

# Society for Applied Anthropology Newsletter

Vol 10, No. 3

August 1999

## SfAA PRESIDENT'S LETTER

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

*"The Society should improve its capacity to respond to policy issues identified by the membership as being particularly important."*

This Long-Range Planning Goal was ranked "number one" in importance by the SfAA officers and board members at its Sunday morning board meeting in Tucson, April, 1999.

This column is dedicated to bringing the membership up to date as to where we stand as a Society in our long-range planning, our mission statement, our vision statement, and our goals. In turn, I invite — no, I strongly urge — you to write to me, as well as to other officers and board members, with your thoughts about these long-range planning issues.

For some years now, SfAA officers and board members have given considerable attention to articulating and then discussing the mission, vision, and long-range goals for the Society. Although I feel certain that long-range planning discussions have been going on since 1941, when the Society was incorporated under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, my first personal recollection of these activities goes back to a retreat organized by Carole Hill during her Presidency.

In 1996 then President Jay Schensul and the Board of Directors undertook a strategic planning process that led to the publication of draft long-range goals in the Fall 1996 SfAA Newsletter. An open forum to discuss the draft was held at the Seattle meetings in 1997. Then in November 1997, Dennis Wiedman, SfAA Treasurer, presented a draft of the Vision Statement, a revised Mission Statement, again in the SfAA Newsletter, and invited comment on the revised version.

When I became President-Elect in spring 1998, a charge made to me was to move the agenda along on our

discussion of long-term planning. Dennis Wiedman and Linda Whiteford, an SfAA Board Member, have worked closely with me in this effort. In April 1998, further comments were requested on the draft "Mission, Vision and 1996-1998 Long Range Goals."

Admittedly, I am pretty practical when it comes to strategic planning endeavors. My emphasis since spring 1998, has been to focus on the (then) nine goals, which I recommended to the Board be expanded to eleven. I modified the language a bit, reordered the goals, and divided two goals into two separate ones. The intent and flavor of the goals were maintained.

It is important to point out that the vision statement and goals are "evolving documents," rather than static texts. From my perspective, their primary value is in their usefulness to help direct the Society where questions of prioritizing time, finances, and overall energy are concerned and to provoke constructive discussion about where we

*(continued on page 2)*

### IN THIS ISSUE

<i>SfAA President's Letter</i> .....	1
<i>Why We're Worried About Cultural Anthro</i> .....	3
<i>Shifting Gears in HIV Prevention Research</i> .....	5
<i>Minding Your Business</i> .....	8
<i>Report from HO Editor</i> .....	8
<i>Report from PA Editor</i> .....	10
<i>LPO News</i> .....	11
<i>TIG for Intellectual Property Rights</i> .....	12
<i>Classics of Practicing Anthropology</i> .....	12
<i>SfAA Environmental Anthropology Update</i> .....	13
<i>World Bank &amp; the Public Commentary Process</i> ..	14
<i>Theory &amp; Practice in Anthropology</i> .....	15
<i>News From the Environmental Anthro TIG</i> .....	17
<i>Call for Session Organizers</i> .....	17
<i>Kushner &amp; Doughty Fettered in Tucson</i> .....	18
<i>Anthropology, Pedagogy &amp; Higher Education</i> ...	18
<i>Special Call for Films &amp; Videos</i> .....	19
<i>Meeting Abstract Notice</i> .....	19
<i>Student Column: A Profile</i> .....	19
<i>From the Editor</i> .....	19

should be going in the future. While they reflect our past, they encourage us to think very seriously about our future.

In my relatively short time in dealing with SfAA long-range planning goals, I have concluded the following: 1) the discussions help us to take stock of how much progress we have made in achieving goals that were established during earlier periods; 2) prioritizing goals now is useful in considering ongoing and new initiatives as they are proposed by the membership; 3) fiscal decisions, especially about new initiatives, can be connected to agreed-upon goals; and 4) planning for the future can be focused and then related to the membership in a way that can be understood and responded to.

While the vision statement and long-range planning goals are evolving documents, the “mission” statement is not. I use this opportunity to report that at the 1999 business meeting of the Society in Tucson, members in attendance unanimously voted to return to the original language of the “mission statement” or what is entitled “Article I: Object and Name” in the By-Laws of the Society for Applied Anthropology. Tony Paredes had brought the Board’s attention to his and other Past-Presidents’ serious concerns about the change in wording of the “object” that was voted on as part of by-law changes in spring 1998. In 1999, both the Board and the members in attendance at the business meeting unanimously voted to return to the more “elegant and eloquent” language of the original statement of purpose: *The Society has for its object the promotion of interdisciplinary scientific investigation of the principles controlling the relations of human being to one another, and the encouragement of the wide application of these principles to practical problems, and shall be known as The Society for Applied Anthropology.*

Our experience with first changing and then returning to the original language points up the importance of our getting members’ perspectives on long-range planning activities during the planning process. At the Sunday morning meeting of the SfAA Board in Tucson, officers and board members considered the eleven goals with respect to their priority ranking in terms of the immediate future of the Society and with respect to the Society’s performance thus far in accomplishing each of the goals.

After an initial discussion, the board concluded that two of the eleven goals were of a different order from the other nine, in that achieving them is essential -- not optional -- for the sustainability of the Society. These two goals are: 1) maintain a clearly defined division of responsibilities between the Business Office and the Board and 2) preserve and further strengthen the financial infrastructure of the Society. Board members felt that these two goals were so essential in terms of prior emphasis and for future work of the Society that it was better to consider them as “givens” in terms of the goals of the Society. Thus, they were not entered into the ranking

Ed Liebow, who joined the Board of Directors at the Tucson meetings (1999), provided a major service to the Board and the membership at the board meeting. He had wisely brought his lap-top computer to the meeting and had “Anthropac” loaded on it. Thus, as the Board was discussing the goals and how each of us would prioritize them, Ed offered to crunch two types of data for us. The eleven board members in attendance ranked the nine goals according to perceived importance each of us felt the goals held for the Society. It is important to point out that all of these goals were considered to be important; otherwise, they would not have been identified and retained. Considerable “winnowing” had already occurred. Therefore, it is fair to say that the ninth ranked goal is considered to be important.

With respect to the priority ranking, the goals are listed from (1) the highest relative priority to (9) the lowest relative priority.

- (1) To improve the capacity of the Society to respond to policy issues identified by the membership as being particularly important.
- (2) To enhance the reputation of the Society’s publications as leading repositories of applied knowledge, skills, and methods.
- (3) To advance anthropological perspectives through public outreach and effective media coverage.
- (4) To promote and expand services to various member constituencies, especially students at all levels and M.A. and Ph.D.-level professionals working outside of academia.
- (5) To expand the readership of the Society’s printed and electronic publications.
- (6) To strengthen its international constituency and endeavors.
- (7) To increase the diversity of people encompassed within its activities, especially regarding the representation of ethnically under-represented groups.
- (8) To support and expand interdisciplinary networks, membership, and perspectives.
- (9) To advance the Society’s capacity to serve its members, communities, and the discipline through contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements with organizations committed to enhancing the quality of life in local communities.

We also rated these goals in terms of how successful each of us thought the Society was performing in terms of achieving these goals. Each was ranked as “high, medium, or low” with respect to our moving along on achieving these goals. The two goals that we thought we were doing the best on were : 1) To enhance the reputation of the Society’s publications as leading repositories of applied knowledge, skills, and methods, and 2) To improve the capacity of the Society to respond to policy issues identified by the membership as being particularly important.

It will probably not come as any big surprise to most readers that the goal that ranked at the bottom in terms of

how successful we believe we have been in achieving our objectives is: To strengthen its international constituency and endeavors. Importantly, the “international constituency and endeavor” goal was ranked mid-way (sixth) in terms of perceived importance to the Society. Thus, we find a discrepancy between what we have achieved and the relative level of importance.

I know this may seem like a lot of detail to digest, but it would be very useful to me (and the rest of the SfAA leadership) to get your feedback on the specific goals you think the society should be focusing its energies and resources on in the immediate future. We would also like to have some particular recommendations on how you think we should proceed to meet those goals.

The budgeting process is a major reason to identify new areas where we want to devote new resources as early as possible. The annual budget is drafted and then approved by the Board late each fall. Therefore, this is an ideal time to be getting your input about these goals.

In the next issue of the *Newsletter* I will provide feedback regarding your recommendations and will discuss how particular goals are being addressed by SfAA committees. Please refer to the SfAA web pages for these documents.

My thanks goes out to current and prior officers and board members and other SfAA leaders who have worked hard on long-range planning issues.



## WHY WE'RE WORRIED ABOUT CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

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

Kendall M. Thu  
Northern Illinois University

One of Paul's labor pals once quipped that the only thing anthropologists produce is other anthropologists. That has us worried because more anthropologists are focusing on marginal topics than important ones. The issue is not whether one subscribes to postmodernism but whether anthropology is becoming part of a larger social problem of obfuscating rather than clarifying the human

condition. When we are distracted from the growing power of multinational corporations in agriculture, science, and politics, we help benefit the elite who have increasing control over the production and distribution of basic resources.

The 1995 AAA survey of graduate departments reports about 93 institutions in the U.S. grant anthropology Ph.D.s. About half of new Ph.D.s find work outside the academy. About half of new Ph.D.s are in some form of sociocultural anthropology. Dissertations emphasize (1) science, (2) advocacy, (3) interpretation or (4) postmodernism. They define *science* as use of replicable techniques and formal methodologies; *advocacy* as furthering a political agenda or the redress of past wrongs that may value subjects over science; *interpretive approaches* are those that prefer to speculate rather than replicate and may deny that objective meanings exist; and *postmodernism* as treating ethnography as biography, emphasizing written texts and preference for subjectivity rather than science. Science is central to only one of these. These are the people getting jobs and producing more anthropologists. Sooner or later, these people come up for tenure, and when they get it, watch out! Then they have power. These folks that speak flowery words about nuance, agency, identity, and individual use the bare fists of their privilege to control those under them. That's why we're worried.

Because it is continually self-critical, science demands tolerance of multiple views. Insofar as other approaches sever the relationships of internal consistency and external adequacy, they become relevant only to themselves. Postmodernism and agenda-driven approaches encourage intolerance because they depend on the authority of individuals rather than the disciplined comparing of observations. “Believe me!” “Why?” “Because I am more powerful than you are. Any questions?” “No ma'am.” They become hierarchic rather than democratic because they demand adherence.

This can all be neutral to those who already have tenure or who are outside the system and see only fools counting, no, not counting, discussing the identities and ironies of a number of tropes dancing on the head of a pin. But to graduate students and junior faculty, such “academic” issues can become political minefields. Try writing a dissertation when your advisor's agenda doesn't allow for your findings. Try making it through graduate school when there is no support for people who don't meet some ideological test. Try making it through the core seminars when your teachers tell you, “You're either with us or against us.” You don't have to be a materialist to figure out how to respond. Through such politics are anthropology departments formed and by such means is the discipline reproducing itself. That's why we are worried.

Instead of inquiring into the nature and dynamics of democracy and its impediments, many of us have focused on tropes, forms, and formalisms, blurred genres and iden-

tities, hermeneutic interpretation, voices of hegemony, reflexivity and solipsistic snake-oil. They have read enough anthropology to find out that we write prose. Scholars at elite institutions masquerade as ‘subalterns’ and participate in rather than engage hierarchy. We see the pretense of empowerment in multivocalism rather than inquiry into the causes of inequality. By turning our backs on our traditional research topics, we are making ourselves increasingly irrelevant to contemporary policy and politics.

What should anthropologists be studying? The human condition. In all its splendor and horror in all times and places: what we are, how we are, and how we came to be this way. How we feed ourselves. And how we feed others by our labor. These are the important questions. The varieties of answers define the variety of human experience. We should seek to understand and explain, not to obscure and hide.

One of anthropology’s major contributions to knowledge has been the discovery that the way people get, distribute, and consume food shapes social, economic, and political systems. The emergence of multinational food corporations that reach every corner of the world is a spectacular step in the evolution of culture. Bill Heffernan and his colleagues in Rural Sociology at the University of Missouri have documented the concentration of food production and distribution in the United States. Four beef packers control the slaughter of about 79 percent of all beef; half of U.S. farmland belongs to 4 per cent of all farmland owners; more than 40 percent of farmland owners and organizations pay others to do their work via contract or other absentee arrangements.

Why should anyone be concerned with the growing power of a few food companies? Because, as anthropologist Walter Goldschmidt showed half a century ago, industrial agriculture is associated with social pathologies. Rural sociologists have made an industry of replicating his work. The question is no longer, “Is industrial agriculture bad for rural communities?” The answer is “Yes.” The questions now are “What is the relationship between the concentration of food production and the centralization of political power in the United States and around the globe?” “How is this relationship connected to the manipulation of knowledge?”

Postmodernists and the agenda pushing anthropologists aren’t the only ones to use bare-knuckle politics in academia. One of the most notable consequences of Goldschmidt’s research was the agricultural corporations’ attempts to suppress his findings. In March of 1999,

Michael Stumo, a former Iowa farmer and current general counsel to the Organization for Competitive Markets (OCM), testified before the Missouri legislature that the University of Missouri as a subsidiary of Monsanto by virtue of the encroachment of Monsanto executives into university planning committees, allowing Monsanto scientists to be adjunct faculty, and the development of a new academic publication on biotechnology. Mr. Stumo says this connection has a “direct or subtle effect of quashing research and outreach which may criticize or be out-of-step with Monsanto’s interests and goals.”

Our work documents the connections among Iowa State University, the former Republican governor of Iowa, and industrial swine producers in Iowa. The North Carolina Pork Council is using legal measures to intimidate Dr. Steve Wing of the Carolina

**Lurking around every conference and seminar room corner is the pestilence of postmodern fashionability and agenda peddlers, waiting to distract us from the fundamental problems of contemporary society and keep us from concentrating on the basic lessons of cultural anthropology.**

School of Public Health for his research findings that show negative health consequences to living close to industrial swine production facilities. He has the audacity to challenge the doctrine, long prevalent, from North Carolina State University, whose intimate association with industrial swine production interests is well documented, that, as rural residents of that state told us, “hog shit don’t stink.”

On another front, Beverly Enterprises sued Kate Bronfenbrenner of Cornell’s School of Industrial and Labor Relations for reporting her finding that they engage in unfair labor practices. We should focus on how the chiefs, big men, and clan leaders of the corporations accrue power and dismiss, ignore, and manipulate the negative consequences. One way they do it is through the manipulation of what passes for knowledge.

We’re not conspiracy theorists. But we think there is plenty of evidence that powerful corporations don’t want people to know about the dynamics of the global political economy. We do think there are well-understood and widely shared assumptions, or as Paul Simon says in the song, “a loose affiliation of millionaires and billionaires.” From a cultural evolutionary standpoint, manipulations of knowledge — especially about relationships of food and food production — whether by an obfuscating industry trying to camouflage its damage or by postmodernists trying to camouflage their vacuity — represent a fundamental condition. As the food system goes, so goes the rest of society. And it’s speedily going to the corporations.

We cite lawyers, rural sociologists, labor studies people (damned few anthropologists) because they are asking relevant questions. With some exceptions anthropology has become increasingly irrelevant to contemporary policy and

politics. Anthropologists have had a hand in the formulation of fisheries policy, but even here the voices of economists and biologists with abstract models tend to overwhelm the anthropologists who keep their feet planted on the ground of ethnography. Some have spoken eloquently of the role of the giant corporations in the production and reproduction of poverty. Penny Van Esterik's work with nutrition in Thailand is but one example. With its concern for such issues as we've outlined, applied anthropology now occupies the theoretical center stage and produces the significant findings. Membership in the SFAA is increasing because applied anthropologists have their methodologies and research topics firmly rooted in pressing social problems — and as a result, there are more jobs for applied anthropologists than for other members of our discipline.

Despite those gains, lurking around every conference and seminar room corner is the pestilence of postmodern fashion ability and agenda peddlers, waiting to distract us from the fundamental problems of contemporary society and keep us from concentrating on the basic lessons of cultural anthropology. We have to be careful not to abandon the academy, the place that reproduces anthropology and creates anthropologists, to the solipsists, narcissists, and histrionics. Science cannot depend on coercion, but we must take care to claim room in the academy. We know from our experience that this is difficult in a day when deans of colleges are as trophy and agendified as any of our colleagues who have been pursuing the trendy at the expense of the reasonable. Whether the obfuscation comes from corporate manipulation or postmodern obscurantism, it comes to the same thing — it detracts people from understanding the dynamics of our societies. That's why we're worried.



## SHIFTING GEARS IN HIV PREVENTION RESEARCH

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

For much of the history of the AIDS epidemic, prevention research has been dominated by a set of psychological models of motivation and behavioral change, including the Theory of Reasoned Action, the Health Belief Model, Self-Efficacy Theory, and the Stages of Change

Model. Research emphasis has been placed on individual cognitive and motivational variables including how individuals interpret behavioral information, how they value that information, and how capable they feel about using the information rather than on social and structural influences on individual behavior. These approaches have tended to focus attention narrowly at the individual level, treating at-risk populations like drug users as if they were isolated entities and not members of couple relationships, families, peer groups, communities, and the broader society. Indeed, marginalized groups like drug users often are conceived of in this way in the popular imagination.

Beyond the individual level, early prevention research did include some focus on the “sex partners” of primary at-risk intervention targets. However, many studies of sex partners treat the relationships in question as if they were unidimensional and mechanical sexual connections of importance only in so far as they involved AIDS risk behaviors. While other people have lovers and spouses, populations at highest risk of HIV infection are treated as if they only have “sex partners.”

A critical change in AIDS prevention in recent years is the shift from an overwhelming focus on individually targeted models to a consideration of community and social prevention strategies. While efforts aimed at changing the knowledge-base, attitudes, psychological preparation, and behaviors of at-risk individuals have made important contributions to HIV/AIDS prevention, it is widely recognized that such programs have been inadequate to stem the spread of infection.

There has been a growing attention given to models and mechanisms for either changing the *social environment of AIDS risk* or implementing *social-level interventions* targeted to *social networks* (webs of socially connected individuals), *social norms* (community standards and expectations), *social groups* (naturally occurring social collectivities), *social settings* (specific socially meaningful behavioral environments) and *social structures* (social relations among groups, policy and decision-making arenas, social control mechanism, communication fields). Movement toward social intervention interest among funding institutions significantly expands the opportunities for anthropologists to make useful contributions to AIDS prevention research.

In Hartford, CT, over the last 12 years our anthropologically-oriented applied prevention research team (composed of anthropologists and other researchers at the Hispanic Health Council and the Institute for Community Research) has focused its efforts on the development of social-level HIV prevention models targeted to high-risk populations, especially street drug users. Structurally, the dominant feature of this approach — which we have begun to refer to as the Hartford Model — has been the forging of broad-based community-consortia designed to em-

ploy ethno-epidemiological research in the development, implementation, and evaluation of culturally and socially sensitive intervention strategies. These consortia are intended to allow wide community input, involvement, and impact by enlisting diverse and dispersed community provider institutions as full stakeholders in applied health research. The key features of this *community collaboration approach* include:

1. Long-term placement of participatory action health researchers in community organizations to share research, grant writing, computer, and programmatic skills and to demonstrate the value of applied research for the achievement of community health goals.
2. Identification of potential consortia partners among health and social service community organizations, universities, health care provider institutions, drug treatment agencies, governmental health programs and offices, public schools, etc.
3. Open-ended discussions among collaborating organizations to build trust and rapport, identify key issues of concern, assess alternative models of action (e.g. specific levels of social intervention), and review the value of an *applied community-based research approach* to community intervention.
4. Thorough exploration of the nature of working community intervention, form a collaboration between researchers, community services and care providers, activists, and educators.
5. Identification and review of funding mechanisms, application requirements, and plans for interorganizational participation in the grant-writing/contract seeking process.
6. Implementation of ongoing consortia steering committees (to provide policy direction for projects and initiate new projects), interorganizational project teams (to provide day-to-day project management), and specific project function meetings (to bring together workers with common job responsibilities and professional identities; e.g., all case managers or community interviewers across participating organizations).

In Hartford, we have used the community-collaboration approach to implement several different types of applied, research-based, social interventions designed to achieve reductions in HIV risk among street drug users. Examples of social intervention models that we have developed include:

- \* *Risk-Site Intervention* — (The High Risk Sites Project) Implemented through a consortium that partners two community organizations and a school of

public health, this project is designed to study drug use sites, such as abandoned buildings or apartments where drug injection and crack cocaine use are common, analyze the social networks of drug users who visit these sites, assess the potential for on-site interventions to prevent HIV transmission, and test alternative on-site and social network intervention approaches.

The project is predicated on the social intervention idea that changing health risk social environments can reduce individual risk behaviors. Work on the project, including the regular ethnographic examination of use patterns and risk behaviors at drug use sites, has revealed high levels of site and network instability and led to a focus on peer-driven sites interventions of the sort undertaken by Latkin and Broadhead. The focus of this effort is on training active drug users as prevention assistants who can regularly visit sites and share prevention information and materials across webs of social connection.

\* *Network Intervention* — (Diffusion of Benefits Project) Implemented by a consortium comprised of a school of public health, a medical humanities department, a community organization and an AIDS service organization, this project is designed to assess the diffusion of prevention materials (e.g., sterile syringes, pads for blood control following illicit injection), information (e.g. hepatitis prevention strategies), and behaviors from users of syringe exchange programs to their non-exchanging network members.

The project has recruited SEP-using index participants and their network members in three cities across the U.S., tested procedures tracking the movement of syringes from the SEP across social network relations to non-exchanges, and begun procedures for testing the dissemination of hepatitis risk reduction information and materials across drug user social networks.

\* *Neighborhood Intervention* — (Syringe Access, Use, and Discard Project) This project teams three community organizations and two schools of public health, with support from a city department of health, to implement an applied assessment of neighborhood level barriers and facilitators of access to sterile syringes and other injection equipment among illicit drug users.

The project is predicated on the social-level assumption that off-the-shelf interventions may not be easily adapted to local conditions. Ethnographic and epide-

**We have used the community-collaboration approach to implement several different types of applied, research-based, social interventions designed to achieve reductions in HIV risk among street drug users.**

miological assessment of 24 inner city neighborhoods in three northeastern cities concerning neighborhood characteristics, sources of syringes, and barriers to sterile syringe access is being used to provide policy recommendations for the implementation of locally grounded intervention models.

\* *Social Environmental Change* — (Syringe exchange project) This project, involving the collaboration of a set of community organizations, drug treatment providers, and a city health department, was designed to implement a community managed syringe exchange program and to use ongoing evaluation research to enhance program operation and efficacy in changing the social environment of risk by significantly increasing the availability of sterile syringes on the street and the removal of used and potential infected syringes from circulation.

\* *Ethnographic Intervention* — (Drug user dyad project) This community pilot project, conducted through collaboration between a community organization and a school of public health, builds on existing research showing that drug user networks can be quite fragile and shifting, while dyadic partnerships (although also fragile and often conflicted) tend to endure over longer periods and have the greatest potential for HIV and other disease transmission. Not only is the sexual risk in romantic couples quite high (because most individuals tend to avoid condom use with regular partners) but injection-related risk is quite significant as well, because syringe sharing is not only common in such relations, it often is defined as an expression of intimacy (as contrasted with syringe sharing in nonromantic relationships, in which this behavior, while necessary because of a lack of access to sterile syringes, is often viewed as distasteful among drug users).

This project is designed to use ethnographic rapport building techniques and data collection strategies to understand the nature of risk in dyadic relationships, build enduring relationships with drug-involved romantic dyads, and to implement drug treatment and risk reduction interventions at the dyadic level or, at least, with sensitivity to the emotional significance of dyadic connections.

These examples suggest the wide range of alternative social-level interventions that can be developed for HIV prevention. Conceptualization, organization and management, and process and outcome assessment of these community health initiatives are important arenas for the application of anthropology to solving pressing health problems.

## MINDING YOUR BUSINESS

By Jude Thomas May <SfAA@telepath.com>  
SfAA Business Office  
Oklahoma City, OK

“Is it true that my article is being re-published?”

The Society owns the copyright on all material that is included in our three publications (*Human Organization*, *Practicing Anthropology*, and the *SfAA Newsletter*). We often receive requests to reprint a portion of an article or a complete article in edited readers or monographs. This reprinting is carefully monitored and permission is granted only for publications which are consistent in quality and content with the SfAA journals.

The Society is paid a fee for this permission and this revenue helps to maintain the low SfAA dues structure. In 1991, for example, we generated \$2,172 in revenue from this activity and this has been increased to \$5,881 in 1998.

In the past, we notified authors in writing when a request to reprint one of their publications had been reviewed and approved. After several years, we stopped this practice because we were unable to track and locate a significant number of authors whose membership had lapsed.

We were contacted recently by a long-time member (Sara Quandt) who had learned quite coincidentally that an article she authored was to be reprinted in an edited book. She inquired about the policy of notifying authors, and without rancor or indignation, made a compelling case for a revision of the procedure back to the earlier practice of notifying authors.

Sara’s suggestion was based on several things, including the perfectly reasonable argument that reprinting history is important for younger people who must document their scholarly productivity. The efficacy of a publication can often be verified in this fashion.

The suggestion made a lot of sense. In the future, we will notify in writing those authors whose articles have been selected for republication. This notification will include information on the form and title of the new book, as well as the editors.

We welcome suggestions of this nature that might make the SfAA Office function more effectively.



## REPORT FROM THE *HO* EDITOR

By Donald D. Stull<stull@lark.cc.ukans.edu>  
University of Kansas

In the May *Newsletter*, I introduced *Human Organization's* editorial and production staff. In this one, I want to review how we handle manuscripts (MSS), to make the process a bit less mysterious to authors and to try to reduce headaches for us.

Manuscripts should be sent directly to the *HO* editorial office at the University of Kansas. (If you're not sure whether your manuscript is a "good fit" with *HO*, call (785/864-2641) or e-mail me — I'll be glad to talk it over with you.) Authors should submit six double-spaced, single-sided copies of their MS. Budget and time constraints prevent us from processing MSS unless we receive the requisite number of copies. Please do not include a disk copy at this stage — that comes later. Be sure, however, to include both an abstract and key words, since they are used to select appropriate reviewers. Within two weeks of receipt, we mail out five copies for review, retaining one for our files. Reviewers are selected for their expertise in the paper's content, geographic area, methodological, and/or theoretical orientation, using the *SfAA/NAPA Membership Directory*, the *AAA Guide to Programs*, other directories, manuscript citations, or personal knowledge.

We send out five copies, hoping for (but not expecting) five reviews. We send them "cold," which keeps down time between manuscript submission and review, costs, and demurrals of busy colleagues. We ask those who do not wish to review a MS to notify us promptly, return the manuscript, and provide names and addresses of other possible reviewers. Some do; others simply ignore us. We wish you wouldn't; we really are nice people, and journals depend on generalized reciprocity among colleagues. Remember, all those publications of yours were reviewed by someone just as busy as you.

We ask referees to return evaluations in six weeks. After about a month, we politely remind holdouts by E-mail, and we have been gratified by how effective such reminders are. When we have received all the reviews, or at least all we think we can get, we make a final decision on the MS. Reviewers may recommend that manuscripts be accepted, accepted with revisions, or rejected. Very few reviewers recommend acceptance without revision, and we have yet to publish such an article.



In reviewing manuscripts, referees are asked to comment on: 1) probable interest to readers; 2) contribution to the literature; 3) attention to relevant literature; 4) adequacy of research design and/or analysis; and 5) style and organization. We expect referees to include substantive comments on content and how the paper should be revised for publication. Most reviews are thorough and intended to help the author improve the work. Some reviews are blunt; others so abbreviated as to be of little value. Every now and then, we receive an evaluation form without accompanying explanation - such reviews may salve the reviewer's conscience, but they do neither us nor the authors any good.

We prefer four reviews before we make a final decision on a manuscript, but we will act on three. Sometimes the best we can do is two reviews, and in those cases, I act as a third reviewer. Deciding the fate of many manuscripts is relatively easy — the reviewers pretty much agree one way or the other. Even so, we read all the evaluations before coming to a final decision (sometimes "accept with revisions" really means "reject," sometimes the flaws that precipitated the "reject" are not fatal). On those MSS with mixed evaluations, not only do I read the reviewers' comments carefully, but I also read the complete manuscript before making the final decision. The decision to accept or reject is not based merely on majority rule — reviews that make strong arguments one way or the other may carry the day.

Authors are notified by mail of the final decision, and all reviews are returned. We are very careful to ensure the anonymity of referees and remove any identifying information from their critiques. Authors' identifying information is also removed from manuscripts before review, though authors often choose to signal their identity by obvious self-citation. (In preparing your manuscripts, please format your MS so your name can be easily removed before we send it out.)

In addition to referee comments, manuscripts accepted for publication receive a formal letter of acceptance and another assigning copyright to the published article. The SfAA holds the copyright to articles published in *Human Organization*, but authors have nonexclusive license to use their *HO* article without charge in any book they may write or edit, on the condition that they credit *HO*. (*HO* does not consider previously published manuscripts or those under review elsewhere.)

In revising MSS, authors should make every effort to respond to reviewers' recommendations and editorial instructions. Recommendations are not always in agreement, but authors should do their best to reconcile differences. Although not required, we ask authors to enclose a cover letter with their revised submission detailing how they responded to recommendations, or why they did not or could not make the recommended changes.

When revisions are complete, authors should submit two copies of the paper along with a disk. We use MS Word 97 for Windows 95 as our word-processing program and convert the text file to PageMaker for final layout. Authors can do their part to ensure peace and harmony, in a little piece of Kansas if not all over the world, by following a few simple guidelines.

1) Be sure to enclose all elements necessary for publication, including key words, abstract, and author's statement.

2) Keep endnotes to an absolute minimum – *HO* is not a law review. If it doesn't fit in the body of the article, chances are it isn't all that necessary. References are cited in the text, not in notes.

3) Speaking of references, make sure they are in the proper *HO* style and remove any and all "courtesy citations." It isn't hard to tell the difference between necessary citations and those thrown in as padding. And please get the citations right — make sure citations in the text appear in the references, and that year of publication is the same in both places. We spend more time correcting and cajoling proper citations out of authors than on any other aspect of copyediting. We want your paper to be both informative and accurate, as do you, but it is not our responsibility, nor do we have the staff or time, to hunt down correct citations, authors' first names (required in the *HO* format), and the like.

4) Carefully edit your own work. I copyedit each MS, and while I don't approve of intrusive copyediting, neither do I have much patience for the sloppy and excessive writing that pervades scholarly journals. The best way to ensure that what you want to say gets said is to make it as clean and as tight as you possibly can before you send it to us.

5) Make sure any tables, figures, maps, or other graphics are essential to the text and present the material in the most effective manner. Just because your word processor can turn out nifty bar graphs is no reason to use them, unless they enhance your argument and are the best way to present the data. Graphics that cannot be included on the disk in a readable format should be submitted in camera-ready copy.

Five months or so before your article is scheduled to appear in print, we put it into production. We begin by copying your disk to our hard drive and checking for incompatibilities. Next the editorial assistants check the references and query authors by E-mail to correct inconsistencies and fill in missing elements in the citations (first names, city of publication, page numbers, etc.) and elsewhere in the MS (key words, abstract, author's statement). Then I copyedit the text, contacting authors as needed. By working with authors to fill in missing information and resolve queries at this stage, we eliminate the need for ex-

tensive revisions at the galley stage.

We finish copyediting and revising the manuscripts for an issue 2.5 months before it goes to press. We then send manuscripts to our production editor, Neil Hann, in Oklahoma City. He lays out the issue and returns the galley proofs to us in 2-3 weeks. During this time, we alert authors to expect their galleys soon and ask for a current mailing address. Upon receipt of the galleys, we lightly

**I want to review how we handle manuscripts, to make the process a bit less mysterious to authors and to try to reduce headaches for us.**

proof them, paying special attention to titles, headings, graphics, and references. Corrections are noted, and galleys are sent to authors with instructions for their review and date of return (usually 4-5 days). Although we proof the galleys simultaneously with the authors, it is their responsibility to read their article carefully and notify us of necessary corrections.

This is the first time the authors see their MS in print — it looks different, and very often they want to make substantive changes or "correct" our editorial revisions. We willingly incorporate corrections that stem from our errors, but at this stage we cannot make substantial changes just because the author wants to reword the original. Once the galleys come back to us, we make final corrections and send them back to Neil for final revision. A month or so later, the issue is in the mail. *HO* does not provide off-prints of articles. Authors receive an extra copy of the journal to be used to photocopy their article.

I hope you now have a better sense of the life and times of an *HO* manuscript. Instructions for submitting your manuscript appear on the inside back cover of each issue. Detailed guidelines will appear in the upcoming Fall 1999 issue.

## REPORT FROM THE *PA* EDITOR

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

**B**usiness and industrial anthropology has been getting much attention lately. That benefits us all especially when making arguments to deans about anthropology's vitality. Yet, few overviews and case studies have been readily made available to those of us on the periphery of the subject. A special issue of *PA* (Fall 1999) titled, "Anthropologists and Globalization of Business Organizations" and guest edited by Tomoko Hamada, should

go a very long way in filling this gap. The issue is quite suitable as classroom material. As a one-time dispensation, I have allowed the articles to be approximately double the normal length for *PA*, since the case studies are so illustrative of what business anthropologists contribute.

Tomoko Hamada's introductory essay provides a succinct introduction to the field, outlining the skills and perspectives that ethnographers use to help solve organizational problems. As well, she gives a valuable working bibliography for beginners. The first case study is by Richard Reeves-Ellington. It concerns his consulting work with a Bulgarian factory that produces hand-woven rugs in the Ottoman tradition. During the communist era, high levels of production were created through subsidies and state handling of international marketing. With the collapse of communism, the factory was privatized and downsized to a fragment of its workforce. It was left on its own in marketing and experienced many difficulties. In participatory style, Reeves-Ellington guided the workers and managers through an examination of their own value system concerning Bulgarian culture and the specific work context. They also looked at how cultural misunderstanding has led to dissonance and problems marketing with British and American agents. The hope is that such self-knowledge and a newly constructed value system will lead to an improvement in the firm's efficiency.

Ann Jordan contributes an ethnographic approach to multidisciplinary research on self-managed work teams in a variety of American firms. She suggests ways to increase the efficiency and morale of such innovative approaches to work. Nancy Rossenberger explores the working subcultures of firms in Korea and Japan, relating the aspirations and frustrations of women at various levels — factory workers, secretaries, professionals, and managers. Hendrick Serrie has had many years of researching Chinese culture in Taiwan and the PRC. He analyzes the situation of multinational (especially American) companies working in China. He suggests a set of principles for more cooperative management, considering core differences in American and Chinese values as they pertain to organizational contexts.

Mary Yoko Brannen and Mark Fruin introduce and explicate the concept of cultural alienation in work situations. Tracing the generic notion of alienation through Marx and Durkheim, they show its relevance in contemporary work and then take it a step forward. The trend is now toward multicultural, face-to-face contacts within multinational corporations. They illustrate the phenomenon through the direct foreign investment takeovers of firms in the U.S. where middle-managers and other workers are displaced or their functions truncated by new Japanese and Korean administrators. Brannen and Fruin contend that cultural alienation at the workplace is certain to become much more common. It probably will become a major di-

mension of globalization and the 21st Century. Implicitly, the message is that there could be plenty of work for anthropologists helping to understand and rectify cultural alienation at work settings.

Volume 21(4) will also have a full-range of departments — the “Real World,” “International Voices,” “Book Reviews,” “Sources,” as well as the annual subject, author, and title index. Book reviews are on the topics of Arctic whaling, conservation projects with indigenous peoples, and domestic abuse in Bangladesh. Alain Anciaux, our international voices editor, provides us with a fascinating theoretical construct that helps to explain the successes and failure of applied projects. Rob Winthrop, through his column, shows some serious differences between academic conceptualizations and the real world concerns of applied anthropologists.

I should warn potential contributors to *PA* that we have been swamped with submissions. Five theme issues, and one editor's choice issue, have already been planned through the middle of 2001. We have accepted more than a dozen individually submitted articles, and I will try to insert them all during 2000. I have to stop considering any more theme issues until the spring of 2000. This is in an effort to keep the journal timely. Individually submitted papers will be considered but authors have to realize that the queue is getting longer. There is some slight flexibility available for the expansion of the Commentary Department — small pieces of around six double-spaced pages focused on topics of significant controversy in applied anthropology.

The addresses and telephone numbers for the editorial office of *Practicing Anthropology* remain: Department of Anthropology and Archaeology, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, S7N 5A5, Canada; the office phone is (306) 966-4176; my home phone is (306) 343-9140; the departmental Fax is (306) 966-5640.



## LPO NEWS

By Carla Littlefield <[clittlef@compuserve.com](mailto:clittlef@compuserve.com)>  
Littlefield Associates  
Denver, Colorado

Have you thought of organizing a local practitioner organization (LPO)? SfAA gets an occasional request for assistance from an individual in an area where no practitioner organization currently exists. The inquiry is usually a request for information about how to get an

organization going or a request for confirmation that there is no active practitioner group in the area. The SfAA Liaison tries to maintain contact with active LPOs throughout the country, but may not be aware of newer groups. The following is some general information about the topic.

Usually a core of enthusiastic anthropologists come together to discuss the direction they want to take. At the initial meeting, certain tasks may be assigned with a follow-up meeting scheduled to discuss progress. Meetings may be conducted in members' homes, on a college campus, or any place where space is available. A planned agenda helps assure that important business is conducted. An early agenda item could be the election of officers or leaders with specific tasks. To facilitate operations, the group may want to develop bylaws and take other steps toward establishing a nonprofit organization with a sense of permanence.

Publicity is critical if the intent is to enlarge the group beyond the original core and ensure its viability. SfAA can assist with this function in two ways. First, through this column, LPOs can publicize their meetings and contact points, e.g., e-mail and phone numbers. Second, SfAA can provide mailing labels of SfAA members living in the area. An emerging LPO can use the mailing labels to publicize the launching of a new organization. The survey conducted in Spring 1999 indicated that some LPOs have fewer than 20 persons. Remember that size is not a criteria for a successful organization!

If you live in the San Francisco Bay Area and want to start an LPO, Robin Beers wants to hear from you. Her e-mail address is <rroucat@aol.com>. Robin is a doctoral candidate in Organizational Psychology. She and Suzanne Gibbs are ready to pull together a group.

To submit information for the LPO News column or communicate about LPO issues, please contact SfAA-LPO Liaison, Carla Littlefield at the e-mail address above.

## TIG FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

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

Old news is good news: Our previous column announced the new transitions that resulted from the Spring SfAA meetings. Significantly, Anthony McAnn (University of Limerick) will organize a new website and take the helm at the listserv. Please send your name, address and interests in IPR to Anthony so he can add you to the list.

The Native American Art Studies Association will hold a panel on "Indigenous Arts and the Politics of Posses-

sion" at the 1999 meetings in Victoria, B.C., October 14-16 (see last *Newsletter*). Scholarships are available through the Allan Houser Scholarship Fund for Native American students. Contact Colleen Cutschall, Native Art Studies, Brandon University, at her e-mail <sisterwolf@techplus.com> for further information.

Summers tend to be pretty quiet in academia, but policymakers never break. I garnered this from personal experience and working 16 hours a day for four days at the Smithsonian's Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage. They had sponsored a UNESCO conference of interest to the IPR group entitled *A Global Assessment of the 1989 Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore: Local Empowerment and International Cooperation*.

As Rapporteur for the Legal Working Group, I reported on the findings of our groups' efforts for a Draft Action Plan that will be considered for future incorporation into the international documents. These include the development of legal and administrative instruments for protecting traditional communities and their cultural creations from poverty, exploitation and marginalization. The overarching theme of the conference addressed "Intangible Cultural Heritage in relation to natural and tangible cultural heritage, and its role in resolving local and national problems related to today's major issues, sustainable human development, globalization, peaceful co-existence of different ethnic groups, conflict prevention, youth cultures, evolution of new technologies in communication and information, environmental deterioration, etc." These are some all-encompassing topics, but necessarily tackled in tandem.

For further information on the UNESCO conference participants, topics and proceedings, please contact Dr. Anthony Seeger at the Center for Folklife Programs and Cultural Studies at: <info@folklife.si.edu>. I look forward to getting more news from you. Send conference announcements, publication announcements and greetings to Anthony McAnn at the listserv or to me at the above e-mail.

## CLASSICS OF PRACTICING ANTHROPOLOGY: 1978-1998

Edited by Patricia J. Higgins and J. Anthony Paredes. Published by the Society for Applied Anthropology. (price still pending). Available Fall 1999

This volume brings together thirty-nine of the best articles published during the first twenty years of *Practicing Anthropology*. Most of them first appeared in the now fast-disappearing newsprint volumes of the magazine. Each is preceded here by a brief introductory statement

setting the article into historical and disciplinary context and is accompanied with an updated biographical note on the author(s). An introductory essay by the coeditors places the collection into historical and professional perspective. The works are framed with a forward written by John A. Young, SfAA President, 1997-99, and an afterword by Linda A. Bennett, SfAA President, 1999-2001.

All four fields of anthropology are represented, and there are examples of research or projects from every continent except Australia and Antarctica. Topical areas of coverage include history, methods, ethics, career development, health, medical services, education, economic development, international/intercultural exchange, natural resources, cultural resources management, business, legal practice, government employment, media relations, and citizen action groups.

The collection is organized by chronological order of publication, but includes a key to articles by topics, sub-fields, and geographic areas covered as well. The editorial advisory board was comprised of sixteen distinguished applied anthropologists, including several past officers and editors for the Society for Applied Anthropology. Place orders with the Business Office, Society for Applied Anthropology, P.O. Box 24083, Oklahoma City, OK 73124. Discounts will be extended to SfAA members and for classroom adoptions.

More details will be coming by mail and be sure to see information on the SfAA webpage. Look for an upcoming advertisement in the newsletter of the American Anthropological Association.

## **SfAA ENVIRONMENTAL ANTHRO- POLOGY PROJECT UPDATE**

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

**T**he SfAA is pleased to announce a series of cost sharing projects with the US. Environmental Protection Agency. These projects began August 1, 1999, and extend for three to six months. Project updates and reports are posted on the SfAA webpage. Project findings will be presented at the SfAA annual meeting in San Francisco, next April.

Environmental Anthropology Fellowships have been awarded to:

- John D. Wingard (“Community Dynamics of Source Water Protection”) to collect information on the dynamics of and constraints to the development of a regional source water protection plan (SWP) for the Memphis metropolitan area.

- Kreg Ettenger (“Community Dynamics of Source Water Protection on Native American Lands”) for technical assistance to the Haudenosaunee (Iroquois) Confederacy of New York State, to assist the efforts of the Haudenosaunee Environmental Task Force in improving source water protection efforts of the Haudenosaunee communities located in New York State.

- Aaron Scrol (“Community Dynamics of Source Water Protection on Native American Lands”) for technical assistance to the Lower Elwaha Klallam Tribe’s as they explore how questions regarding the status of Tribal lands may effect the ability of local tribal communities to adopt Source Water Assessment and Protection programs.

- Katherine Metzger (“Region 5 Sociocultural Profiling Project”) to work with the City of Bloomington, Planning Department, Indiana developing a sociocultural profile of the metropolitan area.

- Eve Pinsker and Kate Gillogly (“Region 5 Sociocultural Profiling Project”) to develop a sociocultural profiles in support of environmental planning and problems solving processes in the metropolitan area of Chicago, Illinois.

- John V. Stone (“Region 5 Sociocultural Profiling Project”) to work with the Great Lakes Commission to develop a sociocultural profiling system applicable to the GLC’s planning activities in the Great Lakes Basin ecosystem.

- Frank Lucido (“Columbia Plateau Agricultural Initiative (CPAI): Agricultural Issues and Framing Practices”) to work with farmers and farm workers in the Columbia Plateau of Eastern Washington concerning pesticide use and awareness of best farming practices.

- Monica Hunter (“Sociocultural Dynamics of Environmental Management: An Ethnographic Case Study of Grassroots Participation in the National Estuary Project at Morro Bay, California”) internship awarded to work with Friends of the Estuary in support of volunteer efforts to monitor, educate and support estuary management.

There are two additional projects in the works: “Environmental Anthropology Fellowship Research Exploring the Role of Religious Groups in Superfund Site Identification, Assessment, and Remediation.” A Preliminary proposal was developed and submitted to EPA’s Superfund Community Outreach Program in February 1999. Applications were solicited and reviewed by the SfAA, EPA and outside reviewers. The SfAA is currently awaiting final project approval. This project is expected to begin this fall.

“Spiritual and cultural values as driving forces in wetland protection on Native American lands” is the theme to an Environmental Anthropology fellowship that is currently being negotiated as a cost-sharing project with EPA’s Wetlands Division of the Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds. This project involves working with a tribe or group of tribes to document successes and problematic factors associated with developing and implementing cul-

turally-appropriate wetland resource management regimes. Fellowship work will take place with a Native American tribe or group of tribes proposed by the applicant in a detailed application proposal. Application requirements include project review and endorsement by a Native American group, tribe, or organization representing a group of tribes. Preference will be given to those applications which propose work in the general region where the applicant lives or has extensive field work experience. Anticipated application period: October 15 announcement, November 15 application deadline, January 1 start date. A call for applications will be posted on the SfAA environmental anthropology webpage. If you would like to receive application information, send me an e-mail (address above).

Additional information on the fellowship program, including previous projects, and updates and reports from current projects are posted on the SfAA Environmental Anthro Project web page <<http://www.telepath.com/SfAA/eap/abouteap.html>>. New and prospective fellows should review the EPA website (<http://www.epa.gov>) for additional information on projects, problems and issues in EPA; and, community-based environmental protection programs and tools (<http://www.epa.gov/ecocommunity>).

## WORLD BANK AND THE PUBLIC COMMENTARY PROCESS

By Theodore E. Downing <[downing@opus1.com](mailto:downing@opus1.com)>  
University of Arizona

As previously reported in this *Newsletter*, in 1998 the SfAA International Standards Committee and Development Policy Kiosk <[www.policykiosk.com](http://www.policykiosk.com)> completed a detailed examination of proposed conversion (revision?) of the World Bank Groups international standards for the rights of people who are involuntarily displaced by development projects to be called “Operational Policy 4.12” along with its associated policies. Society members, including Thayer Scudder (winner of the 1999 Malinowski Award), found in need of substantial improvement. In June 1998, a delegation from the Society met with the World Bank resettlement group and the Executive Directors of the Board of Directors of the World Bank and expressed a number of concerns. (For details, see the Kiosk, project 98A). Following this public commentary, the Bank staff produced a number of other revised drafts, all of which previously were kept secret from the public.

Without advanced warning, in July of this year the Bank released a revised policy for a 60-day public commentary period (closing 10 September 1999). The “converted” policies, as the Bank staff likes to call them, define the human rights of groups in the way of development and other governments. Most US citizens are unaware that

US government agencies, such as OPIC (the Overseas Private Investment Organization) have uncritically accepted them as their de facto standard — whatever their content. Other international development agencies and groups have also accepted the Bank standards as their standards. Why would this happen?

The cross-references of social and environmental policy is part of a process called “policy harmonization” — in which those who must mobilize capital seek to accelerate the movement of capital by simplifying and unifying the diverse environmental regulations. It is common for lenders to “syndicate” loans, meaning that multiple lenders hedge risks by combining with other lenders. Under such conditions, the syndicate must face the possibility that a minority partner’s environmental regulations may become the *de facto* standard for the investment. International standards, such as this one on involuntary resettlement, provide an important step toward resolving this problem. They represent a double-edge sword. Without proper social science attention to the policy language, these may become the “maximal” rights of a group being confronted with displacement. With careful attention, rights and obligations of lenders and borrowers to those effected can be defined.

If issues are left out, such as health impacts, then it becomes much more difficult to struggle for equity. As I have repeatedly argued, international standards are, in brief, *international human rights documents*. Given the extensive impact that they have on millions of powerless peoples throughout the world, it is worth your attention to review the proposed rules and make a comment to the Bank before the September deadline. And, above all, don’t forget to post a copy of your comments on the International Standards Committee to me at the address above.

As we witnessed last year, the public posting increases the visibility of your comment and the likelihood of a response from the Bank.

## THEORY AND PRACTICE IN ANTHROPOLOGY

By David Turkon <[bakoena@imap2.asu.edu](mailto:bakoena@imap2.asu.edu)>  
Arizona State University

John Young’s depiction of anthropology in his February column is indicative of a conceptual divide that plagues the discipline and hinders our ability, to shape debates and influence policy, at broad levels. He equates applied anthropology with anthropology of “the streets, the workplace, and the boardroom, legislative chambers and arenas of public discussion.” Studies of globalization lead to “stylish narratives about everything that is wrong with the world” that speak among themselves rather than doing anything constructive.

Anthropologists who study globalization may indeed be practicing applied anthropologists. There is a reciprocal relationship between theory and practice. One need only consider the social Darwinist theories that provided rational foundations for colonialism and fascism. Such theories and the rationales that they embody do not die easily, as is evidenced by the survival of apartheid into 1994, the genocidal wars in Rwanda, and ethnic cleansing in Kosovo.

Unfortunately, among social scientists, anthropologists seem to be the least likely to grapple with the connection between theory and practice in order to influence what is consciously done in the world. Indeed, we seem not to have a theoretical foundation. We commonly refer to our theoretical base as “eclectic,” as though we have a menu of theoretical stuff to choose from depending upon the problem we are addressing.

This lack of epistemic grounding leads us into relativistic, thick descriptions of practice and the archaeology of knowledge. This situation is rather debilitating in terms of theory, building and lending authority to our collective voices. Without such authority, we cannot hope to be taken seriously by those who formulate and enforce the policies that affect the lives of the people we concern ourselves with. To move anthropology out of the postmodern genres of cultural critique and literary studies, and have our perspectives taken seriously, we need to be more theoretically rigorous by situating our approaches within the mainstream of epistemic development.

Epistemic approaches have fallen out of fashion because they fall into genre of grand or recta-narratives, which are seen as privileging the rational foundations of Western thought. Such approaches need not privilege one perspective, however. Indeed, they can provide frameworks for understanding both the positive and negative aspects of capitalist modernization on a global scale. Rationality can be turned on itself in order to scrutinize the reasoning behind ideologies, the decisions and actions that they justify, and the real or potential consequences of those decisions and actions. By combining empirical research, historical analysis, and micro- and macro-perspectives we can build theories of contemporary social formations. Methodologically, this places the reciprocal relationship between theory and practice at the forefront of research, and thus take on applied value.

At least since Wittgenstein, mainstream philosophy has been turning away from the study of consciousness. The focus has shifted to a philosophy of meaning, communication, and identity. Spinning out of the linguistic turn in philosophy are postmodern thick descriptions of cultural plurality and reflexive, cultural critiques. For others, however, the turn represents a shift in focus to the study of the interplay between communication and action. Here, the focus is on understanding and building upon discourse that proceeds from the standpoint that rational agreement is pos-

sible among parties that disagree on a given issue or course of action. In this vein, cultural pluralism represents not relativistic, incommensurable points of view, but different voices discussing the reasoning behind competing views.

Here we can clearly see the effect of theory on practice. The philosophical shift to communication compels us not to concern ourselves so much with representing people or figuring out what is in their best interest. Indeed, this was the failed rationale behind the liberalism of colonialism and imperialism. Rather, the turn to communication leads us toward drawing disempowered voices into the debates that affect their lives.

During my fieldwork I found throughout rural Lesotho a frustrated population that was mostly impoverished, did not trust its government, and suffered from a pathological distrust among neighbors. Indeed, nearly everyone I interviewed said that neighborly relations were today dominated by hatred (*hloa*).

During the colonial era in Lesotho, a culture of politics was cultivated that endowed senior members of the Bakoena clan with the right to rule, and labeled the bulk of the citizenry “commoners.” This political culture privileged government as an asset to be controlled and exploited, rather than as a venue for popular democracy and civil society. As in so many other settings, the cleavages stemming from the inequalities structured during the colonial era in Lesotho have come to encompass agents of the central government pitted against the citizenry. This translates into a class issue, as government officials use force to silence popular social movements that threaten their hold on the perquisites associated with political office.

Class consciousness has manifest in many ways in Lesotho, but is commonly repressed by the government. For example, the Lesotho Highlands Water Project (LHWP) is a multi-billion dollar joint venture with South Africa, and with funding from the World Bank and the European Community. Five dams in Lesotho’s mountain watersheds capture water for South African industrial use. Lesotho receives payments for the water and will realize self-sufficiency in electricity. But few Basotho have access to electricity, some 20,000 civilians will be relocated, the loss of arable and grazing lands impinges upon the livelihoods of rural citizens, and revenues from the project are commonly used for political gain.

Basotho are powerless to confront such disparities. Laborers working on LHWP have periodically protested over poor wages and racist practices by foreign managers. In 1997 soldiers used tear gas to evacuate strikers at a workers’ camp, and then opened fire killing two. Several detainees were severely beaten. In 1998 the



government again used force to end a strike at a textile manufacturer outside Maseru, resulting in one death and forty-five injuries. Riots once again erupted in many parts of Lesotho. In the aftermath the company replaced its 3,000 employees. The flint that the international community largely regards the internal affairs of states as private empowers politicians to effectively mute these organic expressions of class consciousness and solidarity.

Lack of economic opportunity, unequal access to jobs and development programs, and disparities in wealth frame the greatest sources of resentment and suspicion among the citizenry of Lesotho. Paradoxically, according to the World Economic Forum and the Harvard Institute for International Development, in 1997 Lesotho was among the top ten African nations in terms of economic growth and control of income levels, thus making it a desirable place to do business. Such statistics make large-scale systems appear as autonomously functioning entities rather than outgrowths of human action, and obfuscate anemic conditions that stem from the policies they endorse. They also drive home the point that structural readjustment and many development schemes often have the effect of establishing reserves for sweat-shop industries seeking cheap, subservient labor, rather than improving the lives of citizens.

Clearly, citizens of Lesotho do not constitute commoners who are in a democratic relationship with politicians or chiefs. More appropriately, Lesotho's citizenry constitutes a subaltern that is manipulated to subservient status by those in control of state apparatuses. Studies of social pluralism favored in postmodern approaches obscures struggles such as those revolving around class issues.

It is not surprising then that conceptions of class have been devalued and significantly downplayed in anthropological discourse. If we recognize, however, that theories guide actions, then we must also recognize that the postmodern turn has, to a large degree, been an accomplice in the muting of class issues. Where such issues remain viable, we can only reinvigorate them by analyzing the ways that the internationalization of politics, economics, science, and technology, privileges social constructions relevant to post-industrial nations, and how this in turn influences the economic, organizational and political possibilities for local cultures around the globe.

Only by confronting social realities and their theoretical rationales in critical light can we effect narratives that challenge hegemonic practices and draw subaltern into development and political discourse and practice, thus democratizing the spheres for building theory and acting upon it. Because of their close connection with the implementation and outcome of development projects, applied anthropologists are in the positions to unmask the false impersonalities and internal contradictions that are inherent to dominant political and economic ideologies and the practices that stem from them. This means linking the micro-

level realities that we encounter and seek to improve with the macro-level forces that help to shape and maintain them, including social theory.

In order to invigorate the role of anthropology in policy and planning, we need to retreat from relativistic approaches that fissure power and domination into multiple institutions, practices and discourse, and engage in broader social, economic and political analysis. Without theoretically grounded understandings and critiques of the processes at hand, problems will remain unarticulated, without definition, and their muses contestable. Moreover, applied and theoretical anthropologists will continue to talk past each other rather than working toward constructive ends. Applied anthropologists should not devalue theories of globalization. To the contrary, they should be active participants in keeping them honest.

## NEWS FROM THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANTHROPOLOGY TIG

By John R. Stepp <rstepp@uga.edu>  
University of Georgia

The meetings in Tucson this year contained a record number of over 21 sessions with well over 100 papers on themes related to ecological/environmental anthropology. During the business meeting we made plans to continue this trend by actively fostering and organizing sessions for the meetings next year in San Francisco. The TIG is sponsoring a session on student research in environmental anthropology chaired by Becky Zarger <bzarger@uga.edu>.

If you are a student and would like to submit a paper for this session, please contact her. A panel session chaired by Ben Blount <bblount@uga.edu> was particularly successful in Tucson, and there are plans to follow a similar format next year. If you are interested in organizing a session or presenting a paper on environmental themes and would like the TIG to "sponsor" it, please contact me at the address above and I will help to locate papers with similar topics or pass your name along to a session chairperson.

You can also post a message on "Ambientnet," the TIG listserv that is managed by our coordinating chair, Tim Wallace. Information on joining is available at the TIG website. In March, the TIG launched an electronic newsletter entitled Human Environments. Currently we're publishing twice a year but hope to increase this to quarterly soon. The next edition of the newsletter will be available in October. The newsletter is also archived at our web site <[http://guallart.dac.uga.edu/EA\\_TIG](http://guallart.dac.uga.edu/EA_TIG)>.

## CALL FOR SESSION ORGANIZERS

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

For the SfAA annual meetings in 2000, I would like to hear from people who could organize sessions in the following areas, or who could suggest names of people to contact about doing so. As with all sessions at these meetings, organizers are encouraged to include at least a brief retrospective/ historical component and also a brief plan/“wish list” for where applied anthropology can go with that field in the future. Please e-mail me (ASAP) at the above address.

- 1)“Teens in Trouble” (titles can be changed): cultural and other analysis of situation of teens in America, and reports on applied projects or policy campaigns that address problems of teens.
- 2)“Main streaming Applied Anthropology: The Mismatch Between Anthropology Students and Their Training”: Why do so many large Ph.D./MA anthropology programs either ignore applied anthropology or discourage students from pursuing it, especially given that over 50% of new graduates follow this career path? What are solutions to this mismatch that have worked, or potential solutions that could turn the situation around?
- 3)“Aging in Communities”: applied anthropology of aging in the U.S. and especially of the newly evolving residential options, retirement homes/communities. Is anybody out there doing ethnography on this? Or working in an administrative/program design capacity in these settings?
- 4)“Applied Social Scientists in International Development”: UN/World Bank and other large scale development entities are employing more and more social scientists as time goes on. This session would include a retrospective look at these involvements: rewards and pitfalls (and a “wish list” for the future of this association).
- 5)“NGO/Business Partnerships”: analysis of NGOs that partner with big business to accomplish development goals. Again, a look at benefits and pitfalls.
- 6)“Media Advocacy and Applied Anthropology”: skills and experiences of social scientists who have gotten involved in this kind of advocacy work.
- 7)“Toxic Cleanups”: where have we been, where are we going? (may be partly covered in a session on the cultural epidemiology of disasters).

Thank you. I look forward to hearing from you.

## KUSHNER AND DOUGHTY FETTED IN TUCSON

By Linda Whiteford <lindaw@chuma1.cas.usf.edu>  
University of South Florida

Alan Burns <afburns@anthro.ufl.edu>  
University of Florida

The 1999 Tucson SfAA meeting was the setting for the celebration of “Anthropology United in Florida” (AUF,) marked by a reception hosted by UF/USF/FIU/FSU/MU. Students, faculty, alumni, and friends shared in the festivities centered on toasts and good wishes for two major figures in applied anthropology: Gil Kushner from the University of South Florida and Paul Doughty from the University of Florida as they marked their retirements.

Both Paul and Gil have long been dedicated to the development of applied anthropology in Florida, although their institutions were not always in agreement how to best achieve that goal. Applied anthropologists both within and outside of Florida have benefited from their many contributions to the field and, to paraphrase an old Spanish saying, we wish Gil and Rainey, and Paul and Polly, “¡Pese-tas, salud, amor y tiempo para gozarlos!” (or “Money, health, love and the time to enjoy them!”)

## QUALITY CONTROLS? ANTHROPOLOGY, PEDAGOGY AND HIGHER EDUCATION

*National Programme for Teaching and Learning Anthropology, 1995-9 and Beyond. University College London, Friday 12 November-Saturday 13 November 1999*

The conference is the culmination of the three-year, discipline-specific educational development program of the UK’s National Network for Teaching and Learning Anthropology.

The educational development program is characterized by three main features:

- (1) it involves a consortium of all anthropology departments in the UK;
- (2) it takes a discipline-specific and ‘scholarship’ approach to teaching and learning;
- (3) it has formulated a devolved, department-based approach to educational development and a horizontal strategy for transferring results between departments.

The aims of the conference are threefold:

- (1) to reflect on the work of the National Network over the past three years, to review the program’s original inten-

tions, and consider what conclusions can be drawn about discipline-specific educational development; (2) to provide “hands-on” demonstrations of practical developments in teaching and learning anthropology; and (3) to examine changes in the policy and institutional contexts of Higher Education and to explore how anthropological approaches can be used to analyze their impact on teaching and learning practice.

Speakers include: Marilyn Strathern, Tony Becher, John Gledhill, Cris Shore, Stuart Thompson, Allen Abramson, David Mills, Sue Wright.

Workshop topics include: New forms of student writing (diaries, logs, records of study), Phyllis Creme Problem Based Learning in Anthropology, Pat Owens Teaching Environmental Anthropology, Eeva Berglund Teaching Organizational Ethnography for Work Based Placements, David Gellner.

For registration forms and information on costs, please contact: Conference Organizer, Caroline White, 27 Gladwell Road, London, N8 9AA, UK, Telephone: (0181)348-6169, Fax (0181)292-4940, E-mail <CWhiteN8@aol.com>.

## **SPECIAL CALL FOR FILMS AND VIDEOS**

Anyone interested in submitting films/videos for screening at the March 2000 SfAA meetings in San Francisco should contact Kathie Zaretsky not later than September 30. Possibilities include (but are not limited to) films on topics of interest to applied anthropologists, films used by applied anthropologists in their work, and educational films that anthropologists have worked on. Kathie can be reached at the Department of Anthropology, San Jose State University, San Jose, CA 95192-0113. Office telephone: (408) 924-5712, e-mail: <zaretsky@email.sjsu.edu>.

## **GLOBAL AND LOCAL HISTORIES: APPLIED ANTHROPOLOGY ACROSS THE CENTURES**

**The Society for Applied Anthropology \* 2000 Annual Meeting \* March 21 - 26  
Cathedral Hill Hotel \* San Francisco, California**

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.

Abstracts due October 15, 1999. See insert for details.

## **STUDENT COLUMN: A PROFILE**

By Carla Guerron\_Montero <yachac@hotmail.com>  
University of Oregon

As part of the "auction" held at the 1998 SfAA meeting in Puerto, the Student Committee offered to write a profile of one of the members. Mathew J. Edwards is its first recipient. Mathew completed his undergraduate degree from North Carolina State University in December of 1996 with a B.A. in Multidisciplinary Studies. In 1997, he began his Masters' program at the University of Memphis and is currently writing his thesis on the gambling industry in Tunica, Mississippi. Upon completion, Mathew plans to continue his studies at the Ph.D. level.

Mathew is fluent in Spanish and has this to say about his background: "As an undergraduate, I had extensive travel experience in Latin America including a six-month stay in Colombia and ethnographic field research on tourism and crime in Costa Rica with the NCSU field school program." During the 1999 SfAA Meetings in Tucson, Mathew presented a paper on the relationships of gambling and the development of primary care. He also organized a session on student roles in community development.

Mathew has worked with the lab crew from the "Tierra Dentro Archaeological Project" in Colombia in 1995. He has also done contract work with "NC Can Do," which is a rural town revitalization program in eastern North Carolina. In Memphis Matt has working for the "Lower Mississippi Delta Development Center" – focusing on the growth of tourism. At the moment Matt is working at Chucalissa Museum, a Native American/Archaeological museum "as the point man for community outreach and development programs." Mathew works in general marketing and networking activities, as well as grant writing for the museum. Matthew considers this "a pretty good compliment to my specialization – tourism as a form of community development – it also meshes nicely with my outside interests in archaeology."

In June 1998 Matt married Glenda Carson. He loves to dance to tropical music, particularly salsa and meren-

gue. In addition, he notes: “I am a third generation Eagle Scout, and enjoy whitewater canoing and restoration, and customization of antique and classic automobiles. I think also by my area of study it is probably obvious that I am an avid traveler, with most of Latin America and a bit of Europe under my belt.” These are some of the most pertinent experiences of Mathew Edwards, an anthropologist and traveler at heart.

## FROM THE EDITOR

For a couple of weeks, beginning in mid-July, I periodically wind up holding my breath for long periods of time. Before you wonder if this is training related to snorkeling, it’s not. It’s actually tied into gentle spurts of anxiety associated with whether we’ll have enough material to justify putting out the August issue of the *Newsletter*. Unlike the other two publications affiliated with the SfAA, we almost never have a backlog of materials. Indeed, one of Van Kemper’s most important accomplishments during his recent stint as *HO* editor was to work his way through the clog of manuscripts waiting in a queue. Using a combination of magical incantations, smaller fonts, and longer issues, the turn-around time from initial receipt of a manuscript to publication was more than cut in half — a process that current editor Donald Stull (see his column in this issue of the *Newsletter*) plans to continue. All

of this can still entail a wait of up to a year and a half, but the process is much better than it used to be. In contrast, as I’ve often reported during the annual Business Meeting, the amount of time you wait to see a submission to the *Newsletter* appear in print is not much longer than waiting for a pizza to be delivered, or perhaps to be more accurate, the process coincides incredibly nicely (almost mystically) with the gestation time of a gerbil.

Once again, my fears of sending out a memo-thin issue of the *Newsletter* were unjustified. In fact, quite to the contrary, this is a relatively hefty number. As usual, we bring you a combination of information ranging from the lead-in “President’s Letter,” to columns from a stable of regular contributors, to notices about forthcoming meetings — no job announcements this time though. Increasingly we’ve been getting short article-like contributions, designed to peek curiosity, generate discussion, and the like. We have several in this issue, and I would like to see more of these items. I would also like members to send me short announcements that may be folded in with similar blurbs — perhaps in this column. To wit, I would like to pass along the following: Past President Will Sibley has been elected President of WAPA for 1999-2000 and was also elected to a three-year term on the newly-formed Public Policy Committee of the AAA. Congratulations, Willis. Please send me information along these lines.

Our next issue of the *Newsletter* will appear sometime in November and the deadline for receipt of materials will be October 25th. I look forward to hearing from you.

*Mike Whiteford* <jefe@iastate.edu>