planning exercise among the SfAA leadership, obviously without much success.

The whole complex of strategic planning beliefs and practices is, in my view, heavy-laden with magical thinking, lack of tolerance for ambiguity, and the quest for constituent compliance and unquestioned control. Strategic planning ritual can easily be very wasteful of resources if not kept in check, notwithstanding the psychological benefits to be derived from it as from any other ritual. Perhaps for all these reasons and more, a few governments and businesses, I’ve been told, “got past it” long ago. It upsets me to see anthropologists lining up with practically everybody else and succumbing to corporate mimicry. Too much “going native” in my view.

Those among us applied anthropologists seeking social acceptability in today’s corporate world should not neglect the historic role of anthropology as the quintessential discipline for “thinking out of the box” (if one must find comfort in using a currently “hot” business metaphor). As presumed experts on culture, we should be studying “strategic planning,” not ritualistically imitating it.

Laura Nader’s recent essay “Thinking Public Interest Anthropology 1890s-1990s” (Bulletin of the General Anthropology Division; Vol. 5, No. 2, Spring 1999, pp. 1, 7-9; American Anthropological Association) should be required reading for all applied anthropologists and, especially, for leaders of SfAA. Here, Nader sketches the history of the disengagement of American academics from the sociocultural settings in which they lived and argues that “the university...needs to keep critical work about business and government at arms length because it requires the support of these institutions” (pp. 7-8). Nader’s article should be a wake-up call for all anthropologists, applied as well as academic.

COMPANIES LEARN VALUE OF GRASS ROOT ANTHROPOLOGIST HELP ADAPT PRODUCTS TO WORLD’S CULTURES

By Elizabeth Weise
Copyright 1999, USA TODAY. Reprinted with permission

A year ago in a hot, dusty outdoor market in Baku, Azerbaijan, anthropologist Jean Canavan made her discovery.

She was watching vendors display their wares to discerning customers and praise their value and durability. But it was the customers’ ability to read intricate origination codes on the merchandise that was the surprise.

“They’d flip the cell phone over, take the battery out and actually read the bar code on it to see where the phone was built,” Canavan says.

She and two colleagues were doing fieldwork for their employer, Motorola, investigating how the company could best enter the emerging markets of Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan.

They found that people in the Caspian Sea area have learned to read the numbers on bar codes to see where products were manufactured. The buyers believe that products from American companies are better if they were built in America.

“It created an awareness on the part of Motorola that this is an important purchasing criterion for people,” Canavan says.

Think anthropologists spend their days hanging out in Pago Pago studying the local culture? Think again. Like everyone else, anthropologists and ethnographers increasingly are finding jobs with high-tech companies, using their highly developed skills as observers to study how people live, work and use technology.

“This is not Raiders of the Lost Ark,” says Susan Squires, incoming president of the 1,000-member National Association for the Practice of Anthropology, which has a Web site at www.ameranthassn.org/napa.htm.

“Anthropology developed methods to understand people who were so different from Europeans that you couldn’t just go up and ask questions, so we came up with methods such as participant observation and fieldwork,” says Squires, who also works at GVO Inc., a product development company in Palo Alto, Calif.

The single green ‘copy’ button . The use of those skills in the service of modern technology can be traced to 1979, when the legendary Xerox Palo Alto Research Center hired anthropology graduate student Lucy Suchman. PARC was a center of innovative technological thinking, having created the computer mouse and graphical user interface. Suchman worked in the intelli-
gent systems laboratory, where researchers were trying to build artificial intelligence to help people use complicated copiers.

In a famous film, Suchman showed several people having a terrible time trying to do a copying job. From her research came the realization that features aren’t as important as simplicity. That’s why Xerox copiers now, no matter how complex, all include a single green copy button for when you want one uncomplicated copy.

Twenty years later, a hiring boom is going on, plucking newly minted Ph.D.s from anthropology departments across the country, much to the distress of more tradition-bound academics, who think their graduates shouldn’t sully the purity of their field by working in industry.

Stanford graduate Genevieve Bell of Hillsboro, Ore., says that when she left a teaching position at Stanford for a job at Intel, “as far as the faculty was concerned, it was a total sell-out. (Working in industry is) thought of as second tier.”

Not all schools feel that way. “One of our big problems is that graduate students keep getting snatched up by companies,” says Marietta Baba, chairwoman of the anthropology department at Wayne State University in Detroit. It specializes in training cultural anthropology students in rigorous ethnographic methods — the art of observing social interactions to understand the underlying structures of a culture — and teaching them to apply those methods to industry.

She estimates that about 9,000 anthropologists are in academia in the USA and about 2,200 are in applied anthropology positions in industry. “But the proportions are shifting, so you’re getting more and more applied ones,” she says.

The point of hiring anthropologists is to help companies understand their users and find new products and markets the engineers and marketers never dreamed of — such as Intel looking into designing a computer chip that can withstand a blast from a deck hose.

On a salmon boat, chip ahoy. That particular idea came from John Sherry, a member of the end user research group at Intel’s Hillsboro offices. Sherry’s undergraduate degree was in computer science, not an uncommon combination for techno-anthropologists. He did his doctoral anthropological fieldwork with Navajos, has worked for Microsoft’s usability group and has been with Intel for 2 1/2 years.

Sherry set out to find computers being used in extreme environments. He ended up on an Alaskan salmon boat.

The tender, who picks up the catch from the fisherman and carries it back to the cannery, has to keep a lot of records, from tickets issued for payments to reports filed for the fisheries board, all on a deck slippery with scales and blood. This particular tender, Sherry says, had duct-taped a notebook computer to the entryway of his cabin. “He told me, ‘I need a computer that’s so durable I can blast it with a deck hose and it will still work.’”

Back in his offices in Oregon, Sherry doesn’t regret leaving the halls of academia. “This is a fantastic job,” he says. “In my wildest dreams in graduate school I couldn’t have imagined a job this great.”

Colleague Bell, in obvious agreement, just returned from a fact-finding mission to look into ways high-speed data communications could work in northern Italy. After weeks of eating, drinking and spending hours at the dining room table with her Italian hosts, the answer was “not very well.”

“It’s hard to imagine how technology could improve that life,” she says.

She found close-knit communities revolving around family and the table. Dinners are hours-long affairs, husbands come home for lunch, and the kitchen is the center of life. “In the United States, we talk about the computer competing with television,” Bell says. “In Italy, it would be food.”

But technology in other forms holds possibilities. In households where shoeboxes full of photos were pulled out to show Bell the family history and tell family stories, digital cameras proved interesting.

A simple slip of paper. Sometimes, just seeing and understanding an act as simple as a piece of paper being handed between colleagues holds the solution to a difficult problem.

Marilyn Whalen of Xerox’s Knowledge Interaction and Practice section was researching better ways to train call center workers at the company’s Lewisville, Texas, site in 1996. She saw a call taker on the phone who needed an after-hours price list. “Without even seeming to have been paying attention” to the conversation, a colleague in the next cubicle got up and handed her the list, she remembers.

Seeing that single act helped Whalen and her team realize that workers sitting together listened and learned from each other without knowing it. With that understanding, they crafted the company’s interactive learning policy: Instead of sitting in stuffy classrooms being lectured to, employees are plunked down next to someone doing a job where they can learn from the work environment itself. “It’s the natural human collaborative practice,” she says.

“Technology is the most important story of the 20th century,” says Bonnie Nardi, a longtime design anthropologist who has worked at Hewlett-Packard and Apple and now does research at AT&T Labs West in Menlo Park, Calif.

After a year of fieldwork in Western Samoa, where famed anthropologist Margaret Mead did her original research in the 1920s, Nardi came back to the USA and taught.

But at a time when being an anthropologist meant getting a job as a professor, she instead went to Hewlett-Packard to study how people use spreadsheets. The
engineers imagined one user sitting down and filling in all the blanks. Instead, Nardi found that they were typically passed around the office, each person inserting bits of information.

“This supposedly single-user application was actually being developed collaboratively,” she says. This insight led to designs that better suited what users actually were doing — not what engineers thought they should be doing.

The border of people and tech. Over the years, Nardi has seen the idea of anthropology as a useful addition to industry become more commonplace. Today, both the University of California, Irvine, and Georgia Tech include ethnographic training as part of their computer science degree programs.

“They’re attracting not just supergeeks, but people who want to work on the border of people and technology,” she says.

Traditional market research tools are limited by their question-and-answer format, says Andrea Saveri, a director at the Institute for the Future in Menlo Park. She keeps a staff of ethnographers on hand to do research on the consequences of technology.

“In the case of surveys, you’re telling the respondent how to answer, and you’re not giving them any room for anything else.” She sees ethnography as an incredibly precise and powerful tool when used properly.

Industry is beginning to catch on, she says. “It’s become chic.”

ANNOUNCEMENTS

MEDICAL ANTHROPOLOGIST, THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA. The Department of Anthropology and the Department of Community and Behavioral Health in the newly established College of Public Health seek a jointly appointed tenure track Assistant Professor who will be three-quarters in Anthropology and one-quarter in Community and Behavioral Health. Applicants should hold a Ph.D. in Anthropology by the date of appointment with a specialization in medical anthropology, and should have an M.P.H. or equivalent background in Public Health. Interdisciplinary research experience and interests either in the USA or abroad in critical medical anthropology, rural health, health economic issues, aging, mental health, or gender and health are especially attractive. Teaching load is 4 courses per year, 2 in each department, and previous teaching experience is highly desirable. Screening of applications will begin 12/1/99. Send a letter of application, curriculum vitae, and contact information for three references to: Mac Marshall, Search Committee Chair, Department of Anthropology, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, 52242. Women and minorities are especially encouraged to apply.

VOLUNTEERS NEEDED

Five guests will be coming to the San Francisco meeting from the Institute for Nationality Studies, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences in Beijing. I will help with their costs by sharing my hotel room with one of the guests. I hope others might volunteer to do the same. Get in touch with John Young to indicate your interest <jyoung@orst.edu>.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY’S ETHNOGRAPHIC FIELD SCHOOL enters the new millennium with expanded opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students to learn ethnographic field methods, design and conduct their own community based research projects, and provide direct service to Native peoples in the American Southwest. EFS will continue its tradition of working in collaboration with various Navajo Nation agencies and organizations, with some of the smaller Spanish-speaking areas of northern New Mexico, and this year plans to add placements at several of the pueblo villages in New Mexico.

The program emphasizes both research methods and practical field experience, fostering direct involvement in the local community through the volunteer placement program. Each student works with a local sponsor who supervises the student in an eight-week volunteer position. Students have worked in the Navajo Nation Office of Tourism, the Navajo Office of Women and Children, the Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) nutrition program, at a Navajo nursing home, in the Navajo Housing Office, at KTNN, the Navajo Nation radio station, at the Navajo Nation Museum and Office of Historic Preservation, as a staff person for the Navajo Times newspaper, and in the Peacemaker Division of the Navajo Tribal Courts.
The opportunities are endless as placements are negotiated to meet each student’s interests. In addition, students complete a research study related to their work. Past studies include Navajo uses of computers, traditional themes in contemporary Navajo art, the media, minorities and community, the treatment of substance abuse using Navajo treatment modalities, how to create a Navajo nursing home, grazing patterns and land usage, sustainable agricultural and Navajo farming practices, and the treatment of tuberculosis in a Navajo setting. Students live in private housing, often with Navajo families, and have daily opportunities to learn about Navajo culture and practices.

The field school operates under the auspices of Northwestern University’s Summer Session: students may earn six to nine credits for the eight-week program. The program begins with a four-day orientation and ends with a two day ‘debriefing’ when students give oral presentations of their work and findings. Regular support and supervision is provided throughout the summer from on-site teaching assistants, and the program’s director and deputy. For further information contact Dr. Madelyn Iris, Buehler Center on Aging, Northwestern University, 750 N. Lake Shore Drive, Suite 601, Chicago, IL, 60611. Telephone 312/503-5444, or e-mail to miris@nwu.edu. Applications and program information are available by e-mail from Madelyn Iris.

CDC RESEARCH FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES. Each year the federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) provides millions of dollars of support in the form of grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements for public health research and other activities. Many of these funding opportunities can potentially involve social and behavioral scientists, including anthropologists. Although funding announcements may be posted at any time of the year, the majority of new programs tend to be announced from April through July because of federal fiscal year cycles. Persons interested in CDC funding opportunities should select the “Funding” button on the CDC home Web page <http://www.cdc.gov/>. Because CDC funding announcements often are open for limited application acceptance periods (e.g., typically one to two months), researchers should consult the Web site listing on a regular basis to learn about new opportunities as they become available.

PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY, Department of Anthropology announces a new research and training program in cultural anthropology. We are looking for outstanding students who are interested in the study of transnational migration between Oaxaca, Mexico and the United States. Students should have strong GPAs and GRE scores and be proficient in Spanish. Hispanic/Latino students are encouraged to apply to this project. Our goals are to define the history of transnational migration between Oaxaca and the U.S. and determine the role of remittance investment in socioeconomic change. Students will work with faculty in the U.S. and Mexico and will participate in fieldwork in Oaxaca. For more information contact: Jeffrey H. Cohen at 409/862-3492 or at <jhcohen@acs.tamu.edu>. After January 1st, 2000, contact Dr. Cohen at the Pennsylvania State University, department of anthropology at 814/865-2509. Fax: 814/863 1474.

SUNBELT XX INTERNATIONAL SUNBELT SOCIAL NETWORK CONFERENCE. Vancouver, British Columbia, April 13-16, 2000. This conference is a major forum for social scientists, mathematicians, computer scientists, and all others interested in theory, methods, or applications of social networks to share common concerns. For complete information on the conference, visit <http://www.sfu.ca/~insna> or contact Bill Richards, School of Communication, Simon Fraser University, burnaby, BC V5A 1S6, Canada; <richards@sfu.ca>; telephone 604-251-3272/
GLOBAL AND LOCAL HISTORIES: APPLIED ANTHROPOLOGY ACROSS THE CENTURES

The theme of this conference is understanding the past to negotiate the future, with special attention to our impacts on policy design and advocacy. In areas such as public health, sustainable development, natural resources, cultural resource management, education, and global migration, considering local and global histories is critical to better assisting clients and reaching SfAA goals. Our organizational history emphasizes the value of multi-disciplinary approaches and partnerships. The agenda invites attention to domains we have personally and collectively examined and attention to planning and directions for the future. As practitioners, scholars, agencies, institutions, communities, and grassroots organizations, the conference will help us plan for the coming decade, century, millennium.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS FOR INDIGENOUS PEOPLES, A SOURCEBOOK

Tom Greaves (Editor)

The rights of indigenous societies to control access and use of the cultural knowledge is an issue of global scale, debated in the United Nations, in the biodiversity and human rights movements, within the pharmaceutical industry, in government and private corporations, among the social and applied sciences, and, most importantly, among indigenous leaders.

The Sourcebook offers cases where indigenous groups have asserted these rights and cases that analyze the legal and political context. It is intended to be useful to 1) indigenous leaders reviewing their options, 2) to advocacy groups for indigenous rights, human rights and biodiversity preservation, 3) to policy specialist, and 4) to scholars. The Sourcebook provides a consolidated source of very current information on the rights of indigenous peoples with respect to the use of their cultural knowledge.

To order, call the SfAA Business Office at 405/843-5113 or send an e-mail requesting a copy to <sfaa@telepath.com>.

FROM THE EDITOR

As you may have already seen in the recent Anthropology News, Noel Chrisman (U Washington) joined with some other social scientists in Washington DC in April to give a “Congressional Briefing” on the social and cultural aspects of adherence (compliance) with health care recommendations. As a consequence of that activity, he was invited by the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute to participate in mid-September on a committee to discuss more work by the Institute on the issue of adherence. There were two subcommittees: one on research and one on practice. An anthropologist sat on each. He was on the practice committee; Suzanne Heurtin-Roberts (from NIH) was on the research committee. Both committees generated reports to the Institute and both reports included significant statements about attending to culture and cultural competence in the delivery of health care. Noel reports he was impressed by two aspects of his experience. One was the degree to which the clinicians and other scientists on the practice committee were eager to think and act at the systems level and the second was the warm reception anthropological ideas received.

Do you have a nifty session planned for the forthcoming San Francisco meetings that you think deserves some special mention? If so, please drop us a line (about 100 words will do, thank you) highlighting the session. If we get enough submissions, we will put together a separate section in the Newsletter. The careful reader (and I’m sure that includes everyone) will notice that there has not been a Student Column in either of the past two issues. We encourage our student members to put their fingers to the keyboard and provide us with material for the next Newsletter.

Finally, some news from the AAA Newsletter: Over the past decade the number of undergraduate degrees has increased 56%. The growth is taking place at relatively large institutions (defined as having 5,000 students or more).

As always, we look forward to hearing from you. Please feel free to put pen in hand or fingers to the keyboard and send us something. The deadline for receipt of materials for the next issue of the Newsletter will be January 25, 2000.

Mike Whiteford <jefe@iastate.edu>
The SfAA Newsletter is published by the Society for Applied Anthropology and is a benefit of membership in the Society. Non-members may purchase subscriptions at a cost of $10.00 for U.S. residents and $15.00 for non-U.S. residents. Checks or money orders should be made payable to the Society for Applied Anthropology.
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