Expanding the Influence of Applied Social Science is the theme of the Seattle meetings. Why is this important? Answers to that are practical, ideological, and even personal. Practical reasons for expanding the influence of applied work results in more economic opportunities for social scientists: more contracts and grants, more students in classes, more jobs in different institutions and countries, and more recognition that what applied social scientists do is valuable. Backing up these practical concerns are the values attached to applied work: applied social scientists take the responsibility of interventions, evaluations, and policy work as positive and needed. This responsibility is welcomed. Applied social scientists are policy makers, designers of programs, and evaluators who expect that their recommendations will be constructive. Some of the decisions turn out to be wrong, some of the solutions do not actually solve much, and some of the recommendations fall flat. Engineers have always had the ideology that problems are there to be solved, and the more puzzling a problem, the more interesting the solution. Applied social scientists are likewise attracted to solving problems rather than avoiding them.

The Arizona law regarding immigration (SB 1070) is a good case in point. As individuals and as members of the society, many of us are against the anti-immigrant implications of the law. One glaring effect is to dramatically change the role of police from an occupation concerned with keeping the peace to immigration agents. This has resulted in schisms within the sheriff and police forces throughout the State of Arizona. So what can we do? How can SfAA solve this problem? One way SfAA is engaged in problem solving is through writing an application for a Humanities Grant in the State of Washington so that we can hold a series of town meetings during the meetings next spring in different communities of the state to discuss migration and immigration from an applied perspective. In other words, our responsibility and ideology includes using the meetings as a springboard to move the partisan and regional debate about Arizona law SB 1070 to reflections and recommendations of our members. We have the good fortune of co-sponsoring a session with the School of American Research developed by David Griffith on migration and guest worker programs around the world. Another way SfAA can be useful is to provide a roadmap for other scientific, disciplinary, and academic associations so that they can move from a position of outrage or protest to action. Tom May and I are working on a strategy piece for other organizations who want to harness the wisdom of members and the structure of their organizations to move from outrage and protest to action when similar policy issues appear. The core of our thinking is to develop a clear way to transform issues of policy or concern into something that a society or association can use, amplify, and bring to a wide audience through the mechanisms of meetings, communication, and reflection.
practitioners of anthropology outside of academia have career paths that are not easy for university-employed social scientists to recognize and evaluate. SfAA has an obligation to “identify, promote, and strengthen such professional

A third reason for expanding the influence of applied social science is personal. Whenever people talk about our meetings, they are described as friendly and providing community solidarity among members. Meetings are like rituals of intensification where positive values are emphasized and celebrated. So perhaps SfAA provides members with an addition to the quality of their life. It would be presumptuous to say that “the good life” includes membership in SfAA. But it is worth noting here that this is one of the strategic values of the Society.

The occupation of “Anthropologist” should be promoted as a satisfying, rewarding and important professional role whether as an independent consultant, an employee of public agencies, corporations, nonprofit organizations, or as a university faculty member or administrator. Successful professional roles and identities must be identified, promoted and strengthened. (http://www.sfaa.net/sfaagoal.html)

Today I read in our local paper that an undergraduate anthropology major that went into law enforcement, Atkins Warren, had died. He came to Gainesville to be chief of police from St. Louis 30 years ago and after four years was tapped to work in the US Department of Justice for the rest of his career. His remarkable career included solving real-time violent situations, deescalating tensions, and, of course, solving crimes. He was a one of the founders of the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE), whose mission is “Justice by Action.” Like the mission of SfAA, his organization sought to bring about positive social change as well as help members have satisfying and rewarding careers. His widow, Ms. Carrie Parker-Warren, remarked that “he lived a long, fruitful life” (Gainesville Sun, August 10, 2010). Part of that fruitful life was his self-identification as an anthropologist.

I invited Mr. Warren to talk to undergraduate students about being an applied anthropologist when I first came to Florida in the early 1980s. He was very gracious in meeting with the students, and was especially pleased that he was being recognized as an applied anthropologist and not just a police officer. One of his comments was especially insightful. He was asked how his anthropology helped him in law enforcement, and he said, “I learned in my anthropology classes that talking to people and letting them know who you are is basic to social life. So I tell my anthropology classes that talking to people and letting them know who you are is basic to social life. So I tell my anthropology classes that talking to people and letting them know who you are is basic to social life. So I tell my anthropology classes that talking to people and letting them know who you are is basic to social life. So I tell my anthropology classes that talking to people and letting them know who you are is basic to social life. So I tell my anthropology classes that talking to people and letting them know who you are is basic to social life. So I tell my anthropology classes that talking to people and letting them know who you are is basic to soc

practitioners of anthropology outside of academia have career paths that are not easy for university-employed social scientists to recognize and evaluate. SfAA has an obligation to “identify, promote, and strengthen such professional

A third reason for expanding the influence of applied social science is personal. Whenever people talk about our meetings, they are described as friendly and providing community solidarity among members. Meetings are like rituals of intensification where positive values are emphasized and celebrated. So perhaps SfAA provides members with an addition to the quality of their life. It would be presumptuous to say that “the good life” includes membership in SfAA. But it is worth noting here that this is one of the strategic values of the Society.

The occupation of “Anthropologist” should be promoted as a satisfying, rewarding and important professional role whether as an independent consultant, an employee of public agencies, corporations, nonprofit organizations, or as a university faculty member or administrator. Successful professional roles and identities must be identified, promoted and strengthened. (http://www.sfaa.net/sfaagoal.html)

Today I read in our local paper that an undergraduate anthropology major that went into law enforcement, Atkins Warren, had died. He came to Gainesville to be chief of police from St. Louis 30 years ago and after four years was tapped to work in the US Department of Justice for the rest of his career. His remarkable career included solving real-time violent situations, deescalating tensions, and, of course, solving crimes. He was a one of the founders of the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE), whose mission is “Justice by Action.” Like the mission of SfAA, his organization sought to bring about positive social change as well as help members have satisfying and rewarding careers. His widow, Ms. Carrie Parker-Warren, remarked that “he lived a long, fruitful life” (Gainesville Sun, August 10, 2010). Part of that fruitful life was his self-identification as an anthropologist.

I invited Mr. Warren to talk to undergraduate students about being an applied anthropologist when I first came to Florida in the early 1980s. He was very gracious in meeting with the students, and was especially pleased that he was being recognized as an applied anthropologist and not just a police officer. One of his comments was especially insightful. He was asked how his anthropology helped him in law enforcement, and he said, “I learned in my anthropology classes that talking to people and letting them know who you are is basic to social life. So I tell my anthropology classes that talking to people and letting them know who you are is basic to social life. So I tell my anthropology classes that talking to people and letting them know who you are is basic to social life. So I tell my anthropology classes that talking to people and letting them know who you are is basic to social life. So I tell my anthropology classes that talking to people and letting them know who you are is basic to social life. So I tell my anthropology classes that talking to people and letting them know who you are is basic to social life. So I tell my anthropology classes that talking to people and letting them know who you are is basic to social life. So I tell my anthropology classes that talking to people and letting them know who you are is basic to social life. So I tell my anthropology classes that talking to people and letting them know who you are is basic to social life. So I tell my anthropology classes that talking to people and letting them know who you are is basic to soc

practitioners of anthropology outside of academia have career paths that are not easy for university-employed social scientists to recognize and evaluate. SfAA has an obligation to “identify, promote, and strengthen such professional
roles” as stated in our mission statement. We need to organize “SfAA nights” or “SfAA Forums” in major cities around the world to do this. Take off helmets, start talking to people.

The Seattle meetings will be great. Elsewhere in this issue, Seattle Program Chair Darby Stapp talks about some of the plans and events of the meeting, and I hope that our members are planning interesting presentations, panels, and posters. James Spradley worked in Seattle, and one of his legacies is the category “homeless” to refer to those people who were earlier called tramps, bums, or street people. Spradley first worked with culture brokers among Northwest tribes and later did applied work with homeless people around Pioneer Square on the Seattle waterfront (You Owe Yourself a Drunk: An Ethnography of Urban Nomads, 1970). One story he told in classes was that logs were brought to Elliott Bay on Puget Sound by skidding them down the hills in the Seattle of the 19th century. The area down by the waterfront became known as “Skid Road.” Pioneer Square is more gentrified now, but it is still a good place to spend some time thinking about urban applied anthropology while you are in Seattle.

The year 2012 is important to the Society. Not that the world will end, but rather because the Board of Directors of SfAA has reviewed different locations for our East Coast 2012 meeting. Baltimore will be the site. The city has a tremendously interesting center and waterfront, excellent transportation, and with all of the members in the Greater Baltimore area (Washington, Philadelphia, New York, etc.), it will be a very successful meeting. If you are interested in helping with the meeting as program chair or as a member of the program committee, please volunteer.

One final note. The SfAA Executive Board recently discussed actions concerning the new law in Arizona called SB1070 concerning the checking of residents’ status papers. Consequently, the Board passed a resolution about this new law which is as follows. “The Society for Applied Anthropology, through a vote of the Board of Directors, resolves not to hold the SfAA annual meetings or other conference in Arizona until SB1070 of the State of Arizona is rescinded or until the Board of the Society reviews this issue in the future. As applied anthropologists and social scientists in an international organization, we oppose a law which will make it difficult for our colleagues to travel to the state and be part of professional conferences without fear of harassment. The law adversely affects the very goals of social justice and human worth upon which the society was created.”

The Gulf Coast Oil Disaster: A View from the Field

by Becky Blanchard [bblanch@ufl.edu]
PhD Candidate, University of Florida

I was conducting participant-observation in a meeting of climatologists, water managers, and estuarine resource users at the mouth of the Apalachicola River when I first heard the news that the Deepwater Horizon oil rig in the Gulf of Mexico had exploded, killing 11 workers. In brief breaks between presentations, discussions focused on the impact the event - which we then still conceived as singular, bounded - would have on then-ongoing negotiations over the proposed federal climate bill. None of us expected that the flow of oil from the Macondo Well would continue through most of the summer, becoming the largest marine oil spill in history.

My dissertation wasn’t supposed to be about oil. For the past year, I had worked with oyster harvesters and environmentalists in Florida’s Apalachicola Bay investigating the emergence of “blue-green” advocacy networks in the context of conflict over water and coastal resource management in the New South. In my final month of fieldwork, I had planned to follow up with the many oystermen and activists who had generously shared their time and experiences for my project, capturing a few last comments on the challenges of sustainable resource management. Their lives weren’t supposed to be about oil either. It had been an especially hard year for people who were already used to hard times. They had their hands full trying to make their voices heard in contentious regional negotiations over water in the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint basin, coping with new food safety regulations for the Gulf Coast oyster industry, and getting by in a recession that sent many who had found jobs in other industries back to work on the water. As May arrived and the oil continued to gush, it became apparent that the effects of the oil spill would be far-reaching and prove a major threat to the livelihoods and well being of people across the Gulf Coast.
Apalachicola Bay is a wild fishery that provides upwards of 10% of the nation's commercial oysters.

The enormity - and yet uncertainty - of those impacts imparted tremendous anxiety among the people I worked with. They depend upon the Gulf of Mexico for the bountiful seafood and beautiful beaches that drive Franklin County's economy. Apalachicola Bay produces 90% of Florida's commercial oysters, upwards of 10% of the nation’s harvest. Oysters are gathered by hand from public reefs by men and women - many of them third- or fourth-generation oystermen - working alone or in small kin groups out of 20-foot skiffs. The romantic image of these harvesters hauling up oysters with their long-handled tongs draws tourists who want to experience Florida's “Last Great Bay,” a place relatively unimpaired by high-rise condos and wetland fill. Over the past year, I had come to know the people who live and work on Apalachicola Bay as almost poetic in their knowledge of the intricacies of wind and tides, and fierce in their determination to protect this place.

As other anthropologists have observed, one of the wonderful things about a small community is the speed with which personal ties can be put to use when new challenges arise. Franklin County pulled together a group that included government officials, emergency response personnel, environmentalists from the local Riverkeeper group, and oyster industry representatives to identify and devise booming strategies for the most environmentally sensitive areas. Led by a local retiree with previous experience as an oil spill response trainer, these volunteers created a Tier 3 booming plan that was held up by the state as a model for other counties. Meanwhile, elected officials fought to bring attention and resources to the plight of Apalachicola Bay, arguably the most productive estuary in the northern hemisphere.

As an anthropologist, what resources could I bring? What role could I play in documenting and, if possible, mitigating the impacts of the disaster on the people I work with in Franklin County? I went back to read Tony Oliver-Smith on the anthropology of disaster and to the articles produced by Gregory Button, Christopher Dyer, J. Steven Picou, and other anthropologists in the wake of the Exxon Valdez disaster. I scribbled frantic notes in the margins of NOAA anthropologists’ reports on fisheries social impact assessment. At the same time, I wondered how many other anthropologists, working from laptops in the field or on campuses across the nation, might be asking similar questions.

To connect anthropologists interested in the Gulf Coast oil disaster, we formed a Google Group where the 100+ members engaged in discussions and shared resources. Winnie Ryan put forward a draft proposal for impact assessment. Shannon Dosemagan shared the interactive oil spill crisis map she created with the Louisiana Bucket Brigade. While the site has been quiet of late - I hope this means that people are now in the field or busy writing proposals - new members are welcome to join at http://groups.google.com/group/gulf-of-mexico-oil-spill. The site includes a collaborative bibliography of resources related to the anthropology of environmental disasters.

As I threw myself into spill response efforts, the roles of academic researcher, activist, and “local citizen” blurred in interesting and challenging ways, just as the spill response itself began to blur the lines between public and private governance and between volunteers and response workers. BP sent a team of liaisons to Franklin County to interface with government and set up the Vessels of Opportunity (VOO) program. A cadre of disaster response contractors and subcontractors soon followed. New SUVs bearing a multitude of company acronyms now competed with seafood trucks and dockworkers’ pickups for parking on the waterfront. Access to sites and information became limited to government officials and accredited personnel of the county’s emergency response contractor. Due to liability concerns, only HazMat-trained workers, not volunteers, would be allowed to participate in oil spill monitoring and cleanup.

What does participant-observation entail in such a situation? Apalachicola Riverkeeper, which was appointed to collect donations and coordinate volunteers as the county’s Emergency Support Function 15 organization, took me on as a full-time volunteer, providing entrée to the interagency response coordination meetings and daily briefings. While those around me deliberated over whether to apply for assistance from BP or sign up for VOO, I looked to our professional code of ethics and reflected on my own values to determine what I would and wouldn’t do. Friends from the Seafood Workers Association put my name forward to work the door at the VOO trainings. It was a great opportunity to see how BP was engaging local fishermen, but I couldn’t bring myself to accept the BP check at the end of the day. Like the rest of the Riverkeeper staff, I went through BP's introductory HazMat course. I joined thousands across the Gulf in earning a yellow license that qualifies me for employment cleaning up tarballs from Mississippi Canyon 252. Trying to “help out” necessitates entanglements with BP, something that oystermen and environmental activists - not just researchers - have found problematic.
As I write this, Apalachicola Bay’s beaches and marshes have been spared. I will never forget the tears shared with coworkers in the Riverkeeper office as we saw the horrific images of oil-coated wildlife in Louisiana marshes and read the testimony of Louisiana fisherman facing the loss of their nursery grounds. Our own worst-case scenario did not materialize. Still, Apalachicola is far from unaffected. Tourism took a heavy hit due to unfounded concerns about polluted beaches and contaminated seafood. I heard reports of housekeepers with less than half the rentals they would normally work during the early summer high season. With the closure of offshore fishing grounds, loss of supply from Louisiana, and reduced local supply, Apalachicola’s seafood houses have struggled. Truck drivers have been laid off. Shuckers, packers, and dockworkers have lost work too. Commercial fishers have been frustrated by the amount of time they’ve spent at job fairs and trainings, shuttling between various contractors’ offices, and on the telephone with VOO representatives trying to get work for their boats. They argue that while BP talked a good game about hiring locals, most of the spill response workers hail from outside the county, many from outside the Gulf Coast. Media reports about oystermen sitting on their BP checks instead of working have exacerbated extant tensions between seafood workers and those with “9-to-5s.” My best efforts to convey the harvesters’ side of the story - would you want to do hard labor in 100-degree heat if you had another option? - failed to make it into print. Tragically, one of the oystermen I had interviewed, George Sanders, died while working on the water in the July heat.

Despite all this, there are some notes of hope. The president of the Seafood Workers Association was appointed to the Governor’s Oil Spill Economic Recovery Task Force, suggesting that oyster harvesters might gain a stronger voice in coastal resource issues at the state level. With digital video cameras donated by the Waterkeeper Alliance, Apalachicola Riverkeeper has begun what they hope will be an ongoing, citizen science video monitoring program covering the hundreds of miles of shoreline in Franklin County. As part of this program, I worked with them to develop a protocol for documenting culturally significant sites and recording the stories associated with those places. This comprehensive Oil Spill Recovery (OSPREY) monitoring program is in the running for a $50,000 grant that would fund a full-time volunteer coordinator. Further, Riverkeeper has been able to strengthen ties with the Seafood Workers Association by hiring three oystermen to form a spill response monitoring team. Drawing on the booming and response plans, these oystermen use their knowledge of the Bay to hold accountable the various subcontractors responsible for carrying out spill response operations.

More broadly, I am encouraged by the role anthropologists may play in bringing new understandings of disaster and community-specific knowledge to oil spill response and impact assessment. More than twenty years after the Exxon Valdez disaster, there are now a number of anthropologists working in the regional and national offices of NOAA’s National Marine Fisheries Service. Thanks to the high quality of anthropological research on Exxon Valdez, Hurricane Katrina, and other disasters, anthropologists are increasingly recognized as valuable contributors to disaster response and research. I was initially disheartened to see few social scientists and no anthropologists on Florida’s statewide oil spill academic task force. However, I found that when presented with the opportunity, the organizers were eager to include anthropologists - they just didn’t know whom to contact. As BP begins the “top kill” operations that may finally seal the leaking well, the impacts of this disaster will likely continue to be felt by Gulf Coast communities for decades. The opportunities for anthropologists to make meaningful contributions to oil spill research and long-term recovery are only beginning.

Anthropologists and Business: Through the Looking Glass

Robert J. Morais [rmorais@wsm-inc.com]
Principal, Weinman Schnee Morais, Inc.
www.wsm-inc.com

For most anthropologists engaged in marketing research, ethnography is their unique selling proposition. However, by restricting their role to a single methodology, anthropologists limit opportunities for business employment. In my new book, Refocusing Focus Groups (2010), I suggest several ways that anthropological perspectives and techniques can be applied in focus groups, the most common marketing research setting. If anthropologists added this methodology to their toolkit, they would expand their business employment opportunities. My recommendation is
Based upon my training as a PhD-level anthropologist with nearly three decades experience in advertising and marketing research. I am currently a Principal at Weinman Schnee Morais Inc., a New York City-based marketing research firm with clients in health and wellness, household, food, beverage, industrial manufacturing, and other product categories.

For many anthropologists, focus groups are antithetical to their naturalistic mode of inquiry. Focus groups certainly have limitations, but even business anthropologists Patricia Sunderland and Rita Denny agree that the “talk” in focus groups is rich in meaning (Sunderland and Denny 2007: 175-179). When we attend closely to that meaning, we gain insights about consumer attitudes and sentiments and, more broadly, the culture of consumption. Moreover, focus groups are more likely to be chosen than ethnography by marketing and advertising executives to hear consumers speak about what they need and want, and to see reactions to new product ideas, packaging innovations, and advertising.

Anthropologists are well equipped to conduct focus groups or serve as behind the mirror back room analysts while they witness focus groups in progress. We are experts at listening and observing; we have strong interviewing skills; we possess analytical abilities informed by culture theory that can inspire marketing innovation and bring perspectives that are of immeasurable value to business executives. Following are several ways that anthropologists can apply their training in focus group settings.

A Cultural Perspective in Focus Groups

Grant McCracken believes that when corporations ignore culture, defined as “the body of ideas, emotions, and activities that make up the life of the consumer,” they place their organizations at risk in the marketplace (McCracken 2009: 1). Cultural analysis can be applied in focus group settings, where connections between consumer buying behavior and culture can be made in much the same way that they can be discovered in ethnographic interviews. While the focus room setting precludes naturalistic observation, respondents can engage with stimuli such as supermarket style shelf sets or any kind of material culture, and be questioned about social behavior. In addition, anthropologists can help executives learn whether advertising stories are relatable for target customers.

Focus groups are a venue to explore what I call “culturalographics,” a portrait of the symbolic meaning of consumer customs, rules for behavior, and beliefs. For example, “Thanksgiving” denotes a holiday on the calendar. Its cultural connotations are vast: an idyllic Norman Rockwell-like gathering of family and friends, a day to appreciate all that we have, permission to overindulge in food, a special occasion for cooks to showcase their abilities, a time to reflect on our national history, long, traffic-clogged trips on the highway, college football games, and so on. Each of these meanings has potential applications for marketing brands during the Thanksgiving holiday.

Focus Group Observations

One of the reasons business anthropologists advocate ethnography rather than focus groups is that respondents in focus groups sometimes recount what they do in their lives inaccurately or incompletely. When ice cream consumers say they eat a bowl of ice cream, what size bowl do they choose, and how much is in the bowl? How do they experience the taste? Focus group settings allow for observation, which, while not as pure as field studies, is valuable to marketers. Consumers of ice cream can be offered different size bowls; the observers can note which one they select, and how much ice cream they scoop, reminding the respondents to take their normal portion size. As consumers spoon their favorite flavors into their mouths, an anthropologist can listen as they characterize the cascade of tastes and textures they experience. An anthropologist’s analysis of this event would undoubtedly be very different from that of business executives.
Focus Group Interactions

One way to understand how consumers make purchase decisions is to watch them interact with those who influence these decisions. During interactional research in focus group rooms, it is possible to see and hear children ask their parents for their favorite brands and notice how their parents respond, observe the ways couples negotiate the purchase of big ticket items like cars, or watch the decision-making process used by friends as they discuss where to go for dinner.

My company conducted interactional research among doctors and patients when a client was marketing an innovative prescription contraceptive. We discovered that physicians assumed their patients were happier with their current contraceptive than they were in reality, so they did not encourage change or offer information about new methods unless asked. Only when the patients in the research mentioned reservations about their current method to the doctor or asked, “What’s new in contraception?” did the doctor discuss the new option. Based on this study, the client developed direct-to-consumer communications that sparked patients to inquire about new contraception solutions, as well as doctor-targeted messages to convince doctors that patients would react positively to the new method they were marketing.

The Value of Being Naïve During Focus Group Observations

Anthropologists are experts at assuming a naïve stance because their job is to take nothing as a given. During qualitative research on a breakfast cereal, we asked respondents what breakfast is. We learned that breakfast is an in-between, ritual-like time when certain personal transformations occur. Early morning is a transitional period; consumers move over a threshold from sleep to waking, from their private to public self. The specific breakfast cereal brand they consume during this transition is an essential component of their transformational experience. In this research, we discovered that our brand’s sensate attributes of sweetness and crunch made respondents feel happy, optimistic, and even joyful, promising a positive beginning to their day. These findings demonstrate how anthropologists can contribute to advertising strategy in a focus group setting.

Life Histories in Focus Groups

A modified life history approach in focus groups can yield marketing ideas. A manufacturer was exploring new product possibilities for its carpet freshener. We asked respondents to reflect back on their lives and tell stories about their experiences with things or places that seem “fresh.” Among their comments were:

Raking leaves at my grandparents’ house on an autumn day, the air clean and pure. I felt so alive. It was exhilarating.

The smell of flowers at my communion. My grandmother gave us all flowers – carnations and daisies. I was overwhelmed by the fragrance of the flowers. I felt happy, proud, excited.

My mom’s cooking: homemade pizza, making tomatoes into sauce. I felt content, relaxed.

Sleeping on sheets my mom dried on the line. A smell, but not a smell...just clean.

Respondents were then asked to invent new products for the brand. Among their suggestions (paraphrased to protect confidentiality) were:

- Fresh Lift, a “rake” that lifts embedded dirt before vacuuming
- Old Carpet Freshener, which restores body and color vibrancy to aging carpets
- Fresh and Soft, which makes carpets smell great and feel softer

Not all of the new products flowed directly from the consumers’ reflections, but by taking respondents back to the sensation of fresh, we inspired them to create fresh ideas.

Language and Meaning in Focus Groups

During a focus group on toilet bowl cleaners, my colleagues and I noticed that respondents did not mention a product benefit (“leaves the bathroom fresh”) that was a centerpiece of advertising. Respondents talked about how clean their toilets were and ultimately we concluded that “clean” not only meant free of dirt, but also meant fresh smelling. This revelation had major significance for 15 second television advertising. By attending to the layered
meanings of words, anthropologists can help marketers comprehend what respondents are really saying, and have an impact on advertising.

**Business Anthropology Beyond Ethnography**

Traditional ethnographic techniques, especially when informed by anthropological theory, will continue to provide value to manufacturers, advertising agencies, design firms, and other commercial enterprises. However, as these cases illustrate, anthropologists can make broader contributions and expand their business employment opportunities by adding focus groups to their methodological repertoire.

**Works Cited**


**Holistic History Online: Collaborations Among Tribes, Museums and Schools**

by Patricia Erikson [perikson@usm.maine.edu]
University of Southern Maine, Portland

One never knows where a research interest will take you. At first, it took me to the northwesternmost point of the lower 48 states: the Makah Indian Reservation on the Olympic Peninsula of Washington state. As a UC-Davis doctoral student, my passion for tribal museums drew me to the Makah Reservation, particularly to work at the Makah Cultural and Research Center ([http://makah.com/mcrchome.html](http://makah.com/mcrchome.html)). My passion was directed at understanding how the widespread development of tribal museums/cultural centers in North America was impacting non-Native museum exhibits and collection practices. I found that tribal museums were places of negotiation between “autoethnographic” (or self) portraits and representations framed by anthropological or natural history paradigms (Erikson et al. 2002).

You are likely familiar with the long-overdue shift that has occurred over the past few decades—a shift from Native Americans-as-object-of-museum-study to Native Americans as cultural specialists, professionals, artists, and museum directors who forward their own careers and the self-determination objectives of indigenous communities. “Indigenizing the museum” meant a) using indigenous conceptual categories to organize collections and exhibits; b) modifying museological practices to preserve indigenous intellectual property rights (e.g., in collections management) and to preserve humanity and personhood (repatriation of human remains); and c) disrupt colonial paradigms.

Decades of tribal activism had made clear to me that reforming public school curriculum shared similar challenges with indigenizing museology. “Across the country, tribes felt an increasing need for greater influence over popular representation of Native people. Museums joined the ranks of contested sites of representation, along with textbooks, movies, and various ‘playing Indian’ traditions (Erikson 2008: 46-47).”

Indeed, Native American activism addressing stereotypes in public school education did much to bolster the Native American museum movement. Along with other scholars, such as Linda Coombs (2002), Amy Lonetree (2008) and Gwyneira Isaac (2007) to name a few, my research has documented some of these tangible effects of Native activism (in collaboration with non-Native supporters) on the representation of Native Americans in public settings.

At the time that I published *Voices of a Thousand People* (2002), however, I had not yet worked in the field of public school education.
In 2001 I left university teaching to join the Washington State History Museum in Tacoma as Curator and Head of Education (http://wshs.org/wshm/default.aspx). This gave me the opportunity to apply some of what I had learned in museology and Native American Studies to public school curriculum development.

The Washington State History Museum enjoyed a track record of hosting over 20,000 school children in its galleries annually. Yet, the Museum was deploying a new digital educational initiative to better fulfill its mission to serve a statewide population of students and teachers. The plan was to prepare curricular materials that would provide context to primary historical sources in the museum’s collection. It was hoped that providing context and lesson plans would enable teachers to take advantage of the rich historical resources available online.

Our curricular materials specifically addressed Native American issues, past and present, in order to support a Washington state legislative mandate. RCW 28A.230.090 states that any course in Washington state history and government used to fulfill high school graduation requirements shall consider including information on the culture, history, and government of the American Indian peoples who were the first inhabitants of the state. RCW 28A.320.170 encourages each school district to incorporate curricula about the history, culture, and government of the nearest federally recognized tribe so that students learn about the heritage and culture of their closest neighbors.

Fortunately, the museum already enjoyed positive working relationships with Native peoples of Washington and the digital education initiative continued that track record. Presented with the task of creating curriculum about the Nisqually people, we established a Chief Leschi Curriculum Work Group that included Cecelia Carpenter, Billy Frank, Jr., Cynthia Iyall, Cheryl Wa’pesa Mayes, and others. Not only did these members advise the curriculum project, they also produced or edited materials for an online audience. Cecelia Carpenter wrote an essay “Before the White Men Came to Nisqually Country” (http://stories.washingtonhistory.org/treatytrail/teaching/before-white-man.htm), and Billy Frank, Jr. shared oral history about fishing and treaty protests (http://stories.washingtonhistory.org/treatytrail/treaties/timeline/treaty_1.htm).

My experience with the Chief Leschi Curriculum Work Group reminded me of Linda Coombs’ argument that collaborative and self-determining projects can produce a more “holistic history.” Coombs adds “To tell our story, to add it back into the historical record is seen as a negative thing by some. Reintroducing what should always have been included is seen as ‘changing’ history. We are not trying to change history. It happened. There are no sides [to history], but only one whole story.”

The collaboration between the Washington State History Museum’s online education project with the Office of Public Instruction and tribes created, in my mind, a way to e-publish and make accessible an online version of Coombs’ vision of “holistic history.” It provided a means to project Native knowledge structures into the K-12 public school system.

Of course, online content never replaces face-to-face contacts and relationships; it remains an exchange devoid of the social context that informs each and every transmission of oral history. Also, if online curricular projects reside outside of tribal nations, tribal input could be mitigated by influence from other stakeholders, such as a
museum’s board or by state legislators who may have other “bottom line” considerations.

Nonetheless, online curricular projects remain a promising area for collaboration among tribes, museums, and schools. Since relocating back to my home state of Maine, I have been delighted to find a similar movement afoot here in Wabanaki country to comply with the requirements of Maine Statute Title 20-A §4706. This law mandates K-12 instruction in American History, Maine Studies and Maine Native American History. After decades of trying to reform the representation of Wabanaki peoples (or lack thereof) in Maine’s public school curriculum, the passage of this law finally represented an opportunity to shape curriculum. As a result, an intercultural collaboration produced an online bridging document that charts the integration of Wabanaki Studies into K-12 education (http://maine.gov/education/lres/ss/wabanaki/index.shtml). Much work remains, but a path toward a holistic history online has begun.
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Public Archaeology Update: Investing in Archaeology as Applied Anthropology

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

It’s exciting to see a new building dedicated to applied anthropology. The New College of Florida, which is the state's Honors College for the Liberal Arts, has built a new space to house the New College Public Archaeology Lab (NCPAL) on its campus in Sarasota. For several years, public archaeology at the college has been one of the innovators of archaeology as applied anthropology focused on community engagement, service learning, ethnography, oral history and partnerships as well as traditional archaeology.

As described on the lab’s web page, it is seen “As both a physical space and intellectual project curated by New College students and faculty . . . and dedicated to the ethical advancement of knowledge about past human cultures and societies in order to engage with social issues of the present.” The new space, which broke ground in March of this year, is expected to be opened sometime this fall. (http://www.ncf.edu/pal)

One of the ongoing projects at NCPAL is the survey of Galilee Cemetery in Sarasota, the result of a partnership between the Woodlawn/Galilee Cemetery Restoration Task Force, NCPAL, and the State College of Florida. The cemetery was established in 1932 and closed in 2010, not only necessitating a change in maintenance and administration, but also prompting changes in its meaning to the African American community. The cemetery records were confused and incomplete, frustrating families who couldn’t always tell where individuals were buried. A certain amount of community organizing is inherent in the project, which is assisting the community in defining its roles and responsibilities in the maintenance and commemoration of the cemetery and the local history it represents. Students in the Galilee Cemetery survey are recording relevant stories through ethnography and oral history. The survey participants are also documenting the cultural landscape of the Galilee Cemetery by recording every grave marker (descriptions, sketches, and photographs of inscription, motifs, material, relationship to other graves and landmarks, and condition) and locating each grave on a map of the cemetery. All research is above ground; a non-intrusive remote sensing survey is planned to reveal unmarked graves. Students will organize paper and web-
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based representations of the cemetery and create teaching materials for local schools. The resulting archival record in detailed photographs, maps, drawings, and other documentation will allow others to continue research into the local history.

NCPAL’s “Looking for Angola” project uses both archaeology and ethnography to explore the history of an early 19th-century maroon community of self-emancipated Africans in east Bradenton. This project specifically confronts the racialized history and present-day context of southwestern Florida. The Angola project includes exploratory excavations at Manatee Mineral Spring and a heritage tourism project for Red Bays in The Bahamas, which is where one of the descendant groups from Angola eventually settled. The National Park Service’s Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance program encouraged a partnership with Reflections of Manatee, Inc. that promises a greenway in east Bradenton that will preserve its archaeological record. (http://www.nps.gov/ncrc/programs/rtca/whatwedo/projects/FL.pdf)

The grand opening of NCPAL’s new facility should be soon. Cheers for a grand celebration of a new space where faculty, students and community members can co-create the contemporary relevance of archaeology and ethical practice.

Doing Anthropology as an Environmental Journalist
Tales and Tips, Part 2
Brian McKenna [mckennab@umd.umich.edu]
University of Michigan-Dearborn

When fishing for a topic, why not muckrake your lake? That’s what I did in a cover story for Lansing’s City Pulse in 2002 where I was the weekly “Health and Environment” columnist (McKenna 2002). You can apply a device I call “The Anthropology Dozen” and write something that defamiliarizes your lake by epistemological critique (Marcus and Fischer 1986). In this article I present excerpts from the story, “Can Glory Days Return to Lake Lansing?” which shows some of how to do it. You can read the entire work at the URL below (McKenna 2002).

Outrage motivated the piece. The public health department had suppressed a treasure trove of environmental data about Lake Lansing (McKenna 2010a, 2001) that I had uncovered as an applied anthropologist between 1998-2001. I knew that mercury-laden fish had not been tested for twelve years. I knew that three-block long “soils piles,” that sat beside the lake were possibly leaching arsenic (having been dredged from the pesticide drenched muck on the lake floor). I knew that over 90% of the lake’s water comes from storm water runoff! In other words, it wasn’t really a “lake” at all but a bathtub of chemicals. Officially the Ingham County Health Department declared it was perfectly safe to swim in (as 250,000 did each season). But inside the government the story was different. An environmental regulator within the Health Department, who tests for water pollution, confided to me that he would never let his kids swim in Lake Lansing, “It’s too polluted.”

I proceeded to write the 2,200 word article (under a tight deadline in just four days), exposing all of the above. But my intent was not simply to catalogue hidden environmental hazards. As an anthropologist I dug into the muck of history to reveal deeper patterns. It was political ecologist Eric Wolf who famously asked, and I paraphrase, “if everything is connected, why do we write as though it is not?” So I wrote something holistic—to illustrate how capital had saturated the lake. People know next to nothing about capitalism, the essence of our culture!

Let’s get to the journalism. Here are the lead paragraphs.

Lake Lansing just wants to be left alone. In the Prohibition Era, bootleggers raised hell in a house on stilts that sat in the belly of the lake—site of a men’s social club—while a lookout warned of an impending sheriff’s raid. By the time the police boat reached the moated fortress, all alcohol had been hurriedly dispatched into the lake through a trap door.
Over the years, the lake has imbibed more than its share of bad whiskey. Septage, arsenic, fertilizer, dog poop, gull dung, mercury and just about everything that people throw on the ground for miles around the 450-acre waterworld winds up in the lake. “If you spit on the sidewalk,” says Pat Lindemann, the Ingham County drain commissioner, “it goes into the lake.”

Does that get your attention? Well, if you lived in Greater Lansing it might . . . and it did. I turned the lake into a person, a little literary panache. It was the bait, the set-up for the punch-line (and recall that anthropologist Kurt Vonnegut said that all good writing is essentially a one-liner). The punch-line is radical education. Like journalist Jack Newfield, I used humor to “let ‘the truth’ dazzle gradually.”

Notice also the telling quote by a government source, Pat Lindemann. He officially validated the “dangerous knowledge,” that was previously only oral. It did not come easy. It took an hour of patient questioning to extricate it. As Alex Cockburn says about journalism, “opinion is cheap, facts are expensive.”

Why and How I Write
Using “The Anthropology Dozen”

I take advantage of a gaping ideological hole in this neoliberal age, the GREEN hole. Everyone touts their green credentials, even BP! Universities do one better, they are both green AND “civically engaged,” despite having strong institutional ties to the military-industrial complex (McKenna 2010c). For anthropologists, as public pedagogues, our job is to reclaim our own green and civically engaged luster and reveal the simmering red beneath the emerald green.

In every journalistic article I write I try to incorporate what I call “The Anthropology Dozen.” These questions help insure a muckraking result. Very briefly, here they are: 1) holism (how do disparate phenomenon connect?); 2) fieldwork (from lab tests to participant observations); 3) What’s taken for granted? (Did the Ojibwa help create this lake?); 4) culture (How is capital behind what’s behind?); 5) cross-cultural juxtaposition (how did Indians and colonialists use the lake?); 6) Getting the native’s point(s) of view (Who are the “natives”? What are the ways in which the “native points of view” are ignored, omitted or suppressed); 7) Contradictions & ideologies (Do people say one thing and do another? Are there dialectical tensions in the terrain of inquiry?); 8) origins and history (human origins, the origin of the state, the origin of a nation, the origin of a given institution, the origin of a name, the origin of a place. How have things transformed since the origin?); 9) epistemological critique (Begin with a “rectification of names” in your analysis. Do names—like “Lake Lansing” in this instance—accurately capture the idea/object represented?); 10) conformity/resistance (What are the modes of resistance that the less powerful employ?); 11) privilege the most powerless; and 12) analyze social change.

Often this can be unearthed by asking a simple question, e.g., Why is it called Lake Lansing? Here’s an excerpt from the article.

Unlike greater Chicago’s 30-mile lakefront, which was protected as a public resource for all citizens to enjoy in perpetuity, the periphery of Pine Lake was open to real estate speculation. One of the earliest lakeshore owners was Frank Johnson, who is reported to have said, “I sat down under a tree one afternoon [by the lake] and made up my mind to just go buying.” And buy he did.

In 1927 “Pine Lake Johnson” assumed the prerogatives of ownership and changed the name of the water body to Lake Lansing, “because there were dozens of Pine lakes.” Of course, much of the pine was gone. Thus was the lake’s name transformed from a referent to nature into an alienated abstraction, having no physical relationship to
Largemouth bass caught in Lake Lansing.

The four days of research and writing were very intensive. Unlike academic scholarship, I started writing the piece immediately, both to ally my anxiety and to make my unconscious help with the rewriting (it went through five drafts). Those days consisted of seven long phone interviews, about five short calls, about ten email requests for information, library research for books on the history of the lake, and web investigation of government documents (as well the ones in my possession). I also travelled to the lake for a kind of “rapid appraisal,” conducting semi-structured interviews with people I found there. I found a timely “hook” for the tale, about a new attraction planned for the lake (a Community Bandshell). Hooks are essential for legitimacy! They allow you to gain entry into “the commons” of the dominant narrative. They show that you are resourceful while appealing to the public’s yearning for “news.”

Below is my hardest won excerpt, the result of simply making inquiries about origins.

Origins of Capitalism on the Lake

Long before Europeans set eyes on the ponds, the Pottawatomie, Ottawa and Chippewa tribes called them home. Trails passed on all sides of Lake Lansing, one of which led eventually to Saginaw Valley. Thelma Lamb, a local historian writes, “The natives thrived on the wild bounty around the Lake Lansing ponds, depending on the forests and streams for their food clothing and shelter.” Lamb writes, “They utilized nature’s resources: edible roots; oak, hickory, beech, and hazel nuts which often took the place of bread; wild fruits – plum, crabapple, black cherry, grape, blackberry, and strawberry; and wild game.” “If there was wild rice in the lake, which there probably was, they would have definitely harvested it,” said Tom Peters, an educator at the Nokemos Learning Center in Okemos.

Between 1819 and 1840 European colonialists throughout Southern Michigan succeeded in dispossessing the native inhabitants not only of their land and livelihood but also, in consequence, of their culture and spirit of life. In the summer of 1837, whole villages were lost to a smallpox outbreak. The few who survived the onslaught of the invaders’ land possessiveness, liquors and diseases became poor, broken and wandering specimens around the area. Chief Okemos, who lived in the area till 1858, was revered by the locals, but only after he was domesticated. Once a fierce warrior who fought the Americans bravely in Northern Ohio, Okemos was often reduced to begging for food.

A pair of brothers, both “physicians with money,” were the first colonialists on the lake. In 1836 Obed Marshall and his brother paid the U.S. Land Office $318.08 for 160 acres south of the lake including the shore, Evelyn Huber Raphael wrote in 1958 in “A History of the Haslett - Lake Lansing Area.” The U.S. government had thus transformed the land into a commodity, usurping the native American’s view that the land and lake were common resources for all to enjoy. The colonialists originally called it Pine Lake for the stand of beautiful white pine trees on the east side of the lake—the largest stand in Ingham County. But the white pines were soon destroyed for their wood resources in the second half of the 19th century. According to Raphael, the biggest logging operation was conducted by a John Saltmarsh, whose name ironically revealed his intent. He “assaulted the ‘marsh’” in the winter one year, sending the logs over the lake ice on sled runners. They were stockpiled for export behind the new train depot. Saltmarsh also owned a picket mill, to make the fences that would set the enclosures around the new form of land division around Lansing: private property.

Notice how I translated academic parlance into civic voice. This is journalism as a public anthropology, a syncretism (McKenna 2010b). Think of it as converting ethnography into a good story. There are villains, dramatic tensions, metaphors and ample use of quotations to enliven the narrative.

The anthropological intent is to link “the news” to “the olds,” of history. If not your lake, maybe your river, a park, or even a dangerous intersection, one where you almost got killed. The key is to find a local place that stirs your passions, and then write about it, locally.
This coming November, at the AAA Meetings in New Orleans, anthropologist Elizabeth Bird and I will lead a three hour workshop titled “Engaging Journalism: Making Anthropology Visible in the Public Sphere.” Bird is a leader in Media anthropology and author of numerous books including The Anthropology of News and Journalism (2009). At the workshop we will provide a good deal of insight, tips and suggestions for anyone interested in trying their hand at journalism (both beginners and advanced). Please register early!
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Obituaries

Gilbert Kushner, 2005 SfAA Sol Tax Award Winner

By Maria D. Vesperi [mvesperi@earthlink.net]
New College of Florida

Gilbert Kushner, Professor Emeritus and longtime chair of the Department of Anthropology at the University of South Florida, Tampa, passed away on May 30, 2010 following surgery for a recently discovered brain tumor. He was 76.

On his SfAA personal web page, Gil described his academic areas of expertise as “applied/practicing anthropology; culture change/persistence.” Persistence was much more than a key word in Gil’s life; it was a moral stance. Persistence informed his research, his contributions to the academy and his enduring commitment to ethics and human rights. Gil was internationally recognized for his groundbreaking work in establishing applied anthropology as a graduate discipline. Less known beyond his community was how he practiced anthropology as a way of life since joining the USF faculty in 1970. Over those four decades, Gil’s deep scholarly and personal understanding of persistence in the face of suffering and loss impelled him to give generously of his time and expertise to many community initiatives, including the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council—where many applied anthropology interns learned their craft—and the first hospice care service in the Tampa Bay region. Among the rare long-term survivors of lung cancer, Gil continued to travel and to remain deeply engaged with his family, his community and his intellectual network at a time when others might retreat from the world. He allowed the Moffitt Cancer Center in Tampa to videotape his experience, in the hope that his story would encourage others to persist when faced with discouraging odds. Until the end of his life, he retained active status as a Fellow of the Society for Applied Anthropology and as a member of the Washington Association of Professional Anthropologists.

Many applied anthropologists last saw Gil at the 2005 SfAA meeting in Santa Fe. There he was honored with the prestigious Sol Tax Distinguished Service Award, named for that prescient leader in establishing anthropology as a socially responsible discipline whose practitioners should participate in solving social problems as well as studying them. The award committee described Gil as “a major player in the rapid expansion of applied anthropology in our time, and a key contributor to building the structures that ensure its continued prominence within the discipline.” The award ceremony was followed by a crowded, joyous celebration. While his impact on the discipline was already widely recognized, Gil himself was gratified and truly surprised to see how many careers he had influenced and how openly his contributions were acknowledged.
The professional accomplishment for which Gil is best known both nationally and internationally—and the one that will constitute his deeply influential legacy for generations to come—was his strong leadership in establishing the University of South Florida as the nation’s first and preeminent center for training applied anthropologists. As chair of anthropology from 1971-1985, he led an intellectually innovative and bureaucratically challenging movement to establish anthropology as a strong undergraduate discipline and then to create the nation’s first MA and doctoral programs in applied anthropology.

Once applied anthropology was fully instituted as a free-standing, graduate-level degree, Gil turned his full attention to the challenging task of securing its place within the larger discipline of anthropology. His scholarship in this effort was meticulous and, of course, persistent. His contributions to the field overall include seven authored or co-edited books, monographs and special issues of journals, along with eleven chapters in books and twenty eight articles. Within this corpus, he authored, co-authored or edited some 16 articles, monographs and collections on applied research and training, from “Anthropology at the University of South Florida” (with Roger Grange, Jr.), a 1972 article published in The Southern Anthropologist, to the much-referenced January 1993 issue of Practicing Anthropology devoted to “Internship and Practice in Applied Anthropology,” co-edited with Alvin W. Wolfe. Gil’s early collaborators in thinking through the applications of anthropology included Eleanor Leacock and Nancie Gonzalez; in 1974 they edited Training Programs for New Opportunities in Applied Anthropology as a special publication of the American Anthropological Association and SfAA.

Over the course of his career, Gil held a wide range of offices and participated in some 30 academic committees, including more than a dozen within SfAA. He was a member of the SfAA Nominations and Elections Committee during the pivotal mid-1970s expansion period and served as SfAA Secretary from 1983-86. In 1988 he co-chaired the SfAA Program Committee, bringing the organization to Tampa for a memorable annual meeting that is still noted today as a benchmark in demonstrating the scope of applied anthropological research and training. He also served as President of the Society for Humanistic Anthropology, as a member of the AAA Board of Directors and as a member of the AAA Program Committee.

Gil organized, chaired and presented tirelessly at both the SfAA and AAA meetings from the early 1970s through the 1990s. At SfAA he organized and participated in cutting-edge discussions about applied training and research. At AAA he was equally likely to be found in a session on “The Role of Internships in Graduate Training,” “Contemporary Humanistic Anthropology, I and II” or “Back to the Future Traditions of Humanism for the 21st Century.” He rarely missed an opportunity to discuss the relevance of applied anthropology within the larger discipline or to explore new theories and findings that could sharpen an applied approach.

USF’s anthropology program lacked four-field coverage for undergraduates when Gil assumed leadership in 1971. When he left the chair position in 1985 to become leader of the department’s urban track, there were 44 majors and 62 applied MA students. By 2000, just a year after Gil retired, the USF Department of Anthropology counted 128 undergraduate majors, 64 MA students and 44 enrolled in its highly regarded applied doctoral program. His distinguished emeritus colleague, Alvin Wolfe, had this to say in 1999 when nominating Gil for the title of Emeritus Professor of Anthropology: “This innovative program rapidly gained national and international recognition, and soon served as the model for similar programs elsewhere. In many ways this new approach to anthropological education changed the discipline and had an effect on social sciences generally.”

Before joining the USF faculty in 1970, Gil taught at the University of Houston from 1962-66 and then briefly at the State University of New York at Brockport. He maintained active, collaborative relationships with many of his former students, who openly acknowledged his inspiration and mentorship. These ties mirrored his decades-long connection with his own mentor, Edward Spicer, who supervised Gil’s MA and dissertation work at the University of Arizona. Gil earned his doctorate from Arizona in 1968. He referenced and credited “Spicer”—a name he evoked with unvarying admiration and joy—at every turn in his career.

For anthropologists, early field experiences provide indelible impressions and insights that guide future research and career paths. Living in communities very different from one’s own and observing first-hand the struggles of people who are often colonized and oppressed—the observed rather than the observers—is a humbling and enlightening experience. His dissertation work among immigrants from India to Israel provided such insights for Gil, along with his commitment, honed during the 1950s and ’60s, to civil and human rights at home and abroad. Some readers will be surprised to learn that Gil was an accomplished guitarist and folksinger, who performed and recorded in his youth and maintained a large repertoire of songs from the Mexican Revolution and the Spanish Civil War.

The titles of Gil’s early publications tell the story: “Immigrants from India to Israel: Planned Change in an Administered Community”; “People without Power: The Administered Community in International Human Rights”; and
the 1981 collection co-edited with GP Castile, *Persistent Peoples: Cultural Enclaves in Perspective*. As early as 1965, Gil published an analysis of the Mau Mau movement as an example of cultural revitalization—the re-energizing of beliefs, values and practices with which human communities resist oppression and celebrate their identities. *Human Rights and Anthropology*, an anthology Gil co-edited in 1988 with Theodore Downing, was the first collection focused on what is now an established area of research about human rights issues and their impact on “persistent peoples” worldwide.

Gil’s own wellsprings of persistence were his splendid family and his Jewish faith and cultural traditions. He is survived by his wife of 52 years, Lorraine; sister, Esther; sons, Andrew and David; daughters-in-law, Shelley and Sue; and granddaughters, Alyssa, Samantha, and Mia.

A short poem written by his friend and retired USF colleague, Jerry Smith, summarizes Gil’s persistence in the face of daunting challenges and odds. Jerry recalled a line that Gil had routinely included in the “Welcome to USF” package distributed to new members of the Department of Anthropology: “If you see a nit, pick it. If you see a windmill, tilt it.”

Jerry wrote: “When the time comes, I hope someone might read this to others who gather to share the privilege of knowing and loving this wonderful man.”

Go on, Gil. Go up the hill
To tilt among the windmills.
We’ll watch from here.
We’ll weep and cheer,
As you bring each mill to a standstill.

Robert E. Rhoades

By Eric C. Jones [ecojones@uncg.edu]
University of North Carolina-Greensboro

Robert E. Rhoades was born January 30, 1942, and raised on a farm in southern Oklahoma. On March 24, 2010, his family said that “Bob - Dad, Tito Bob, ‘Fessor, Doctór, Guru-ba, Okie, Pahbee, and more - crossed the Great Divide...” After arriving home from a research trip to Peru with his wife and collaborator Dr. Virginia Nazarea last May, Bob learned that he had pancreatic cancer. While chemotherapy and surgery kept him away from much of his work for the next several months, he remained imaginative about the possibilities of applied anthropology. During the spring semester of 2010 he taught a graduate seminar entitled, “Anthropology of Agriculture and Natural Resources” from his living room up until a few weeks before he passed away. One of the purposes of the class was to plan an edited volume on agricultural anthropology, a subfield that Dr. Rhoades championed, and his students remain committed to that vision. He also found the energy to thoroughly critique two of his students’ dissertations in those last two months—they passed their defenses days before his death. In the words of another student from the University of Georgia, "his warmth and generosity are legendary.”

Rhoades graduated from Oklahoma State with a B.S. in agriculture and sociology, but did a stint in Nepal with the Peace Corps during its first years of existence in the middle of his undergraduate studies. He took an MA in sociology and international development on an East West Center Fellowship at the University of Hawaii, including a year at the University of Philippines-Los Baños along with the International Rice Research Institute. After farming part-time and teaching at Phillips University, he took his Ph.D. at the University of Oklahoma under Stephen Thompson. His early post-graduate work in the 1970s concerned international migration associated with the guest-worker program of Germany, as well as the potential application of a guest-worker program to the United States. In Germany, he lived among Spanish, Turkish and Italian laborers who worked in factories producing kitchenware and tableware. He was interested in the nature of migration systems—how long people stayed, who they brought with them, how their
households formed, how they saved money, what they sent back home, and what their plans were for returning home (or not) if they hadn’t already developed a cycle of migration. In peer-reviewed journals, he weighed in on the topics of return migration, cyclical migration, foreign labor, as well as how these meshed with industrial capitalism and what kind of economic development they engendered.

However, it really was the persistent inquiry into Development—his economic interest in how capitalism works, his humanist commitment to those seeking a better life and, later in Bob’s work, his ecological concern with sustainability of human-environment relations—that constituted the thread that wove Bob’s intellectual passions into various projects of applied anthropology throughout his life. Or, perhaps, an agricultural metaphor is more suitting...development was a perennial strawberry plant to Bob, one which sought fertile ground for sending out runners to establish new and fruitful translations of an idea. And a sense for seeking fertile ground he certainly did have. Beginning as only an idea when Rhoades was awarded a post-doctoral Rockefeller Fellowship (a ‘rocky doc’) as the International Potato Center’s first resident anthropologist in 1979 in Lima, Peru, his interest in mapping the world geography of the potato and correlating potato production with climatological factors less than 10 years later turned into digitized maps of well over 100 developing countries and the agro-ecological zones that supported potato production. This interest in agriculture and climate later nurtured one of his students at the University of Georgia to produce a dissertation on the ethnoclimatology of apple production.

As one of the early social scientists directly engaged with the Consultative Group for International Agriculture Research system (CGIAR), Rhoades was fortunate to have (at least some of) his ideas heard. It helped that his insight of seeking indigenous or local knowledge on potato production provided much needed data for international agricultural programs in the early 1980s. But, to Bob, this would not be just the supplying of data to those at the top for them to make decisions. It needed to be accompanied by participatory research and farmer-led initiatives that he referred to as the ‘farmer-back-to-farmer’ model—exemplified in his book “Breaking New Ground: Agricultural Anthropology”—that showed how to introduce agricultural technologies that were appropriate and acceptable to farmers and their communities. In that vein, in 1988 he started UPWARD—User’s Perspectives with Agricultural Research and Development—an arm of the International Potato Center based in the Philippines.

In 1991, Bob Rhoades was brought to the University of Georgia to launch and build their Ph.D. program’s new focus on ecological and environmental anthropology. Again, his sense for fertile ground was excellent. The department developed the introduction to anthropology course into one of the few environmental literacy courses on campus, which allowed the funding of sizable cohorts of Ph.D. students in the first decade of the program’s new focus.

About half of Rhoades’ recent work was on rural livelihoods, community and sustainability in Andean Ecuador, although his visionary interest in mountains long ago led to the creation of the interdisciplinary science of montology (see Rhoades’ 2007 manuscript Listening to the Mountains), based on a large interdisciplinary study he directed from USAID’s Sustainable Agriculture and Natural Resource Management-Collaborative Research Support Program (SANREM). His own research efforts in that large project focused on ethno ecology (with Virginia Nazarea) and on the envisioning of possible futures by local stakeholders. His two books from this period are Bridging Human and Ecological Landscapes: Participatory Research and Sustainable Development in an Andean Region (Kendall/Hunt 2001) and Development with Identity: Community, Culture, and Sustainability in the Andes (CABI 2006), both of which were also published in Ecuador in Spanish. Bob accepted a Fulbright to continue his research in Ecuador after the SANREM project ended, leading to his recent cutting edge work on the ethnoecology of climate change and the disappearance of glaciers in Ecuador.

The other half of Bob’s recent work was in support of southern US agriculture. He co-founded the Southern Seed Legacy Project which were annual seed swaps held on his Agrarian Connections 300-acre educational farm, and he developed a certificate program in sustainable agriculture at the University of Georgia. The public face of anthropology also greatly benefitted from Rhoades’ contributions to National Geographic and his service on the boards of national and international agriculture and natural resource organizations.

But mostly, his family and friends and the farmers he worked with everywhere cherished his humility and warmth, his grand smile and generous laugh, and his keen perceptions of the world about him. Bob is survived by his wife Virginia Nazarea, Professor of Anthropology at the University of Georgia, and his two children; Tristan Nunez, who is pursuing a PhD in ecology, and Dani Rhoades Adams, who is continuing to run the Georgia farm that Bob brought back to life and farmed for many years.
Marcus Hepburn (1946-2010)
A Sorrowful Loss for Applied Anthropology and Many Others

By J. Anthony Paredes [janthonyparedes@bellsouth.net]
Professor Emeritus, Florida State University; National Park Service (ret)
and
James C. Sabella [sabellaj@uncw.edu]
Professor Emeritus, University of North Carolina-Wilmington

At the 1975 meeting of the American Society for Ethnohistory, Marcus Hepburn gave a brilliant presentation on the impact of the introduction of wire traps to the blue crab fishery of a Florida Panhandle coastal community. As he was deftly fielding questions afterwards, a former professor of Paredes leaned over and asked, “Is he your student?” To which, Paredes proudly replied “yes,” and his former professor responded “I assume that’s from his dissertation.”

At the time Marcus had barely finished his Master’s degree! He never finished his doctoral dissertation. He had almost completed the first draft when personal circumstances—including the death of his 13 year old daughter—ground him to a halt in the mid 1980s.

He rebounded, however, with a career first in the Florida Department of Community Affairs, then with Catholic Charities of Florida and a renewed dedication to his Roman Catholic faith, eventually becoming a Deacon. Nonetheless, in 2005 he resolved to finish at last his dissertation. Hepburn was readmitted to the doctoral program at the University of Florida in 2007 and on May 6, 2010, he retook his doctoral exams and passed them “with flying colors,” as his sister said at his funeral, just as he had done thirty years earlier. Tragically, he died on June 6 from a brain injury suffered nine days earlier in a freakish accident while cleaning out his garage. Those of us who knew Marcus only as an anthropologist were surprised to learn from the many accolades at his funeral about Marcus’s “other life” as devoted church member and public servant.

Marcus Hepburn was one of the great pioneers of modern fisheries anthropology in the southeastern United States. He laid the groundwork and paved the way for many others in Florida and North Carolina with his work in the 1970s. During 1974-75, as a master’s student at Florida State University, he did most of the fieldwork for “Human Factors in the Economic Development of a Northwest Florida Gulf Coast Fishing Community,” which we directed and was the first Sea Grant funded anthropology project in the Southeast. In 1977 Hepburn led a Florida Department of Natural Resources/Sea Grant oyster transplantation study at Cedar Key, Florida, which was featured in the summer 1983 issue of Practicing Anthropology (page 13). Whatever status Paredes was to enjoy later as a “fisheries anthropologist” (including ten years on the Scientific and Statistical Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fisheries Management Council) rested first and foremost on Hepburn’s work.

In 1977 Marcus followed Sabella to UNC Wilmington for fieldwork on Harkers Island, NC, for the North Carolina Sea Grant Project “Social Organization of a North Carolina Island Fishing Community.” Hepburn’s work there was twice featured in the UNC Sea Grant publication Coast Watch (May 1979; June 1980). In 1980 Hepburn returned briefly to Florida where he completed doctoral coursework and exams at the University of Florida. He also did a brief stint as an interviewer for the privately contracted National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) project, “A Socio-
Economic Study of the Mackerel Purse Seine Fishery.” In that project he delighted in finding fisher folk descendants of Harkers Island living on the central Florida Gulf Coast.

In 1981, he was back in North Carolina. This time at the East Carolina University Institute of Marine Resources where he worked on various applied projects with Peter Fricke (now chief social scientist with NMFS) and John Maiolo, then working with the South Atlantic Fisheries Management Council, and Marcus was on hand for hiring Jeffrey Johnson (now coeditor of Human Organization).

During 1984 Marcus was a Sea Grant Congressional Fellow in Washington, D.C., assigned to the National Ocean Policy Study of the Senate Commerce Committee. In 1985 he returned to Florida and worked for several months with the Institute of Science of Public Affairs, Florida State University. He also was writing his dissertation comparing Cedar Key, Harkers Island, and the Panhandle community where he began his maritime career. It was Harkers Island that held a special place in Hepburn’s heart. And he by its people. Sadly, an “island homecoming” that was in the works to honor Marcus was not to be.

Barbara Garrity-Blake, a present-day North Carolina coastal anthropologist (and three-term gubernatorial appointee to the North Carolina Marine Fisheries Commission), wrote in an on-line condolence to Marcus’s wife, Toni DeSilva Hepburn, “I am so sorry for the passing of Marcus. I listened to many hours of oral histories that he recorded on Harkers Island...his comfortable dialogue with islanders as fish trucks rumble by, dogs bark, babies cry, and in some interviews, your daughter plays and vies for daddy’s attention...What a loss to us all, but what a blessing he was in this world.” In another on-line condolence, the director of the Core Sound Water Fowl Museum and Heritage Center, Karen Willis Amspacher, a Harkers Islander, wrote of Marcus’s “most precious work on Harkers Island...and even though I was not here at the time (I was in college) I have read every word of his writing about my homeland...I am deeply saddened by your loss and hope that you know that his name continues to be held in high honor here on the coast of North Carolina after all these years. His work will continue to ‘live’ for many generations. I hope you will come and visit with us soon. There are many people here on the Island who still remember him with great affection.”

Marcus was a first-rate ethnographer, in great part because of his personal attributes. Start with his humility and deference toward others. He was able to forge excellent working relationships with people because he was genuinely interested in them, and would spend hours listening and learning about their way of life. The pictures of Marcus with Louis Hancock and Mary and Dallas Rose in the Coast Watch articles are quite revealing. Far from being staged, the photos express the deep relationships that Marcus developed with these and other residents of Harkers Island. To this day the sons and daughters of Marcus’ principal informants (many are long since deceased) ask me, Sabella, about him whenever I have the opportunity to visit the island. They remember him with fondness, and how he participated in their work and the life of the community.

People trusted their perceptions of Marcus. He was comfortable, like an old shoe, and able to navigate local rivalries without having to choose sides. He was honest, sincere, trusting and never vindictive or mean. Despite a considerable intellect, Marcus was always self-deprecating and kind.

Sabella prizes his memories of working with Marcus in North Carolina over many years, especially on the Harkers Island project. Our collaboration over the two-year period was exceptionally rewarding from both a personal and professional standpoint. The quality of Marcus’ work is obvious from even a brief perusal of his field notes. They are an ethnographic model of professional excellence in community studies for their comprehensiveness and wealth of
His analytical and conceptual abilities were on a par with his ethnographic expertise. Marcus was always searching for theoretical and interpretive constructs that would generate insights into his data.

On that note, we would be remiss not to mention Hepburn’s other contributions to anthropology in general. He twice attended the Summer Institute of Linguistics, and, as one result, brought to the attention of Paredes (once an Ojibwe specialist) the uncanny link between Lakota peoples and the famed “windigo/witiko” complex of northern Algonquians in the very name of the great Oglala leader “Crazy Horse”-tashunka uitco in Lakota. Marcus worked out an algebraic resolution of Kariera Four-class and the Aranda Eight Class section systems in a University of Florida course with Charles Wagley. Using what he had learned from Florida oyster workers, Marcus helped a fellow FSU graduate student figure out how the people at his pre-Columbian archaeological site opened their oysters: they “billed” them (i.e., broke off the thin end of the shell and pried them open), and even identified—by appropriate wear marks—the tools they used, large welk cores. Finally, Marcus and Paredes spent many hours in splendid conversation and collaborative writing for their sometimes “controversial” work on cerebral lateralization (Current Anthropology 17:121-127; 323-326; 510-511; 739-742).

Even after Marcus Hepburn left formal employment within anthropology and went to work for the Florida Department of Community Affairs, he never lost his anthropological perspective as he worked on resource impact, land-use policy, affordable housing, conflict resolution, homelessness, farm workers, and much more. At one point, Marcus was even put on loan to another agency to document Florida’s maritime heritage, an experience which Marcus described in an article for High Plains Applied Anthropologist (9-10: 196-201).

Marcus went to work for Catholic Charities of Florida in 2005. There he rapidly built a reputation as one of the leaders in disaster preparedness and recovery. He was beginning his third term as chair of Florida Voluntary Organizations Active in Disasters. The Florida Catholic Conference executive director said of Hepburn, “...he understood the culture of the church and the culture of government...he used...his knowledge of how systems work to make things happen” (Tallahassee Democrat, June 9, 2010).

Hepburn was about to begin work on the Gulf of Mexico oil spill disaster. At Marcus’ funeral in Tallahassee, Florida, marine biologist and nationally prominent writer Jack Rudloe (e.g., The Living Dock, Alfred Knopf 1977), himself a resident of the Florida Panhandle coast, remarked privately to Paredes that it was such a shame that Marcus would not be able to do that oil spill work, because, as Jack said, “he was the one who really understood the people down there [on the coast].”

We will sorely miss Marcus Hepburn. His loss is especially sad being so close to completing his dissertation after so many years. It would have been a masterpiece of maritime anthropology. We hope something can still be done with his drafts. Whatever the outcome, Marcus Hepburn was for all of us a wonderful role model of a citizen-anthropologist.

Authors Note: A few portions of this article are scheduled to appear in slightly different form in the September 2010 issue of the American Anthropological Association publication Anthropology News.

Shelton H. Davis

Shelton H. Davis, a 25-year resident of Falls Church, Virginia, activist anthropologist and indigenous rights advocate, died May 27 of lymphoma. He was 67.

Davis was born in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania in 1942. He graduated from Antioch College and received a doctorate in anthropology from Harvard University in 1970, after two years of field work in Santa Eulalia, a Mayan community in the highlands of Guatemala. He taught at Harvard University, creating Harvard’s first course on Native Americans in the United States. In 1973, he founded Indigena, Inc. in Berkeley, California, the first documentation center in the United States on indigenous people of the Western Hemisphere, publishing the first English-language newsletter on Indian peoples of the Americas.

In 1975, he founded the Anthropology Resource Center - a public-interest research organization devoted to analysis of the effects of development policies on indigenous peoples and the environment in the Amazon and western United States. He and ARC are cited today as one of the founding advocates and exemplifiers of
“public interest anthropology” - anthropology that, in Davis’ words, “grows out of the democratic traditions of citizen activism” and holds that “the role of the intellectual is to work with citizens in promoting fundamental change.” During his time at ARC, Davis wrote the seminal work, *Victims of the Miracle*, published by Cambridge University Press in 1978, the first in-depth account by an anthropologist of the social and environmental impact - and human cost to the indigenous Indians - of the Amazon development program of the 1970’s.

He worked at the World Bank from 1987 to 2004, where he - in the words of his co-workers - was one of indigenous peoples’ “staunchest advocates” from inside the Bank and where he spent his time taking on “the struggle for minority rights - territorial rights, linguistic rights, cultural rights - as his professional mission.” Davis firmly believed that the “best qualified experts” on what a community needs development-wise are the community members, themselves, and thus worked actively to ensure that the Bank included the poor and indigenous in the development decision-making process. As a result of his work “mainstreaming” social issues into Bank policy, social impact assessments and social inclusion of indigenous peoples during Bank project preparation became the norm. His colleagues write that he was an “indefatigable defender of indigenous peoples' rights and an unshakable optimist” and that “one could solidly count on Sandy whenever a battle for ‘Putting People First’ in development had to be carried out inside the Bank, or outside.” Davis taught courses on sustainable development, poverty reduction and social inclusion in Latin America at Georgetown University from 1992 to 2008 in the Center for Latin American Studies.

Davis lived the past 25 years in Falls Church, attending recreational sports games, George Mason High School events, and sitting in on the English as a Second Language Advisory Committee for Falls Church City Public Schools for eight years. He is remembered around Falls Church as a kind and humble man, ready with a smile and words of encouragement and gratitude.

He is survived by his wife, Mary Clare Gubbins of Falls Church, his daughter, Rebecca, of Brooklyn, N.Y., his son Peter of Falls Church, and his brother, Allen of Bay Harbor Island, FL. (Editor’s Note: The source of this obituary is the Falls Church News Press, http://www.fcnp.com, June 8, 2010.)
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Never Forget: Violence and Hope in Kurdistan and Iraq

By Diane E. King [diane.king@uky.edu]
University of Kentucky

“In 1963 much of our area was destroyed by the government because of their war with the peshmerga (Kurdish anti-Iraqi-government fighters). In 1967 there was even worse fighting there, and most people fled to the mountains, some to Dohuk. Our house was destroyed then... [In 1970] we returned... and rebuilt our house. In 1975 the government destroyed our village again, and everyone fled. We went to Mosul this time. In 1976 the government ordered us to return to our villages, so we went, and again rebuilt our house. In 1980 there was more fighting...”

- A Kurdish man from Bamarne, Bahdinan, Kurdistan Region, Iraq

My main field site is the Kurdistan Region of Iraq. While I have carried out fieldwork throughout the Region, I have spent the most time in its uppermost corner, an area now known officially as the Dohuk Governorate but still called informally by the name of the princely family that ruled it for several centuries, “Bahdinan.” In this column I advocate for awareness about the violence that has plagued Bahdinan. My method? In the spirit of “never forget,” the rallying cry of advocates of mass killing and genocide victims everywhere, I will simply inventory some of the episodes of violence, and then cite some hopeful signs.

Violence, both collective and individual, is unfortunately a feature of human life everywhere. However, Bahdinan and adjacent territories have been the site of a seemingly inordinate amount of collective violence, at least in the past 200 years or so. The above quote is taken from my field notes, which contain many more like it. Indeed there have been so
A woman displaced by violence in the city of Mosul prepares dinner in a makeshift kitchen in the Kurdistan Region.

many waves of large-scale violence that I lack the space in this column to list them all. How can we account for the violence that has plagued Bahdinan? Of course, this is a complex question. Bahdinan was for centuries wedged between the Turkish, Persian, and Russian empires, which often vied for territory around and through it. Western Europeans, especially the British, were present as colonizers as well. After WWI and the drawing of the modern states of the Middle East on the map by the winners of the war, Bahdinan became part of the new Iraqi state, although it borders Turkey and Syria so these states are influential as well. For most of its history, the main definers of Iraq have conceived of it at an “Arab” state. But Bahdinan is home mainly to ethnic Kurds, and it has significant numbers of Assyrians, Chaldeans, and Turkomans as well. Iraq’s growing pains as a state, and efforts to define it in ethnic terms that excluded various groups (especially Kurds), have led to horrific violence. Since the American invasion of 2003, further waves of violence have swept Iraq, bringing many refuge-seekers to Bahdinan.

Waves of Violence: Some Samples

Here are a few of the instances of collective violence that have taken place in or bordering Bahdinan during the past century-and-a-half:

• Sheikh Ubaydallah, “the acknowledged leader of a vast Kurdish nationalist movement” (Jwaideh 1960: 253) went to battle against the Persians in 1880, attacking the city of Urmiah with 12,000 men (Nikitine 1929, cited in Jwaideh 1960: 258). McDowall (1996a: 54) notes that for a time the sheikh received the support of Nestorians in Tiyari, a strategic valley bordering Bahdinan, and goes on to describe a carnage in which more than 2,000 villages were destroyed and 10,000 people were made homeless.

• In the 1890s, the first of two major massacres of Armenians by Turks took place in the areas bordering Bahdinan to the northwest (see Sykes 1904, as well as many contemporary sources). The bloodshed resulted in migration by some surviving Armenians to Bahdinan, where some Kurdish chiefs harbored them; I have met a few of their descendants, who remained in Bahdinan. The Armenian pogroms are today regarded as a “genocide,” the first in the genocide-ridden 20th century. The Turkish government staunchly resists the “genocide” label.

• In 1933 a Kurdish general in the Iraqi army led his men on a killing spree of Assyrians in the Bahdinani town of Simel. Raphael Lemkin, the Polish lawyer famous for his efforts against genocide, was moved by this massacre to develop the “genocide” concept (Martin 1984:166).

• Three small-scale conflicts occurred in Bahdinan in 1961 as detailed by Schmidt (1964). Kurdish nationalist leader Mulla Mustafa Barzani led his followers against their neighbors the Rekanis, and approximately 500 Rekanis fled across the border into Turkey. In the second clash, Zibari tribe members raided a mainly-Christian area under Barzani control. Between 5,000 and 6,000 people fled toward Turkey, while the Zibaris fled to Iraqi-controlled Aqre and Mosul. The third clash that year was between the Barwaris and the Barzanis. According to Barzani reports, 98 Barwaris were killed, 200 surrendered, and others fled to Turkey. Then a faction of Barwaris defected to the Barzani side, bringing an abundant supply of arms with them.

• In 1988 one of the greatest mass killings of the 20th century took place in Bahdinan and neighboring areas: The Iraqi army, on orders from President Saddam Hussein, killed thousands of people, disappeared thousands more, and razed several thousand villages in the “Anfal” campaign. The killings were unofficially considered “genocide” by many, and in 2005 the District Court of The Hague made the label legal, at least in the Netherlands. During Anfal the government destroyed approximately 4,000 Kurdish villages. 200,000 people are believed to have perished (McDowall 1996b: 27; other sources include Gunter 1992, Human Rights Watch / Middle East 1995, and McDowall 1996a). Much of Anfal took place in Bahdinan. A series of maps detailing the attacks can be found here: http://www.rightsmaps.com/html/anfalful.html

Two of the waves of violence that I have inventoried were relatively small-scale. Three were anything but: they were genocides. These are simply samples; there have been many more conflicts in my field site than just these five.

Signs of Hope?

Given the history of violence in my field site, are there any signs of hope? I am happy to report that I do see some. For one, Bahdinan has largely been peaceful and stable since 1997, the end of the internecine conflict between the two main Kurdish parties in Iraq. Border areas with Turkey have continued to be dangerous, as they are the site of conflict between the PKK [Kurdistan Workers Party] and the Turkish military, but since this conflict is taking place in the high mountains, it does not directly affect the daily life of most people in Bahdinan. Attacks by Islamists happen very infrequently compared to some other areas in Iraq. The Kurdistan Regional Government (KRG) has brought about
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many improvements in civil society since taking over from the Iraqi Ba’th regime in 1991, and since the Ba’th regime’s ouster by the United States in 2003, the KRG has been recognized by the Iraqi government even though relations between the two are often strained. The recent period has been the most conflict-free that the region has seen since the 1830s.

Secondly, many of the conflicts in and around Bahdinan have been ethnosectarian in nature. This is evident even in the highly abbreviated examples I gave above - of “Kurds” and “Armenians” and people of other categories. Each of these identities is automatic in that it is passed on by a father to his children. Even as ethnosectarianism remains a major social force throughout the Middle East, each time I visit Bahdinan and Kurdistan, I hear people discussing and expressing hopes for a new way beyond ethnosectarian relating. Political parties have recently worked extra hard to display their inclusiveness. Perhaps this is the beginning of a shift to a new kind of citizenship in Iraq, which will affect Bahdinan as well. Time will tell. What I do know is that the violence of the past 200 years has caused incalculable human suffering, and I hope for increased awareness, advocacy, and action to militate against this awful trend.
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Arizona’s Immigration Law - S.B. 1070
By Josiah Heyman [jmheyman@utep.edu]
University of Texas-El Paso

Overview
Arizona law S.B. 1070, as amended by H.B. 2162 (S.B. 1070 henceforth), presents applied social scientists, and the publics with which they are connected, with several important issues. The core issue is that unauthorized migrants, and the communities that include them (which are often heavily Latino, but also African, Caribbean, and Asian) will be subject to intensified surveillance by state and local police, and criminal arrest, detention, and penalty as consequences. Interior policing as opposed to border policing of immigrants and deportation of unauthorized people by the federal government has roughly quadrupled in the last half-decade. Such deportations are disruptive of families and communities, and should be a concern of applied social scientists even when done by the federal government. But S.B. 1070 expands this concern to the much more pervasive interaction between state and local police and immigrant-heavy communities. It constitutes a key emergence point in the diffusion of a state and local enforcement approach to immigration restriction, previously approached mainly as a federal issue.

S.B. 1070 also raises the issue of the overlap in the U.S. imagination and in policing practice between Latino identity, phenotypes, and “illegalness,” even when unjustified by actual citizenship and immigration status. It signals the continuing importance of addressing migration issues, in the face of delays in passing federal comprehensive immigration reform legislation and the hidden issue of human and civil rights in border and immigration enforcement. At the same time, it is inappropriate to use the national failure to pass comprehensive immigration reform to excuse Arizona for the sorts of laws it passes and actions in some cases it tolerates. Finally, anxieties about the U.S.-Mexico border, realistic and imaginary, substantially motivated the passage of S.B. 1070, point toward the need for engagement with border issues.

S.B. 1070 Basics
S.B. 1070 is a complex law, with a number of unprecedented elements. The most important component is that it creates an Arizona state crime of being undocumented that is parallel to, but different from the federal administrative violation of unauthorized status and the crime of entry without inspection. Specifically, for any non-citizen not authorized to be in the United States, it is an Arizona state crime to fail to carry a federal immigration document issued to the person or to fail to register under a specific federal statute. By making this an Arizona crime, it gives probable cause for Arizona state and local police to make immigration-status based warrantless arrests.

The law gives the police specific mandates to enforce this law. The police must make efforts to determine the immigration status of anyone they have reasonable suspicion of being undocumented, when lawfully stopping, detaining, or arresting a person, except when that would interfere with an investigation. In other words, police (given a set of subjective suspicions) must inquire into immigration status, in any sort of enforcement, with limited exceptions for investigations, even if the underlying encounter has nothing to do with immigration. Many police departments previously had policies or practices of not inquiring into immigration statuses when that was irrelevant to the violation or situation at hand. When the person is arrested under S.B. 1070, their immigration status must be determined before they can be released. An Arizona driver's license is presumptive evidence of authorized or citizen status. Any violation that can lead to federal administrative deportation is grounds for warrantless criminal arrest in Arizona.

In developing the “reasonable suspicion” of undocumented status needed to detain a person to determine their actual immigration status, officers may not consider race, color, or national origin except to the extent allowed by the United States or Arizona constitutions. State and local agencies are disallowed from restricting enforcement of immigration laws, enforceable by private lawsuits.

S.B. 1070 also makes it a crime for non-authorized immigrants to work or solicit work, a parallel set of crime to federal laws. It makes a crime of such persons hiring or being hired if the new employee enters a car that is blocking traffic. These provisions are aimed at day laborers, although they cover a wider range of people and situations. The bill makes human smuggling an Arizona crime in addition to already being a federal crime, using fairly specific language. Finally, when a non-citizen who is unlawfully present is discharged after conviction of a crime, federal authorities must be notified.

From 1993 onward, there has been a huge buildup of federal immigration enforcement at the southwest border, including an increase of the Border Patrol to 20,000 officers and approximately 700 miles of wall. Surveys in Mexico of past and future migrants show that this enforcement does not deter people from attempting the crossing and that prior to 2009, did not successfully halt their ultimate entry. Since 2009, unauthorized flows have slowed, but it is unclear if this is because of slumping U.S. job markets or that for the first time, border enforcement has worked. One effect of the changes in enforcement after 1993 has been to displace the unauthorized entrances along the border, in particular to Arizona, which has become a focal point of dangerous modes of entry (walking across deserts and mountains), human smuggling, temporary shelter, and transportation to other states. Meanwhile, a comprehensive immigration solution like that of 1986, but without some of its obvious flaws, has repeatedly been proposed in Congress but has failed to pass.

Although many laws penalize both migrants the those that hire them, migrants are far more powerless than members of the dominant society (i.e., actual businesses) within the unauthorized migration system. In the meantime, local police and sheriff’s departments in Arizona (and other locations) have approached immigrants in very different ways, but one noticeable actor has been Maricopa County (Phoenix area) Sheriff Joe Arpaio, who has conducted street sweeps and other roundups of Latinos in order to identify unauthorized migrants to be held for deportation. S.B. 1070 would legalize the arguably extralegal operations of Mr. Arpaio.

The law specifies that the police may not consider race, color, or national origin except to the extent allowed by the United States or Arizona constitutions. This is ambiguous, because court decisions have allowed space for profiling of apparent national origin in immigration enforcement, in specific ways. Furthermore, legal provisions are one thing; police practice is another, in a state where a major law enforcement agency (the Arizona Department of

Specific prejudices against Mexico and Mexicans intersect with a widespread sense of fear and anxiety. Fear of immigrant crime and border violence are exacerbated by the media, in particular its tendency toward reporting the exciting (and thus frightening) “event of the moment,” regardless of actual causes, patterns, or frequencies. Such representations play on the key symbol of the border as protection from external danger and disorder. Key Arizona politicians running for or holding elective office (Governor Brewer, Sheriffs Arpaio and Babau, and so forth) are also responsible for stirring up fear and loathing, often providing the media with unsupported “facts” and divisive rhetoric. The Pima County (Tucson area) Sheriff, Clarence Dupnik, expressed this pointedly: “this is a media-created event. I hear politicians on TV say that the border has gotten worse; well the face of the matter is that the border has never been more secure.” Fear of social change, and desire for walls (physical and metaphorical) to block such change, are fundamental drivers of reaction against migration.

The core issue is the distinction between legal status and actual participation. Unauthorized migrants participate in our lives, and we in theirs. They work in businesses that we own, or from which we purchase goods and services, and this applies both directly (e.g., at many restaurants) and indirectly, as part of the entire web of the economy. They live in houses and apartments that we rent out, even sell, and which are located in our neighborhoods and wider urban systems. Their children attend schools with our children, and they become our high school and college students. Their careful law-abidingness accounts for much of the increasing safety of our communities. Demographically, they renew our populations, and personally, bring the joy of children and youth to an aging society. Legality, however, draws an absolute line of separation across these bonds of interchange, sociality, and mutual recognition as humans and community members. Legality, as we have seen, is desired by almost all the unauthorized, but for most of them impossible to obtain, unless and until we have comprehensive reform. Therefore, illegalization creates a group of less-than-people in the midst of the “real” human beings. The question is, do unauthorized migrants deserve emergency medical services or K-12 public education, two services that by law and court decision are open to citizens do not currently need to carry identification (versus the various categories of legal immigrants and visitors); this law may particularly impact Hispanic citizens, and may result in the introduction of a universal national identification system so such people can demonstrate their lawful presence. So, the question is, do we want a national ID?

Implications for Applied Anthropologists and other Applied Social Scientists

Laws and ordinances of various sorts aimed at unauthorized migrants are spreading across U.S. states and localities. Responding to such initiatives is an important task for applied social scientists—indeed, beyond responding to them, we should be anticipating and forestalling them. This points to collaborative work with communities. Alliances need to be developed with immigrant community members and organizations, and supportive institutions, including ones that previously had not necessarily been considered relevant, such as local police departments. The applied social science should emerge from the needs of specific alliances and situations; it can include elements such as research, synthesis of existing research sources (policy briefs), content and issue analysis, public education in ways that resemble existing teaching, other forms of communication, meeting with elected officials, and so forth. It also draws us into public policy at all levels, including municipal, state, federal, and even transnational policy (as we work with migrant political organizations across borders).

The state and local initiatives are an attack on the whole life of people. Federal enforcement is comparable, of course, insofar as it involves the absolutely drastic act of removal, but the panoply of proposed state and local laws specifically aim to disrupt or deprive people of many different features of daily life, including employment, housing, transportation, health, business ownership, education, and so forth. They aim to eliminate or severely restrict the
normal functions required of existence. While an interpretation that such laws attack the reproductive dimensions of immigrants as opposed to affecting the labor supply is too simple—since there are laws attacking employment and seeking arrest and removal altogether—it does capture an important tendency in recent proposals. That is to attack immigrants “being here,” in a community, the totality of life. Arguably, the goal of such laws is to drive away these stigmatized insider-outsiders by harassing them, by making their lives insecure, miserable, impossible. It therefore seems central that we work collectively to defend a positive vision of productive, satisfying, dignified, and contributive community life on the part of all persons, citizens, legal immigrants, and unauthorized immigrants. A vision of shared community seems fundamental here. I have previously called this mutual moral recognition, a recognition of what we give and get from each other in our communities. Ohio State anthropologist Jeffrey Cohen in a perceptive comment on S.B. 1070, suggests that S.B. 1070 reduces wide issues of migration and immigration law reform, involving many actors and forces, to an isolated group, migrants, a targeting that makes an already vulnerable group even more vulnerable. As he suggests, we need to push the debate toward deeper issues, including global connections and the economics of migration, and issues of the moral economy (e.g., open, fair, dignified labor). It is also important to make the public aware that this is a shared issue, not just an immigrant or even Latino issue; that we all benefit from equal protection and fair policing.

Various sorts of stigmas and invidious distinctions are raised by S.B. 1070. The legal/unauthorized distinction is, of course, obvious in the bill, and is discussed above. On the other hand, the bill hides its racism, in particular in the clause against racial or national origin profiling (readily enough bypassed by an outrageous police unit like the Maricopa County Sheriff’s Department). Yet among a large segment of the U.S. population—though by no means all—Mexican is identical with foreigner with illegal alien (speaking here of symbols, and not realities). There is a nativist and also skin color-racist hostility to Mexican-origin people in some corners of the United States, just as the Mexican-origin population of the country grows in size and importance. We have seen this before, in hateful reactions to the Irish, Chinese, southern and eastern Europeans, and others. Other elements of prejudice, including a horror of poor, working people, and fear of women, children, and demographic change, also have to be confronted. Yet the other side of this great struggle is advocacy for immigrants, as symbolized by Emma Lazarus’s poem inscribed on the Statue of Liberty. To advocate for an ample, inclusive, and creative vision of the American community, one that benefits from adding new peoples and demands for new opportunities and rights, is a vital task at this time. U.S. history demonstrates the practical worth and humanistic beauty of this inclusive vision.

Certainly, we know far more about immigrants than hosts, which hobbles our ability to understand and contribute to the public debate. Difficult as it may be, we need to understand better the people who respond to immigrants with powerful emotions and viewpoints of rigid exclusion, and to be comprehensive, also those in the host community who are folk cosmopolitans, who reach across such would-be distinctions. It appears from the timing of S.B. 1070 (though not all such state and local initiatives) that scapegoating was key; Arizona is one of the states most badly impacted by the bursting of the real estate bubble and the human suffering of mortgage foreclosures. Obviously, in a rational view, unauthorized immigrants had almost nothing to do with this. But we need to recognize, understand, and fend off scapegoating. Also, anxieties about the U.S.-Mexico border are central to S.B. 1070. Much better understanding of how to fight back against the powerful distortions induced by the news media, perhaps in collaboration with communications scholars and professionals, is called for. A symbolic analysis of border fears is unavoidable and necessary; the border readily represents the boundary between safe interior and threatening exterior (especially in a period of corrosive globalization), and people and other materials that cross such a symbolic border are dangerous and polluting matter out of place. Though largely unrelated to migration, a violence-producing, ineffective drug policy makes things worse, and needs also to be addressed. Such conceptual frameworks are hard to resist, but that must be done if we are to have realistic and humane relations with Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean. The first step is envisioning the border, together with immigrant communities, as the future of us all. It is indeed a good future.

Josiah Heyman is Professor of Anthropology and Chair of the Sociology and Anthropology Department, University of Texas at El Paso. He is a member of the Border and Immigration Task Force and President of the Board for the Border Network for Human Rights, and was former chair of the SFAA Public Policy Committee. His vision of positive, practical alternatives to current migration policies can be found in his book, Finding a Moral Heart for U.S. Immigration Policy (American Anthropological Association, 1998). This newsbriefing can be found in its entirety, including references for further reading at http://sfaa.net/committees/humanrights/AZImmigrationLawSB1070.pdf.
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Ways to challenge ourselves in responding to Arizona’s SB1070

By Merrill Eisenberg [Merrill@u.arizona.edu]
President-Elect, SfAA
University of Arizona

The Policy Committee has been focusing on immigration issues since the advent of Arizona’s new law. Joe Heyman’s astute analysis of the immigration situation, which appears elsewhere in this Newsletter, is very helpful in understanding this complicated issue. Heyman’s piece makes it clear that the forces behind the political situation that led to passage of SB 1070 in Arizona were not solely related to racism. Although the law, as passed, did satisfy and empower the racists among us, characterizing Arizona as a “racist state” is a one dimensional simplification of the issue that does not further our understanding, nor does it inform a remedy. Here in Arizona, families as well as the government are hurting economically, and as always, the “other” are convenient scapegoats. The impact of the crossers on border property and the environment is real, and the participation of drug smugglers produces real danger both at the border and in the neighborhoods where drugs and crossers are housed. Portrayals of the situation in the press are based on a simplistic framing of the situation in terms of legality/illegality, with little mention of how our economy has depended on these people and how they have enriched our communities over the years. The result is that public opinion strongly supports 1070, and candidates for state and local political office that support 1070 are likely to win voter approval, making reversal of the law even more unlikely than it currently is (which is not likely at all!)

The SfAA membership responded to the passage of SB1070 with outrage and indignation, with several members urging, indeed demanding, that the Board announce a boycott of Arizona as a potential meeting site for our 2013 conference. The Board took this symbolic action in May. However, from a policy perspective, our action has little impact other than to make us feel good. From a practical perspective, we ended up voting to boycott Tucson as a meeting site, even though Tucson was the first city to approve a legal challenge to the law and the Pima County Sheriff announced early on that he had no intention of enforcing the law. In the end, we hurt our political allies, and had absolutely no impact on those to whom we wanted to send a message.

At this writing, the Federal Court has enjoined most of the particularly outrageous portions of the law, and the Governor of Arizona has appealed to the 9th Circuit Court. It will likely be months before a final outcome is reached. In the meantime, the question remains - what can we, as concerned individuals and as an association of applied social scientists, do to address the immigration issue? This is not just an Arizona issue - many other states are considering emulating the Arizona law so it is likely that this is coming to your neighborhood as well. As Heyman says, we need to anticipate and forestall these actions by participating in community conversation, forwarding a vision of “shared community.” I suggest that this means developing and using a communication frame that places the issue of illegal immigration in a social ecology framework using language that everyday citizens and policy makers can understand.

To that end, the Society is planning to use our upcoming annual meeting in Seattle to highlight immigration issues. The topic of our School of Advanced Research (SAR) plenary session will be “Migrants and Guest Workers.” In addition, SfAA is seeking funds from the Washington Humanities Council to sponsor community forums in three cities in Washington State (Bellingham, Wenatchee, and Yakima) during our annual meeting next March. The forums are meant to engage the general public in a balanced conversation on immigration and its consequences. Each one will be conducted by two SAR scholars in collaboration with two local humanities scholars. This outreach effort is an exciting new addition to our usual conference activities which have typically been directed exclusively at ourselves. Many thanks to Tom May, Melissa Cope, and others on our SfAA staff for developing this opportunity!
Another action that the Policy Committee urges the Board to consider is joining the Consortium of Professional and Academic Associations, an ad hoc group of scholarly organizations that came together to oppose SB1070 as well as Arizona’s other disgraceful new law which prohibits the teaching of ethnic studies. The group held a press conference on the lawn of the Arizona state Capitol in May, wrote a letter to Governor Brewer, and issued a press release which was picked up by many media outlets, including the Chronicle for Higher Education. Member organizations are each responding to the issue based on their own resources. Some support legal challenges and others working with local community activists to conduct public education and document the law’s implementation. There is surely strength in numbers, and the voice of SfAA will be amplified in the policy debate when we join with others. Groups that have joined the Consortium to date include:

- American Studies Association (ASA)
- Asian American Psychological Association (AAPA)
- Association of Asian American Studies (AAAS)
- Chicano/Latino Faculty and Staff Association, ASU (CLFSA)
- City University of New York (CUNY) Graduate Center’s Immigration Working Group
- Joint Coordinating Committee of Mexican, US, and Canadian Historians
- Justice Studies Association (JSA)
- Law and Society Association (LSA)
- MAVIN Foundation
- Mujeres Activas en Letras y Cambio Social (MALCS)
- National Association for Chicano and Chicana Studies (NACCS)
- National Association for Ethnic Studies (NAES)
- Native American and Indigenous Studies Association (NAISA)
- Peace and Justice Studies Association (PJSA)
- Psychologists for Social Responsibility (PsySR)
- San Francisco State University (SFSU), College of Ethnic Studies (multiple programs):
  - Department of Africana Studies; Department of American Indian Studies; Department of Asian American Studies; Department of Raza Studies; Race and Resistance Program; Arab and Muslim Ethnicities in Diaspora Program; César E. Chavez Institute
- Science Fiction Research Association (SFRA)
- Society for Adv. of Chicanos/Hispanics & Native Americans in Science (SACNAS)
- Society for Community Research and Action (SCRA)
- Society for the Study of Social Problems (SSSP)
- Sociologists for Women in Society (SWS)
- Sociologists Without Borders (Sociologos Sin Fronteras) (SSF)
- Therapists for Social Responsibility

As individuals who are concerned about the future of immigration reform, I believe we should heed Joe Heyman’s advice and begin to engage the public in a balanced conversation about immigration and human rights, and that we should do this at home, in our own back yards and in the communities in which we work. Here in Arizona I see a need for proponents of both sides of the issue to broaden their frame of reference, to stop demonizing each other, and to discover the common values that can serve to bring us toward a humane solution. Obviously, a more rational national immigration policy is needed, but until the vitriol dies down, federal lawmakers will have no stomach for taking up this issue, and if they are forced to do so, the debate will only further divide us. One of the most lasting lessons we were taught by the consummate politician Tip O’Neill is that all “politics is local.” We must start to raise the level of public debate in our own communities before real and humane immigration reform can be realized.

**Public Policy Committee**

**Using the Freedom of Information Act as an Anthropological Tool**

By David H. Price [dprice@stmartin.edu]

St. Martin’s University, Lacey WA

The Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), and state public records laws are valuable but underutilized research resources for anthropologists engaged in public policy work. Since 1966, FOIA has allowed individuals to request documents from federal agencies under principles that the public has a right to know the workings of governmental agencies.
Think of FOIA as a powerful tool allowing researchers access to a massive unorganized database containing any record ever created or held by the U.S. Government; these records range from databases, reports, analytical projections to unprocessed raw data. Anthropologists working in advocacy roles or on issues of public policy can gain access to an incredible amount of untapped information by using FOIA to access governmental records and electronic databases. The possibilities of using FOIA requests for anthropological research are limited only by the extent to which governmental reports, correspondence or records exist relating to a given topic of inquiry.

Barbara Rose Johnston used FOIA to access historical records of the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) relating to her work with Marshallese populations who were victims on U.S. weapons testing. Johnston also used FOIA released documents released by an NGO relating to the Chixoy Dam in Guatemala. Johnston found that in both of these instances, the information she gained was useful, but incomplete (in the case of the AEC documents, she was given fewer documents than journalist Patrick Tierney had been given for similar requests) and at times consisting of newspaper reports that were publicly available. Johnston says that “FOIA gives you access to those files that are accessible at the time you make a request—files that represent a slice of the story—essentially those records which someone at some time thought important enough to squirrel away in a federal closet.”

Laura McNamara recently used Defense Department and FBI documents released by ACLU FOIA lawsuits in her research refuting claims that anthropological knowledge was informing post-9/11 American torture practices.

I have made extensive use of FOIA to access records ranging from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Central Intelligence Agency, Department of Energy, the Department of State, and the Department of Defense to collect tens of thousands of pages of documents relating to a variety of historical interactions between anthropologists and U.S. military and intelligence agencies. Some of these records document the widespread monitoring by the FBI of anthropologists engaged in progressive activism on issues relating to racial equality, or economic justice. Other records document a range of work that applied anthropologists have historically done working for military and intelligence agencies during the Second World War and the Cold War. As a citizen involved in public advocacy work, I have also used Washington State’s public records laws to access documents and even emails sent by members of my local school board and to have local governmental in-house studies released to the public. In the mid 1990s I worked as an applied anthropologist on a project making recommendations to the US Department of Education and once I resigned from the project I made FOIA requests to access records satisfying my curiosity that DoE had not taken program evaluator’s comments (like mine and many others) seriously.

The strength of FOIA legislation has varied over the past forty four years as governmental transparency rises and falls with political tides. Post-Watergate legislation strengthened FOIA, and Reagan era legislation restricted FOIA and allowed broad national security exemptions limiting a range of releasable documents. After the terrorist attacks of September 2001, President Bush issued agency guidelines that limited the flow of information, and 2002 and 2003 legislation further restricted what information could be released to individuals or organizations representing foreign governments. While federal agencies continue to have a renewed concern with protecting possibly sensitive information, FOIA remains an important means for researchers trying to access governmental documents.

FOIA legislation allows several exemptions to the release of records. These include exemptions such as: national security data, internal materials, personnel records, legally privileged material, privacy protections, and investigative records pertaining to ongoing investigations. When records or portions of records are withheld from FOIA release, agencies are required to specify which exemptions were used to withhold release; requesters can appeal withholdings first at the governmental agency, and if unsatisfied with this outcome, in federal court. Some governmental agencies charge fees to search for and process documents, other agencies (e.g. the FBI, or Department of Energy) provide FOIA requesters with up to 100 pages of documents without charge, and will charge ten-cents for each additional page. Some federal agencies now accept online FOIA applications (for example, see the Department of State's online FOIA application at: http://foia.state.gov/foiareq/foialetter.asp)

While FOIA legislation provides requirements for the release of records held by federal agencies, records held by state and local governmental bodies are accessible through provisions in state public records laws. Public records legislation varies greatly from state to state. The Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press has produced a useful online guide explaining open records laws for each state: http://www.rcfp.org/oggl/ In many states, public records laws allows individual to access things like the emails of elected officials or any other state employee that are sent on public email accounts. The Global Integrity Commons’ website has compiled useful information on public records laws for countries around the globe and is an excellent resource for anthropologists working outside the U.S. who are interested in using FOIA laws in other nations (http://commons.globalintegrity.org/2009/03/freedom-of-information-comparative.html).
The mechanics of filing a FOIA request are simple. First, a requester must identify the agency to which a FOIA will be made and find the address for the agency’s FOIA officer. Each federal agency processes its own FOIA requests. The requester simply writes a letter requesting documents; the more specific the request is, the better. Requesters should make it as easy as possible for those receiving these requests to understand what records they are after. Over the past two decades I have made several hundreds of FOIA requests and have a record of success by keeping my requests very simple. If I am after a specific document, I simply describe the document as best I can in a paragraph or so; if I am after records on a specific individual or organization, I simply provide a few paragraphs of information that might be useful in indentifying the individual or organization.

If the requested records relate to a specific individual, the request must either provide a verified authorization from this person (usually this is done by providing a notarized letter from the individual), or proof of the individual’s death in the form of a published obituary (proof of death is not required if the deceased individual was born over 100 years ago). These steps are needed because the Privacy Act protects living individuals’ records, when we die, our legal rights to privacy die with us.

Different agencies have different policies relating to fees for requests and photocopies of records, but if you will be making the results of your work available to the public, you may apply to have search fees waved under programs in place for educators or journalists. An excellent list of the addresses of a number of federal FOIA officers can be found online at: http://www.justice.gov/oip/foiacontacts.htm and sample FOIA request letters can be found online at sites such as this example at the USDA’s website: http://www.fas.usda.gov/info/FOIA/sample.html.

Anthropologists using FOIA and public records laws must consider both legal and ethical issues arising by the access and use of particular documents. Access to documents under FOIA is mitigated by laws, but the legal limits of access do not resolve anthropologists’ ethical issues arising when using FOIA. As with general considerations of legal and ethical dimensions of anthropological research: just because information can legally be accessed, it does not follow that it necessarily ethically should be used. In a world where it may be legally simple for researchers to access the workplace emails of a governmental office workers under FOIA, the ethical issues raised by such nonconsensual invasive monitoring are not as easily resolved as the legal issues and anthropologists need to consult professional ethics codes when facing such dilemmas.

Many anthropologists are unaware that records they collect or data they generate on projects receiving governmental funding (local, state or federal funds) could be subject to FOIA requests. Any such records requests or releases would need to undergo a Privacy Act review that would remove any specific identifiers of individuals’ identities in the released documents (e.g., individual names or other identifiers would be redacted from released materials) before release. Anthropologists need to mindful of the ethical commitments to the populations we work with and study, and be aware of the possibility that notes and other records could possibly be accessed by others through FOIA requests and keep identities and sensitive data safe.

I would encourage any anthropologists working on issues of public policy or in an advocacy capacity that finds them engaging with local, state or governmental agencies to consider making FOIA and public records request for documents that can significantly supplement the other forms of data they collect and analyze.

Noel Chrisman Applies Anthropology through Community-Based Participatory Research in Community Health and Nursing: An Excerpt from SfAA Oral History Project Interview

By John van Willigen [John.vanWilligen@uky.edu]
Chair, SfAA Oral History Committee
University of Kentucky

This transcript is of an interview with Noel Chrisman done by Elizabeth Strober for the Society for Applied Anthropology Oral History Project. Noel is on the faculty of the University of Washington, School of Nursing where he is involved in cross-cultural nursing and cultural competence training. In his research and practice he has been a consistent practitioner of Community-Based Participatory Research in health. Noel Chrisman has served the Society as its President 2001-2003. The interview was conducted on January 4, 2002 in Seattle. Elizabeth Strober is on the faculty in the Department of Anthropology, Sociology and Social Work at Seattle University. This transcript has been edited for continuity by removing repetition, conversational restarts and hesitations and it is also abridged.

Society for Applied Anthropology
STROBER: This is Noel Chrisman, interviewed by Liz Strober, and it is January 4th, 2002, already. All right. How did you find anthropology originally?

CHRISMAN: Accidentally I had an open course slot in my sophomore year of college. I was in zoology, and my advisor said, “Well, you’ll like anthropology,” because in those days [in] anthropology all four fields were taught in one semester. Except for linguistics, so three. And I did, I loved it, because the first half was all physical anthropology, and you know, that fit directly with what I was interested in, and in the second half, I didn’t like as much, the socio cultural part, probably because we had to learn basket weaving and stuff like that. But in that same semester, I dropped chemistry, because I didn’t understand a word of it, and I had this huge amount of extra time to spend on anthropology. So I read almost everything, I read a lot in physical anthropology, and probably even more in ethnography, and so I was hooked.

STROBER: And it was originally the physical anthropology that you related to most?

CHRISMAN: Yeah. And in my first teaching job I taught physical anthropology. So I taught physical until I got here.

STROBER: And when you started out taking this course, it was just not even particularly of interest.

CHRISMAN: It wasn’t interesting or not. My roommate had taken it the semester before, because I remember him one of the textbooks was Le Gros Clark’s little book on *The Antecedents Of Man* and I remember the green color, and one of the assignments that he did, though I didn’t, was to do a genealogy, what I later learned to be a genealogy. He just had a big piece of paper and he drew on it [Chuckles – Strober]. So it’s, I hadn’t the faintest idea what anthropology was.

STROBER: And then once you kind of got a toe in there, what do you think? It kind of sucked you in?

CHRISMAN: I was sucked in anyway, and you know, it was first physical, then ethnography and then I went through a hiatus, I, I got angry at the professor because he gave me a B for very good reasons, so I got a C on the final. And so I tried out sociology, and I hated sociology.

STROBER: Really!

CHRISMAN: ... except for two things ... we had to do two book reports. One of them, and we could choose from books, and the first set, I chose Ruth Benedict’s *Patterns of Culture*, perfect. And the second set, I chose William Foote Whyte *Street Corner Society* and Whyte, as you know was one of the founders of the Society [for Applied Anthropology] and has been my hero ever since.

STROBER: It just took one book.

CHRISMAN: Yeah [Chuckles - Strober], well, it taught me that . . . anthropologists, I mean even though he was a sociologist, he has worked with anthropology, and so I could see in ‘Street Corner Society’ that I could go do that kind of stuff, you know, ethnic urban research in the United States, and then it would be valuable and interesting. In fact, [as] part of that book report I did some field research, by accident and I, you may remember that part of the book is what later became network analysis of the ‘Corner Boys’ and I did kind of a slap-dash one of the teenage boys who came to visit my cousin at Christmas vacation, because that’s where I was during that time. So I did research.

STROBER: At the start of your career, what questions were you interested in?

CHRISMAN: Huh . . . let’s talk about graduate school.

STROBER: Okay.

CHRISMAN: And I had a very good education in both social anthropology and cultural anthropology, and so, I was interested in, in how life is constructed, how is social life constructed, and I was interested in both the social parts and the cultural parts. So the way that showed up in my dissertation was that I looked at Danish-American immigrants in the San Francisco Bay area, notice how it fits with what Whyte had done. I would have done that research in Kampala,
Uganda, except I didn’t get the grant, I did want to finish. So, I looked at voluntary associations and their influence on the persistence of an ethnic group. So it was partly structural, you know, how do you form relationships in a city that will maintain ethnic identity among people, and then what are the cultural components, you know, the identity part, what is it that feeds into it. So the question was, how do you construct urban social life? There was a subsidiary question which was applied, and that has a longer history. When I fell in love with anthropology, I went to see the professor and asked what could you do if you were an anthropologist, and he said, “Well there are only two things to do, if you’re an anthropologist. One is to teach anthropology to anthropologists who will teach anthropology to anthropologists and endlessly.” That’s what he did. And then the other thing, he clearly was discouraging about this one. The other thing to do is that you can advise the government mostly, and maybe businesses, on how to accomplish certain aims that the government or business has. And the example he used is a continuing example today, and that is how do you get the “Baga Baga” to accept latrines and that’s still an issue in applied anthropology today. Well, the notion of teaching anthropologists to become anthropologists sounded okay, but didn’t sound interesting, but this business of actually doing something really did sound interesting. So, back to my dissertation. In graduate school, I went to Berkeley, and George Foster was there, who is one of the premiere applied anthropologists, and so I took his course, and then I did a reading course on social change, and in preparation for my preliminary exams, I just read gigantic amounts of applied anthropology. I sat down with the journal called Applied Anthropology and then later Human Organization and just read it. That’s another place where I fell in love with William Foote Whyte . . . so I, I was interested in applied anthropology. I couldn’t do much with it in graduate school, because of the bias about applied anthropology. But in my dissertation there is an applied appendix. I was getting my money in public health at that point, and so I looked at the effects of this construction of social life in a city on mental health, and I didn’t do a very good job at that, because I didn’t know what I was doing. There was an automatic applied feature to whatever kind of work I was doing. So, the two questions then were how do you construct social and cultural life in cities, and second, how do you apply this information, and in my case I wanted to apply it on health issues.

STROBER: You mentioned a, a bias that was felt during your graduate school years. What was that like?

CHRISMAN: There is a hundred . . . two-ton gorilla in the middle of the room and no one talks about it?

STROBER: Yes!

CHRISMAN: Well, this was not a two-ton gorilla, because it was such an insignificant issue, but it was in the middle of the room and no one talked about it. And that most, most of the reason why people didn’t talk about it was because it didn’t enter their consciousness.

STROBER: I see.

CHRISMAN: I don’t remember any explicit conversations, the people I ran around with had a variety of interests, psychological anthropology, Latin America, some Africanists. There was a big fad, a couple of years before my orals, in being interested in the history of anthropology. So there was no cohort of people interested in applied work. Those of us who took the social change reading course had an interest in applied work, but not very heavy. So what—we knew it was the wrong thing to do, it was a bad, you know, that’s a bad choice to make, because it’s immoral to make change.

STROBER: I see.

CHRISMAN: You know, I’m imputing that.

STROBER: . . . So it [was] taboo. [Chuckles – Strober]

CHRISMAN: Well . . .

STROBER: . . . It was an early anthropology taboo.

CHRISMAN: Yeah.

STROBER: Have you always been interested in applied anthropology in the sense that did it play a role in your work from the very beginning?

CHRISMAN: Well, you’ve heard about it in my dissertation.

STROBER: Mm-mm.

CHRISMAN: Then, what I did after that I did a post-doc in public health. I did that because I was interested in what was going to become medical anthropology. But that work in public health really solidified, and it formed my way of understanding applied anthropology. In some cases there was a synergistic interaction, and in some cases it was just brand new stuff, like epidemiology. But, since I think applied anthropologists have to know two fields, their own and the one they work in, this was, you know, a real leg up, and that’s what Foster had said was, he wanted me to take courses while I was still in graduate school, and I didn’t. But he said, it will teach you how to talk their language, and that was just crucial. So there was that very early. And then in my first teaching job, I taught applied anthropology most years . . . and the thing I think is so interesting is that I taught at first in 1967. I used Benjamin Paul’s book on health community and health culture and community [Health, Culture and Community: Case Studies of Public Reactions to Health Programs, 1954], as one of the textbooks, and, but we only spent two weeks of class time on what later became a yearlong piece of work for me on medical anthropology. So, applied has always been around, it’s always been applied medical in some sort of way. My research at that time was urban, and not applied, and not medical. And then when . . .

STROBER: Down the line.

CHRISMAN: Pardon?
STROBER: De—urban down the line.

CHRISMAN: Yeah. And there was where all my publishing was, it was on urban stuff. In fact once I went to the University of South Florida for a visit. And the first time I went, I was an urban anthropologist, and then I went ten years later, and they had invited me as a medical anthropologist, and I was talking to this woman who didn’t remember me, and I said, “well, don’t you remember? I was here ten years ago.” And she said, “Well, I just thought that was another Chrisman” [Laughter - Strober]. So I guess your identity is hugely important in this field [Laughter - Strober]. So, when I got here, I conceived of everything I did as applied anthropology, because my job was and still is, to help nurses and other health practitioners make change in order to make lives better for patients. So I, my teaching is not direct out there, doing whatever applied anthropologists do, but it’s applied in an academic setting. I was saying on the phone to somebody yesterday though that I had to be talked into joining NAPA, because I didn’t see my work as applied enough to join NAPA.

STROBER: How would you conceive what folks in NAPA were doing?

CHRISMAN: I thought of them as the ones who were employed by business or government to help the Baga Baga adopt latrines.

STROBER: I see. You talked a little bit about that change that happened in your own identity and at the same time in the field of moving into the label of medical anthropology. Has that been a helpful thing overall?

CHRISMAN: Well, I didn’t change the label, I added. I mean I haven’t stopped being an urban anthropologist. I have stopped teaching that course here. I mean the last time I taught it, it was about five years ago, and that’s just because I’m so busy doing applied anthropology that I don’t have time to fiddle around with it, and I still keep up to some extent on the literature. It turned out that the addition of an official medical anthropology statement to myself was real helpful in the field, in the general field of anthropology. I started making that change in the early seventies, and not long after that, by the mid to the late of ‘70s of medical anthropology started to take off, and so there I was, you know, right in the beginning of something that has now, I think, become a really significant sub-field in anthropology. So that was helpful. You know, in the ‘60s and ‘70s, medical anthropology, at least the way I read it was much more applied, you know, it, in my mind came out of applied roots. For me, medical anthropology was applied anthropology. My research, however, was pure anthropology, well, influenced a lot by health services and medicine. But it wasn’t—and it could [be] applied, I mean I used all the data and theoretical jumps that I made in my teaching so that I think it was having an applied effect, but I didn’t think of it as applied. There, there is a parallel story here, it took me a while to become a member of The Society for Applied Anthropology, and I can’t remember if I did that in the ‘60s or the early ‘70s. But that was, you know, there’s, there is something that took a while, like I was a member of the AAA, starting in 1964, so I conceived of myself as an anthropologist, that, just I didn’t do much with applied in an official way.

STROBER: And then what do you think change that attracted you then to SfAA?

CHRISMAN: It’s the only place to go, and, and remember my interest had always been applied anthropology. I was teaching it. So, if I can remember when I started, which probably is not hard ‘72.

STROBER: ‘72.

CHRISMAN: At that point, let’s see, I was trying to get out of Southern California, and I really wanted to work in a health science center. So I think that I conceived of that shift as much more applied.

STROBER: And when you went and joined SfAA, who were the other characters that you related with, or worked with, on early projects that were also members?

CHRISMAN: Nobody. I, I went to my first applied meeting in 1973, I think, just as I was taking this job, and I didn’t know anybody. I knew the people from South Florida, because I had visited there, but I didn’t really understand what they were doing, and I only knew two or three. I met some people, like Joan Cassell whose name you may know. She does the work on surgeons, and Del Jones, you know, who just died. But that was, you know, sitting around at a party b-s-ing. So, I never did see much relationship between my work and what I could read in Human Organization, or whom I met at the SfAA meetings. The SfAA meetings were a time to, you know, like any meeting, to sit around and talk and get to know people better and to hear papers. Now, there was a big shift for me . . . and—oh and I did not attend meetings consistently. I attended that one, because I was looking for a way to get out of southern California [Chuckles - Strober] . . .
STROBER: That seems significant.
CHRISMAN: Yeah. Sometime in the early ’90s, I needed to learn some stuff, about how to do evaluation. And so I went to the meetings. I think these were the ones in Albuquerque, and I just went to every session I could, and just sat there and took notes, you know, just like a graduate student, learning all this stuff. So, evidently one’s interaction with the meetings depends on what you need to know.
STROBER: That makes a lot of sense.
CHRISMAN: At the AAA meetings I tend to go to papers that friends give, or sessions that sound interesting, but it’s not this thirst for having to have a particular kind of knowledge at a particular time, that I feel many times at the SfAA meetings.
STROBER: Mm-mm. Which collaborations and projects thus far have been the most memorable for you?
CHRISMAN: Well, one of the most memorable collaborations was with Arthur Kleinman, and that didn’t have much to do with applied anthropology at all, it, but it was an incredibly exciting and interesting working relationship between about ’76 and ’83, whenever it would be, the years he was here, because we met in the first two weeks he was here and we started working together at that point. I mean, he and I had exactly complementary interest. He was much better at the cultural aspects of illness, and I was much better at the social aspects of illness, and so the two of us collaborated. I just grew horrendously at that time, and he says he did too. So that was real positive. And the, the direct applied outcome of that collaboration was the clinically applied anthropology book.
STROBER: Right.
CHRISMAN: So he and I, and Gabe Smilkstein, a guy in family medicine, had been working in the medical school, I had been working in the nursing school, and we were, and there were a few other people across the country who were being sort of self conscious or reflexive or something about their work in trying to change the health care system through changing practitioners. So, it was, it was very good medical anthropology collaboration, and I think a significant step forward in both medical anthropology and applied anthropology to have people start thinking about this stuff differently. So that’s one. The second, ...another really good project and collaboration was the Yakima work that’s published in HO in ’99. And there I collaborated with a woman named June Strickland who at the time was working for the cancer information service in Seattle, and later, about two or three years later, became a faculty member here, in the school of nursing. She’s got a PhD in higher education and thinks of herself as a health educator, and she is a nurse. So she had an interest in public health, she had an interest in minority health, because she is Native American and the two of us worked together, did this really neat participatory action research project. There was another of those accidents. We did our work according to where we were coming from, and she...
came from health education, and I came from applied anthropology, and we literally constructed that project. I mean, we had a proposal and it was funded, but the project was really constructed in the car on the way over to Yakima and back, and we both had the same set of ideas about how to do this, you know, work with people not on them, and do capacity building and empowerment, think at the community level, a whole bunch of stuff that nurses simply don’t think of, but she did, and so did I because of applied anthropology. A year or two into the project, my wife was, was doing an internship at the American Lake VA, which is about forty-five minutes away. And she would stay there three or four nights a week, and sometimes, when I had time, I would go spend the night with her, and I always had a book to read while she was doing whatever she was doing, and one of them was William Foote Whyte’s book on participatory action research, and I started reading this thing and I said, “holy cow! That’s what we’re doing!” So I had a term for it.

STROBER: There is the fit.

CHRISMAN: So that was the real positive collaboration. And now days I only work on teams, which I think is what you have to do when you’re doing community work. I work on . . . one project in south Seattle with my students, and two projects, one of which is King County wide, and one is south Seattle, with the health department with CDC funding, plus this year while I’m on sabbatical I work at the National Cancer Institute, and in all cases I work in collaboration with other people. XXX For example, one of the projects is called ‘REACH 2010,’ and it’s a nation-wide CDC funded project, REACH stands for Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health, and we had an evaluation team meeting yesterday. There are two outsiders, two university people, one a health economist who does a lot of evaluation work, and me; he does the quantitative part, I do the qualitative part, and then the rest of that committee [are] representatives from each of the three ethnic agencies that are carrying out the intervention, plus some staff from the health department, and that’s an unbelievably exciting circumstance. I was listening to one of the reports, we’re only about six to eight months into doing the intervention, and since no one knows how to do this, least of all us, we’re inventing it. I was listening to one part of an intervention . . . one, one difficulty they were having, and I said, “holy cow, you know, maybe we’re cheating people in these communities.” And I said to the co-fi, you know, this was more of a service issue then a research issue, but I thought that they interacted, and we’re only getting real small numbers of people into our support groups and education groups, and I said, “that may be cutting back on people’s learning, you know, community people’s learning.” And everybody around the table started saying, “yeah!” you know, and we brainstormed for about five minutes on how we could make changes. And that’s so exciting! Plus . . . my—the other part of my job with that is to evaluate coalition growth, and when I see things that I think need to be done, based on my experience, or my reading of the literature, then I’ll say it from the perspective of an evaluator, and I, we’ll have a retreat in February, next month and part of the retreat will be the preliminary results from this year’s interviewing, you know, that tell us what things are going well, what things are going poorly, so that the coalition can take that information, you know, how PAR works, they can take that information, have me do new stuff and then, you know, they can, it’s actually we, can help move the coalition to new places. Slick.

STROBER: That’s pretty exciting stuff.

CHRISMAN: Yeah, and you know, this finally seems to me like real applied anthropology, and I’m out doing research, I’m analyzing it, the research has an effect on what’s happening in the real world.

STROBER: When you’re bringing your perspective to the table as a member of a team, what do you think it is that the other members of the team are looking for you to, to provide?

CHRISMAN: That’s an interesting question, because what they are looking to, for me to provide and what I provide are different things. I am only guessing on what they look to me to provide, and I’m now mixing the two big projects I work on, because I have to do exactly the same thing with the other one. Too many people think of an evaluator as providing an outside objective distant and somewhat scary evaluation, and you know from your work with [David] Fetterman that that’s not the way he thinks of it, and it’s not the way I think of it. So I think of that as collaborative and working together and we are all on the same side, but there are still a number of people, probably less so on REACH, and more so on Seattle Partners who see the evaluation component as more distant. And that’s probably because my role in the evaluation has been a lot less, up until about two years ago. I conceive of it, I mean I, I think that an important part here is my relationship with individuals on these boards, and my relationship with the projects themselves, because I am deeply involved. So what I expect to do, is to be a member of each of those coalitions to have goals that are just the same as theirs, and to bring a couple of kinds of expertise that I think are important. One is the research analysis. traditional applied anthropology stuff that epidemiologists do and sociologists, and nurses, and, you know, MPHs, a bunch of people do that, so that’s a skill set that I have. But the more important skill set, and I’m really seeing it at, back at the NCI, is . . . to be a thorn in people side, to raise questions from what seems like left field. For an anthropologist it’s not left field, it’s just that we are so strongly grounded in what’s happening at the community level, and with real people, that we don’t get as stuck in epidemiology or public health, or medicine, or nursing, as people from those fields do. My, I’m, next Friday I’m going to facilitate a retreat of people, a small group in the National
The [SfAA] has always been...real academic, located in departments, more concerned with teaching applied anthropologists to be applied anthropologists than concerned with actually doing it.

American cultural statement, and that is, as De Tocqueville said, you know, we build on, we count on volunteerism, we count on voluntary associations, we count on inter-personal relationships around getting jobs done that will help the community. So, I think there’s that strong core value in America, and institutions like the Department of Health and Human Services, are saying more on prevention and more on community. So I, I think that there is this kind of belief infrastructure that will help us get there, just belief on the part of Americans. Then, it’s going to take smaller, but I think growing numbers of applied social scientists ranging in public health through nursing, anthropology, medicine, working together, learning how to work with community people, because we are so arrogant that, you know, we turn people off. So there is a gigantic amount of learning, but the excitement, both methodologically and theoretically is just unbelievable. I can see in [David] Fetterman’s case that empowerment evaluation works perfectly, or nearly perfectly, if you are well known and an organization comes to you and says come work with us. But in public health and in the rest of the health science fields, they don’t usually come ask, in particular, and we have to be able to be convincing to people who are not convinced, you know, the medical types and epidemiology types that this kind of evaluation makes sense, and it makes automatically no sense to them, and just that, and I think theirs makes a lot of sense is just ... too narrow. So, that challenge, at least that’s what motivates me, and I suspect it motivates others who do the same thing.

STROBER: But it sounds like there are little openings, little shifts going on.

CHRISMAN: Yeah, I conceive of it as the little mammals running around the legs of the big dinosaurs, and soon the asteroid is going to hit.

STROBER: That’s lovely. How has the Society for Applied Anthropology changed over time, and in particular its role within anthropology?

CHRISMAN: The real answer to that one is I don’t know, so, how has it changed? In the really olden days, in the 40s and 50s, the Journal Applied Anthropology was more, was full of applied anthropology. Now the journal, and now and for last probably twenty years or more, the journal is full of good international anthropology with some kind of an applied basis to it. When Erve Chambers started Practicing Anthropology at South Florida, thirty years ago, or whenever, I think he was trying to solve that problem, because Practicing Anthropology speaks to practitioners that’s not written in an academic style. It’s even more applied than the early applied anthropology journals were. So there is a shift. The Society for Applied Anthropology has always been, I think, real academic, located in departments, more concerned with teaching applied anthropologists to be applied anthropologists than concerned with actually doing it. I had a conversation with a friend at the applied meetings that were here in Seattle about five, four or five years ago,
however many, and I told her that I had heard one of her graduate students, one of the graduate students from her department saying that her department was discriminating against the use of social marketing techniques in doing work, and in public health, it’s not a very well known way of doing community change, but it’s an accepted way and I thought, what in the heck is this anthropology department down on her for, and it’s an applied anthropology department. So I had this discussion with my colleague and we went through all the faculty in her department and most of them don’t really do applied work, they do anthropology with applied implications, which is what I did, you know, in the very beginning with my career, and so I think that that’s a place that applied anthropology has been in, I, there is a huge amount of possibility for change in that. Ten or fifteen years ago, the Society started working very hard to get practicing anthropologists into the organization. That was probably about the same time NAPA started, so that may have been part of the stimulus. The other part of stimulus was that the SfAA had split from the AAA and the AAA wanted to have some sort of applied arm. Now at the meetings, I have missed the last two or three meetings because of being either president elect or president, which means I don’t ever get to go to meetings, but I’m still able to find, when I get to go to sessions, I am able to find some things that are very pragmatic, and there are still some things that are not as easily useable. But I always listen to them for their utility, and they’re probably made easier, you know, more user friendly for utility anyway. So the journals changed, the society’s changed, the meetings have changed, and then did, was part of your thing about.

STROBER: How it fits . . .

CHRISMAN: Was the future . . .

STROBER: . . . into anthropology generally.

CHRISMAN: How it relates to it?

STROBER: Yeah.

CHRISMAN: Well, the main relationship is that anthropology really, really loves to have its bias about applied anthropology. To me it’s an incredibly powerful thing. I didn’t go to a session that Laura Nader was in some years ago, but I heard about it and she said, “you know, the anthropologists who work for these corporate outfits are just selling their souls,” and whoever told me the story said, “you know, Berkeley, which is where Laura is, has to sell its soul to corporate interest every hour of the day, in order to just survive,” maybe not the anthropology department but.

STROBER: The Lawrence Livermore Labs?

CHRISMAN: Yeah! They used to be the Robert Lowie Museum of Anthropology and now it’s the Katherine Hearst, of course Katherine Hearst’s money is doing something about it, and has always. So there is that. But let me tell you about what’s happening right this minute that may change that. As, as an aside, one of the things that, that I remember learning from an article by Raymond Firth, about social change was that there three levels, one was on the personnel level, one was the change in the way we do things, and another is the change in structure, the values, and norms changes. The personnel level is often overlooked, but in this case personnel is making a difference. Some years ago the AAA, who are consistently in one kind of trouble or another, partly because the field is so broad, put as part of their strategic plan that they wanted to do more in applied and practicing anthropology, and so the personality of Louise Lamphere, who was just the outgoing president of the AAA, combined with the personalities of Linda Bennett and me, Linda was the president of the SfAA and I was president-elect, Louise said, “we’ve got this strategic plan and we need to work on it, and we need your help.” And at least I have always been interested in trying to get the AAA to become more rational, you know, and actually work in the real world. And so Linda and I just jumped at it.

STROBER: That worked.

CHRISMAN: Yeah. So what we have is a AAA-SfAA commission for applied and practicing anthropology that’s an organ of the AAA, and a commission is a relatively high level something or other. We started, our first meeting was in Merida last March, and our second meeting, which was the one when every single person was there, was at the AAA in Washington, in December of 2001. This commission has the possibility of making applied and practicing anthropology much more visible, both to anthropologists and to the rest of the world, but first to anthropologists, and to the rest of the world, and that is what we are proposing.

Further Reading


An Invitation from on the Society for Applied Anthropology Oral History Project

Readers are invited to suggest persons to be interviewed for the project to members of the Oral History Committee (Allan Burns, Barbara Rylko-Bauer, Don Stull and John van Willigen). I can be reached at (ant101@uky.edu)
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or 859.269.8301. Think of the anthropologists that made a difference in places where you live and work. Often the person making the suggestion is asked to do the interview. The collection of SfAA recorded interviews and transcripts is archived at the Louie B. Nunn Center for Oral History at the University of Kentucky Library. Their url is: http://www.uky.edu/Libraries/libpage.php?lweb_id=11&llib_id=13

SfAA Student Corner

By Elizabeth Marino [ekmarino@alaska.edu]
Editor, Student Committee
PhD Candidate, University of Alaska-Fairbanks

Gender and the Environment: Why Gender Studies Matter in Environmental and Climate Change Studies

As a cultural anthropologist who studies disasters and climate change, I was anticipating writing a large introduction for this installment of the Student Corner. Gender construction and gendered experiences of the environment are constant points of interest and inquiry in my own work. As it turned out, an introduction is practically unnecessary. The essays submitted in response to this call for papers were outstanding, nuanced, eloquent, and critically important for the future of applied anthropology. They truly inspire the future of feminist anthropology and feminist scholarship in complex, fluid, and creative ways. I invite you to read through these essays, which are a mixture of personal experience, editorial commentary, research summary and theoretical positioning. I am certain you will enjoy them.

Women, Fertility, and Climate Change: Reviving Old Paradigms or Forging New Ones?

By Jade S. Sasser [sasserja@berkeley.edu]
PhD Candidate, Environmental Science, Policy & Management
University of California, Berkeley

When most people think of issues associated with climate change, women’s sexual and reproductive health does not come to mind. After all, burning fossil fuels, accumulated atmospheric carbon emissions, and various strategies for developing alternative sources of energy tend to have pride of place in the climate change discussion. When it comes to viewing climate change through a gendered lens, the analysis is most often focused on addressing various forms of gender inequality, from increasing women’s participation in international climate treaty negotiations to reducing social and environmental vulnerabilities, for women in the global South.

However, an increasing number of newspaper articles, media reports and scientific studies are addressing gender and climate change through another angle—specifically, a focus on women’s fertility.[1] Positing a link between individual fertility, large scale population growth trends, and greenhouse gas emissions, authors argue that current trends presage a future of rapidly rising emissions in global South countries, driven in part by the childbearing of poor women. At first glance, the arguments sound familiar: neo-Malthusian claims that rapid population growth will outstrip the Earth’s ability to produce food and other resources have been circulating in popular discourse since the late 18th century. These perspectives enjoyed widespread popularity in the U.S. in the late ’60s and ’70s, thanks to Paul Ehrlich’s The Population Bomb,[2] a book that sparked widespread crisis narratives about the disastrous ecological impact of rapidly growing human populations. Despite the fact that Ehrlich’s predictions of impending ecological collapse and global famine have been proven inaccurate, the underlying argument that population growth poses a direct, linear threat to environmental systems gained strong traction, serving as a justification for top-down population control programs for decades.
Unlike the top-down, demographically driven programs advanced in previous decades, today’s proponents of population stabilization argue that supporting voluntary global access to contraceptives supports broader sexual and reproductive health services for women, reducing unsustainable levels of population growth and future greenhouse gas emissions in the process. Touted as a ‘win-win’ strategy, this approach sounds attractive- but its propositions are misleading. Consider the fact that the U.S. accounts for 5% of the world’s population, and 25% of its greenhouse gas emissions. 

Add to that the fact that the average American woman’s carbon legacy (lifetime emissions of each woman and her future progeny) is more than 85 times that of an average woman in Nigeria, a country with a much faster population growth rate than the U.S., and it is clear that population growth is not a major driver of climate change. Despite these statistics, some climate scientists argue that current trends in both population growth and carbon emissions in the poorest countries demonstrate that these countries will eventually become significant emitters of carbon and other greenhouse gases- and that their future emissions can be mitigated through investments in international family planning today. 

Supporters of this approach maintain that a focus on sexual and reproductive health, aimed at supporting the contraceptive access needs of individual women, offers mutual benefits for women and the global environment.

Does this approach move us beyond the old neo-Malthusian line and into a woman-centered approach to addressing climate change? At a fundamental level, no. The argument is still predicated on the assumption that women’s childbearing practices are to blame for environmental catastrophe, an argument which allows coal-fired power plants, gas guzzling SUV drivers and transnational logging corporations off the hook for their harmful practices. As one of my research informants notes, proposing contraceptives as a tool for mitigating climate change is a “safe” strategy: it reinforces development interventions offering a simple, technoscientific fix in place of broader political and economic changes. It also impedes alternative understandings of how women experience climate change, as well as silencing movements for reproductive and climate justice. Forging a new paradigm entails de-linking women’s fertility from climate change mitigation debates, and shifting the focus to supporting women-led mitigation and adaptation efforts. Through a lens focused on ‘women, leadership and climate change’, we can shift the debate and move forward in a progressive way.

Endnotes

Gender Matters in Climate Change Related Disasters!

By Sasikumar Balasundaram [balasund@mailbox.sc.edu]
PhD Candidate, Department of Anthropology
University of South Carolina

“Women, especially if they do not receive timely warnings, or other information about hazards and risks, or if their mobility is restricted or otherwise affected by cultural and social constraints, are major casualties in disasters” (Cited in Kotegoda 2007:17).

Women, the largest minority in the modern world, are one of the most affected and vulnerable groups to climate change. Women’s minority status is not based on numbers but based on their lower status within the social and political power structures of societies in the era of globalization (Kingsolver and Gunewardeni 2008). When I started writing this essay my roommate who is a male neuroscience graduate student at the University of South Carolina and originally from China said, “Well, climate change and disasters affect everyone, not just only women.” I completely agree with his statement. However, my argument in this essay is that climate change and its consequences affect women more than men because of their multiple marginalities in society. Using specific examples of the comparative impact of the 2004 Tsunami on women and men, I call for anthropologists to engage in climate change research through the lens of gender.
On December 31, 2004, five days after the giant Tsunami struck the Indian Ocean and killed approximately 200,000 in Asia, including 40,000 in Sri Lanka alone, Sir David King, a top British scientist told BBC Radio 4's program that the “the tsunami disaster underlines the threat posed by climate change” (Guardian 2004). He said “What is happening in the Indian Ocean underlines the importance of the earth's system to our ability to live safely.” (Guardian 2004) During this disaster the death toll of women outnumbered men in the three most affected countries: India, Indonesia, and Sri Lanka. Becky Buell, Oxfam’s Policy Director, delineates how the Tsunami specifically affected women.

In some villages it now appears that up to 80% of those killed were women. This disproportionate impact will lead to problems for years to come unless everyone working on the aid effort addresses the issue now. We are already hearing about rapes, harassment and forced early marriages. We all need to wake up to this issue and ensure the protection, inclusion and empowerment of the women that have survived (http://www.developments.org).

In Pachakuppam village in Tamil Nadu, India, all recorded deaths were women. In Sri Lanka, 60% of Tsunami deaths were women (Oxfam 2005). According to Emmanuel (2005) 80% of the deaths in Batticola district in Sri Lanka were women and girls. These disproportions raise basic anthropological questions. Why do women suffer more during and after climate related disasters than men? How can we reduce women’s vulnerabilities to climate and climate change related disasters in the future?

My first hand work and a study conducted by Oxfam, a British NGO, suggest that social and cultural marginalization in male dominant societies like Sri Lanka, India, and Indonesia contributed to the high number of female deaths. During my post-Tsunami relief work I found, in some Muslim villages in the eastern province of Sri Lanka, 80% of the deaths were among women. In those villages, it is culturally inappropriate for women to leave their homes without a head cover. On the 26th of December, 2004 when the first wave of the Tsunami hit the villages, people started to flee their homes to escape the destruction. The majority of women, however, remained in their homes, as they had lost their head covers in the first wave. The next wave swept all of these women into the sea. I want to be clear that I am not arguing whether the practice of wearing head covers is right or wrong, but seeking to explain how certain social and cultural practices make women more vulnerable during climate change related disasters. I argue that anthropologists who understand the very nature of social structures, belief systems, and culture can greatly contribute to development policies to reduce women vulnerability during and after climate change-related disasters.
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The Gift of Berries
Laura Henry-Stone, PhD [henry-stone@wlu.edu]
Post-doctoral Fellow in Environmental Studies Washington and Lee University

“Do you have any frozen blueberries?” Before I could finish, my grandmother was already on her way to the freezer. I ate the berries straight out of the freezer box while sitting at the kitchen table in one of her green-floral, vinyl-covered chairs. We have repeated this pattern over and over since I was a girl during the frequent visits my family made to the Pennsylvania farm where my mother was born and raised.

Now a postdoctoral fellow of environmental studies and sustainability education, I have never surrendered my love of berries. While completing my PhD, I lived in Alaska for ten years and spent considerable time with Alaska Native people and communities, many of
which remain closely connected with long-standing, land-based subsistence lifeways. I never learned to hunt, but I also never failed to engage with other women in foraging practices, notably, berry-picking. I spent countless hours every summer and fall picking berries, mostly wild blueberries and low-bush cranberries.

In my experience, berry picking across cultures has been set firmly in the domain of women. When I left Alaska, one of the experiences I was most sad about losing was being able to pick wild berries right outside my front door, often with one of my female friends. Happily, where I now live in the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia, other sorts of wild berries abound, mostly the thorny-bush kind, like blackberries and wineberries. These bushes skirt my long gravel driveway, which has become a familiar place. I recently invited a new friend to join me for a Sunday afternoon of picking, recounting for her a life history told over the course of an afternoon harvesting berries.

What is it about picking berries that is so appealing, so central, to so many women? I clearly cannot speak for all women, but permit me to speculate on the relationship between women and environment as expressed through berry-picking. Much research has been done on gender-based division of labor in hunter-gatherer cultures, but this experience is personal. Undoubtedly, camaraderie develops through the shared experience of berry-picking, and knowledge is shared, like how to easily freeze berries by spreading them out on a cookie sheet. Afterwards, there is the practice of giving. Just like my grandmother’s gift of blueberries to her young granddaughter, the berry-sharing aspect of my picking habit is essential. I have been the giver and the receiver in berry-sharing, from making Alaska cranberry jam as the party favor for my wedding reception three years ago to baking Virginia wineberry muffins to take to a work meeting last week. Clearly in some arenas berries enter the world of production, commerce, and the cash economy; but in my experience they have more often been equally about immersion both within the environment and within important social relationships. Berries are a staple of the gift economy, both a gift from Mother Earth and a gift to and among women.

Many diverse women from many distinct places come to know the world and the weather through these berries. Wild-berry-pickers are in a prime position to note potential effects of climate change on our harvest. Sharing observations about fluctuations in berry ecology from one year to the next and speculate on what weather factors might play a role are already key components of conversation in the berry-picking community. The wineberries along my driveway were some of the best harvest in the county this year. As it happens, we were experiencing one of the longest and most intense heat waves in recorded history in the eastern U.S. during wineberry season, something that undoubtedly affected the berries. But we had a wet Spring, and my driveway is in a wooded area next to a creek, so perhaps my berries did well for that reason. What will happen if we continue to have record-high heat waves in the Shenandoah Valley? Will we lose our berries? Will we recognize their integral place in our lives after it is too late?

Years later, my grandmother is gone, but the blueberry bushes at the farm are still producing their annual harvest. As is so often the case, it has taken me these long years to appreciate the gift of berries and this simple symbol of my grandmother’s care.

Making Space: Gender in Climate Change Research

By Beth Bee [bab333@psu.edu]
PhD Candidate, Geography & Women’s Studies
2010-2011 American Association of University Women Fellow
Pennsylvania State University

Feminist social scientists have long argued that gender is an integral component to understanding local experience with social and environmental phenomena. Feminist environmentalists and political ecologists argue that gender differentiates the relationships that people establish with natural resources and ecosystems. These relationships shape knowledge, use, access, and control of natural resources and attitudes towards resources and conservation. The feminist literature on gender and environment, agriculture, and disasters has clearly demonstrated how women are disproportionately vulnerable to natural and social stressors (Cupples 2007; Fordham 2004; Schroeder 1987). Additionally, gender and disaster research reveals how gender and poverty intersect to increase women’s vulnerability to such events. Research on cyclones in Bangladesh and Hurricane Katrina in the US emphasize the devastating outcomes of this increased vulnerability.

Women have differential opportunities and ‘safety nets’ for coping with climate change. Access to material and productive resources such as income and employment affect the capacity to cope and recover from climate variability. However, as climate variability and economic restructuring in some places trigger predominantly male migration in search of employment, women come under increasing pressure to earn more income while simultaneously shouldering the responsibility of child-rearing and other home-based responsibilities. Yet male emigration does not necessarily
make women more vulnerable. In some instances, women gain greater decision-making power. The gendered division of labor and the different ways in which men and women respond to environmental and economic change are largely due to unequal social relations. Women experience differential access to resources and are therefore exposed to different risks.

The absence of gender in climate change debates ignores these differential risks and ignores differential outcomes. Furthermore, it perpetuates the under-valuation and misunderstanding of women’s contribution to environmental management (Brody et al. 2008). Feminist scholars such as Fatima Denton (2002) argue that rural women in developing countries play a key role in environmental and natural resource management so that both their active involvement and their dependence on these resources make them key stakeholders in effective management strategies. Social science has a crucial role to play in highlighting how women’s experiential knowledge can be incorporated into decision making for successful adaptation planning.

Current research on climate change adaptation has investigated household and community-level adaptation strategies and capacities. However these studies focus on the household and community as sites of equitable resource distribution. The result masks gender-based inequities that exist at these scales. Adaptive capacity is context specific and can vary among social groups and individuals, between communities, and over time. At the same time the scales of adaptive capacity are not independent, so that the ability of individuals within the household to adapt to climate risks may depend upon: (1) the capacity of the community to adapt, or (2) the individual’s access to key resources, which at times may be constrained or enabled by various political, economic and social institutions. Understanding the differentiated power relations and the levels of access and decision-making at various scales are key to developing appropriate responses that enhance the ability of rural communities to adapt to socio-ecological change.

Social research in applied climate change is incomplete without a holistic examination of the gender-based inequalities that may create winners and losers within communities and households. If we are truly concerned about building resilience and adaptive capacities within coupled social-ecological systems, then it is imperative that applied social scientists of all disciplines fully explore the socially differentiated landscapes, scales and individuals affected by a changing climate.
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If you are a student who does research related to the anthropology of tourism, we would encourage you to submit a poster for consideration in the Valene Smith Tourism Poster Competition. This is a special competition for the best posters on the theme of “tourism,” broadly defined including topics such as heritage, archaeology and tourism, ecotourism and cultural resource management, during the annual meeting. Posters are an excellent means of communicating your research and allow the presenter to interact directly with others interested in your work. Three cash prizes will be awarded - $500 for first prize, $300 for second prize, and $200 for third prize. The Competition and Prizes are sponsored through the generosity of Valene Smith, one of the pioneers of the anthropology of tourism. Dr. Smith's ground-breaking book, Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism (1978) established the foundation for the study of this topic.

The deadline for the receipt of poster abstracts for the Competition is also October 15. In some cases, it may be possible to both present a poster in the Valene Smith Poster Competition and give a paper. Please go to the SfAA web site (www.sfaa.net) for additional information on the Meeting and the abstract submission process. You will also find on this web page a more detailed description of the Competition as well as the winners from previous years (click on “Awards” and go to “Valene Smith Prize”).

AAA Meetings in New Orleans

The AAA meetings in New Orleans will be held November 17-21, 2010. The AAA will soon post a searchable online program, as well as information about workshops and other events that require advance registration on the meeting’s website (www.aaanet.org/meetings). The searchable online program allows you to search papers, sessions, posters, events, etc by themes and keywords, so that you can develop your own conference schedule. I will be listing tourism related papers, sessions, workshops, and events in the November newsletter. The Tourism TIG will also be scheduling in New Orleans a meeting, date and time TBA. We will post info on the meeting in the November newsletter and on the TIG’s Facebook page.

More Online Resources for Tourism Scholars

If you haven’t already, I would recommend everyone interested in the anthropology of tourism to subscribe to the ANTH-TOURISM list-serve (sign up by emailing tourismanthropology@jiscmail.ac.uk). I have mentioned this resource several times before, but it really is the best way to learn about opportunities, conferences, publications, news, etc., related to the anthropology of tourism.

There are also several online tourism industry news sources. Two of the most comprehensive industry news sites are Tourism-Review (www.tourism-review.com) and Travel Daily News (www.traveldailynews.com). It has been my experience that there is an unfortunate disconnect between the industry and those that critique it (academics, NGOs, etc). Understanding the industry and private sector perspective is fundamental to understanding the tourism phenomenon. If there are hosts and guests, it is the mediators are usually the ones negotiating this relationship.

Finally, my third suggestion this month is to check out this wiki page on tourism-related journals. The wiki can be found at http://shtmteacherswiki.pbworks.com/Tourism+journals, and it was compiled by Brian Garrod of Aberystwyth University, Wales. Currently, there are 82 journals listed, some of which are e-journals and available for free. I learned about this site from the ANTH-TOURISM list-serve, just another example of the potential benefits of subscribing to that resource.

Is Tourism a Human Right?

In interesting tourism news, Antonio Tajani, the European Union Commissioner for Enterprise and Industry has declared travel for leisure a human right. Tajani revealed his plan to subsidize travel for low income Europeans (primarily students and the elderly) at a ministerial conference in Madrid in April. Under his plan, which is set to go into effect by 2013, those who would not normally be able to afford vacations will receive cuts on European travel packages, since according to Tajani, “Traveling for tourism today is a right.” His plan is also to promote European culture, bridge the divide between the north and the south, and provide tourism destinations with more off-season revenue (The Sunday Times (London), April 18, 2010). The plan sounds... nice. But is leisure travel a human right, and should it be the responsibility of taxpayers to ensure this right? Is this a right that only applies to residents of societies where leisure travel is enjoyed by all but the poorest? There are a lot of intriguing implications that can be drawn from Tajani’s argument for this program. I would be interested to hear other anthropologists’ takes on this issue.
Mini-Trip Report: Tourism in Tanzania

I am planning to conduct dissertation research on tourism in Tanzania next year. I was able to get funding for a pre-research trip this summer, and I spent most of my five weeks in the Arusha area meeting with representatives of different sectors (industry, NGO, academia, activist, resident, etc.) to try to get a better picture of what is happening from a variety of perspectives.

My overall impression of tourism in Tanzania (summary version) is that few of the benefits do not trickle down to the local level. Most of the tourism revenue seems captured by foreign investors (lodges, safari companies, and other industry providers) and the central government. Tanzanians living in tourism areas have very little direct involvement in (or benefit from) tourism, but they do experience the costs (land and resource alienation, livelihood limitations, loss of political voice, higher costs of living). Much of the local-level benefits are captured by an elite few, and government corruption and lack of transparency are significant problems. However, there are efforts to redirect more tourism benefits to communities, and to build local capacity to engage more productively in the industry. Of specific interest to many (in the NGO, government, and private sectors), is how to use tourism to (1) reduce poverty, and (2) encourage local level conservation activities.

Some questions that need debate—maybe on our Facebook page... or on the SfAA Ning site (http://sfaanet.ning.com). Do people have a right to benefit from tourism? How does the right to participate and benefit as a tourist/guest (e.g., Antonio Tajani’s students and pensioners) relate to the right to participate and benefit as a host (e.g., residents of tourist destinations)? What is the role of the mediators (e.g., the private sector, the government, etc.) in deciding and ensuring these rights? See you next issue!

What Does Heritage Mean to You? Preliminary Survey Analysis Suggests Some Interesting Possibilities

By Cameron Walker [cwalker@fullerton.edu]
California State-Fullerton
and
Lisa A. Gonzalez [lisaviva@umich.edu]
California State-Fullerton

The Anthropology of Tourism, an upper-division class in the Department of Anthropology at California State University, Fullerton, recently agreed to conduct a random, anonymous survey on the public perceptions of the term “heritage”. Questions focused on what the term “heritage” actually means to the public, whether it is perceived as a valuable resource, and if so, how important do individuals rank the concept of heritage? During the semester, more than one-thousand anonymous surveys were collected from various locations, such as around the university campus, family members, airports, and online survey responses.

Many Meanings of Heritage

This class survey was intended to explore the many different ways that the public perceives the meaning of heritage. According to current literature, the term “heritage” can be defined on several levels, among them as a landscape; a physical entity that has been shaped by human means; and as an expression of the values and meanings attached to material objects. This meaning suggests that the term “heritage” represents a dynamic process that involves complex feelings about ancestry, identity, community and continuity, not least of which includes the legitimization of power and authority (Skeates 2000:9-11). Other definitions of heritage range from: a relic of the past; the product of modern conditions that are influenced by the past; all cultural productivity, past and present; elements from the natural environment that are original, typical, or suitable to pass on in the future; a major commercial industry known as the heritage industry; and finally, elements that are adopted by political extremists to carry out ethnic or racial discrimination (Timothy and Boyd 2003:2-5).
Archaeological heritage is one of the more visible forms of heritage; therefore archaeological heritage can be said to represent both the material culture that survives in the present, and the processes by which material culture can be re-evaluated at a later time. To date, the largest scale study on the public perceptions of archaeology is a 1999 Harris Poll commissioned by the Society for American (Ramos and Duganne 2000). The poll results reinforced other studies demonstrating that the public in general places a high value on archaeology. In a discussion about another survey performed by N. Merriman (2004:9-10), he stressed that, “…there was a strong correlation between people’s beliefs about the past in general, and their current circumstances, with attitudes to the past being used as an unspoken critique of the present.”

In general, it seems that for both scholars and the public, the concept of heritage has several kinds of meaning, but it is equally important to appreciate that those perceived meanings are constantly influenced by the dominant values of the present. The values associated with heritage may broaden or shrink in relevance and scope, or they may become more or less crucial as a social issue, as they relate to the mores and social consciousness of the public at any point in time.

Heritage Survey

A random sample of 103 surveys was initiated and compiled into an Excel program in order to gain insights into the various responses to the questions. Some survey questions were quantitative in nature, with a choice of numbers from 1 to 5 assigned to an answer as to the perceived relevance for the respondent. Other questions were qualitative in nature, and meant that the two parts had to be handled separately. This decision to include both qualitative and quantitative was deliberate because we wanted to learn which sites are actually mentioned in relationship to specific questions. For example, when a respondent is asked, “What heritage sites have you visited?,” the specific answer will provide more information about the concept of heritage. The decision to use both quantitative and qualitative questions added interpretive complications to the analysis due to the wide range of possible responses but the opportunity for access to other kinds of information made it seem worthwhile. The use of both kinds of questions also allowed the students in the class to have some experience with both approaches to a survey.

The following is a sampling of some of the most pertinent questions presented in the order in which they were asked, for example: What does “heritage” mean to you?

A full 86% answered that heritage is “culture that is handed down” or “cultural background”, revealing answers that most often derived from a highly personal perspective. Providing a concise definition of the term “heritage” was deliberately avoided in order to assess how broadly or narrowly it is defined by the responding public. For the question, “What is a World Heritage Site?,” 33% of the respondents answered “I don’t know”. Another 48% answered that heritage is a “place of cultural heritage” or “where the family originated”, while 7% answered with a specific place name as an example of a World Heritage Site. In response to the question, “Why visit a heritage site?”, respondents were asked to rank the importance from 1 = not important, to 5 = very important. The answer: “It is part of your personal heritage”, was deemed by a full 66% of the respondents as important to very important as a reason to visit. A third answer, “You wanted to learn about the site’s history,” was also rated as important to very important motivation by 78% of the respondents. Of the respondents who answered that a heritage site was an important factor for increasing tourism to an area, the implication was that if a site is known as important for “heritage”, 77% saw it as an important to very important draw for tourist visits. Most respondents (80%) answered that a heritage tourism site enhances the perceived value of a region, which suggests that heritage sites are important among both locals and visitors.

Since this survey was performed as part of an upper-division, elective class at a state university campus, it was not surprising that 77% of the respondents answered that their age grouping was 25 years old or younger.

Preliminary Thoughts
Initially, we found it surprising that the survey results suggested a limited understanding about what it means to be designated as a heritage or a World Heritage Site. When the survey was designed, it was agreed not to define the word “heritage” as part of the survey, or to describe what it means to be designated as a World Heritage Site, in order to gauge whether the two terms were distinguishable in the local vernacular. This lack of definition was a little problematic for some of the respondents who expressed a degree of uncertainty about the specific definition we were expecting. This may have biased the answers in favor of a more personal definition of ancestry in lieu of a more broad concept of human heritage.

From this sample (10% of total number of surveys), it is evident that there is a fairly well understood definition for the word “heritage”, suggesting that there are a number of meanings operative among the public’s individual perceptions of heritage. Some respondents mentioned that “heritage” includes genealogy web sites, or learning more about an individual’s ancestry or ethnicity, rather than the more expansive concept of a heritage of humanity. Is it possible that websites, books and programs for researching an individual’s family tree is somehow pre-empting the concept of heritage over any grander sense of the history of humanity among these young adults?

It is less of a mystery that respondents are not at all clear about the significance of achieving designation as a World Heritage Site, which indicates that a particular site has been officially listed with UNESCO (United Nations Education, Science, and Cultural Organization). Designation actually entails a complex process that begins when a host nation presents to UNESCO a formal request for consideration, accompanied by plentiful documentation to justify the designation as a World Heritage Site. World Heritage Sites can be built by humans, or natural, or they may have both attributes. The World Heritage Sites Lists are always in flux, and at any time a number of sites are under consideration for listing, while others are in danger of being taken off the list due to management problems, usually associated with tourist access. Although UNESCO does not have real power to enforce a particular set of standards, the listing as a World Heritage Site is presumed to add value and prestige, as well as raise public awareness as a World Heritage Site. It often surprises the public to learn that some well-known sites are not listed with UNESCO, in particular, the Bronze Age site of Knossos on the island of Crete, Greece. Despite the reality that Knossos is the second most visited archaeological site in Greece (after the Acropolis), Greece has never requested designation as a World Heritage Site, presumably for political and academic reasons related to the controversial, yet imaginative, restorations of Arthur Evans in the early years of the 20th century.

Another prominent assumption among social scientists is that a term such as “heritage site” or “world heritage site” will attract more visitors to a site. This assumption has yet to be definitively tested by research data but it is interesting to learn that this same assumption is shared by the general public, as suggested in this survey. The responses to certain questions imply that there is an added value to a region or a site when the term “heritage,” or “world heritage,” is included in the marketing. For example, certain questions in this survey ask the respondents to assign a numeric value related to how much they agree or disagree with the statement. In response to the question, “A heritage site increases the value of the region,” 80% of the respondents rated it as a 3 (important), 4, or 5 (very important).

Since the majority of survey respondents were under the age of 25, and many were university students, the results may reflect a higher level of understanding about the concepts of heritage and heritage sites. When asked which heritage sites they had visited, many different kinds of heritage were listed, including the more iconic, ancient sites such as Stonehenge, the Giza pyramids, and the Great Wall of China. On the other hand, lesser-known sites such as Head-Smashed-in-Buffalo-Jump, in Ontario, Canada, and the Richard M. Nixon Library in Southern California, were also listed.

A particularly interesting distinction for possible future research entails how people categorize heritage sites, in that it is possible to indicate a heritage site as the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, D.C; as the city of Washington, D.C.; or as an entire country, such as Ireland.

Another interesting point worth future consideration is that only 1 respondent listed a theme park such as Disneyland, as a heritage site, whereas Williamsburg was mentioned a number of times. This suggests that the public, in this survey at least, easily recognizes and distinguishes the many different degrees of authenticity (or verisimilitude) associated with heritage sites. Equally, the survey respondents revealed that heritage is not limited to historical
categories, or relegated to some dimly glimpsed antiquity. Heritage also includes the immediate present, as indicated by the listing of the Golden Gate Bridge and the World Trade Center, which loom large in the public consciousness.

This sampling of survey responses suggests that the public recognizes and values heritage sites beyond the personal and sees it as encompassing all of humankind. Such an expression of goodwill for a common humanity can be powerful for achieving solutions for some of the social ills inflicting mankind.
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On the Cuban Road to Development: Reflections on Sustainable Tourism, Environmental Conservation, and Globalization

By Ricardo Pérez [perezr@easternct.edu]
Eastern Connecticut State University

As the afternoon was beginning to fall, I rushed to leave Cayo Coco before the sun completely set over the horizon overlooking the northern coast of central Cuba. Cayo Coco, an island off the coast of Ciego de Ávila Province, is the largest of the more than 2,515 keys that belong to the Sabana-Camagüey Archipelago, a long strip of keys and islands of various sizes that stretch from the Province of Matanzas to the Province of Camagüey in the north-central zone of Cuba. While Cayo Coco has several modern hotels and tourist installations, the prices for hotel rooms were rather expensive, especially in the month of February right in the middle of the high tourist season. For instance, after inquiring at several hotels, I learned that the cost for a night ranged from $100 at Hotel Oasis Playa Coco to $280 at Hotel Sol Mélia Cayo Coco. Therefore, I decided to drive to Ciego de Ávila, a city of 109,710 inhabitants about 90 km south of Cayo Coco, where I hoped to rent a moderately-priced room from a home owner with a government license to accommodate international tourists. Luckily, at the police checkpoint in the pedraplen (causeway) Turiguanó-Cayo Coco that crosses Bahía de Perros and connects the island of Cuba with the key, I was stopped by an officer who asked me to give a ride to Ciego de Ávila to a tourist worker who had lost his transport back to the city. As the police officer commented, “asi tienes con quien hablar” [this way you will have someone to talk with]. Eniel, a young man in his late twenties, not only proved to be a good informant with whom to talk about the development of the tourist industry in Cayo Coco but, more importantly, he graciously helped me find a nice place to spend the night in Ciego de Ávila.

The development of hotel accommodations and other tourist infrastructures such as marinas and an international airport in Cayo Coco is a result of the current process of tourism development in the Sabana-Camagüey Archipelago that began in the 1990s. By now it is well-known that Cuba opened up its economy to international tourism in the first years of this decade as a result of the collapse of the socialist economies in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, an economic debacle that triggered a series of socio-economic and political reforms that Cuban authorities refer to as the “Special Period in Times of Peace.” As reported by Jorge Dominguez, Omar E. Pérez Villanueva, and Lorena Barbería in The Cuban Economy at the Start of the Twenty-First Century (2004), with the collapse of socialism in Eastern Europe, Cuba lost nearly 85% of the markets for its export and import products. Thus, tourism development quickly became one of the most convenient and easiest ways for the Cuban government to attract foreign investments and to re-insert itself into global processes of capitalist development. And, although not a theme that I will develop in this article, it can well be argued that tourism development has become a highly controversial topic of conversation among Cubans, particularly in tourist areas within the Sabana-Camagüey Archipelago where Cubans employed in the tourist industry tend to earn higher salaries and live relatively better off than Cubans without access to tourist jobs. As Eniel commented at one point during the two-hour drive to Ciego de Ávila, the tips and (sometimes) the presents that international tourists can give the tourist workers provides them with an edge over the majority of Cuban citizens. In fact, Eniel had lost his transport back to Ciego de Ávila because a group of Canadian tourists that he has known for some time now invited him to gather with them at the bar of Hotel Blau Colonial, where he has worked for the past ten years, before the tourists took their returning flight to Canada.
I visited Cayo Coco for the first time in 2005 when I initiated a field research project with the goal of examining the implications of tourism development in the Sabana-Camagüey Archipelago, where some of the most important tourism development projects are currently under way. The archipelago, which is called by Cuban authorities from the Ministry of Tourism and international tourists by its commercial name of Jardines del Rey, is one of eight main tourist poles selected by the Ministry of Tourism for the development of international tourism, and it has rapidly become one of the preferred destinations for international tourists wishing to explore Cuba beyond (and away) from the traditional, well-established, and more crowded tourist poles of Havana and Varadero Beach. As the site of an impressive ecosystem with high levels of endemic flora and fauna, tourism development in the Sabana-Camagüey Archipelago represents an interesting case in which to examine the consequences of economic development in coastal areas subject to the intensive promotion of ‘sun-sand-and-beach tourism,’ the modality that prevails in the Caribbean region. Cayo Coco is the island within the archipelago where the largest and more profitable tourism ventures have developed since November of 1993, when Hotel Blau Colonial first opened for business. In the spring of 2010, while I lived in Cuba as part of a sabbatical leave from my teaching duties at Eastern Connecticut State University, there were six international hotel chains doing business in the key catering primarily to Canadian, Spanish, and Italian tourists. The majority of the hotel installations are joint ventures between the Cuban government and Spanish hotel chains such as Sol Meliá, Blau, and Barceló while other European chains from France, Italy, and Germany are also represented. This model of tourism development, where the Cuban government engages in joint economic ventures with transnational corporations, is the hallmark of the international tourism development boom that has turned this industry into one of the leading economic sectors on the island since the late 1990s.

It is also worth noting that before the Cuban government undertook the plans for tourism development in the Sabana-Camagüey Archipelago, it built the Coastal Ecosystems Research Center in Cayo Coco to help create a comprehensive program for the promotion of sustainable tourism development in the key and the other main islands in the archipelago such as Cayo Guillermo and Cayo Santa Maria (this one in the Province of Villa Clara) that were also being considered for subsequent tourism development. The creation of the research center responded to the efforts by the Cuban government to develop and implement environmental conservation policies to help minimize the potential negative impacts of tourism development in the archipelago. Thus, by the start of the 1990s Cuba entered into a partnership with the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and the Global Environmental Fund (GEF) to design a research program to promote sustainable tourism development in the archipelago. Currently in its third phase, the research program seeks to study and protect the endemic flora and fauna in order to make the archipelago suitable for the implementation of international parameters for sustainable tourism development. An outcome of this partnership has been the expansion of the research infrastructure to include the creation of four additional research centers throughout the archipelago in areas where tourism development will be heavily promoted in the near future. The research center at Cayo Coco, however, is still the largest and best-equipped of all. As a global partnership between the Cuban government and international organizations, the project has proved to be a model of environmental awareness with the potential to put Cuba at the forefront of sustainable tourism development in the Caribbean, a region whose island-nations depend heavily on revenues from international tourism. In essence, Cayo Coco represents the best example of the newly acquired interest by Cuban government authorities to promote sustainable tourism development and environmental conservation.

The Cuban experience with sustainable tourism development has important implications for contemporary anthropological studies of tourism. First, Cuba’s model suggests that the government’s discourse on sustainable tourism development is in line with global notions of economic and environmental sustainability. This aspect is clearly seen in the success of the partnership between the Cuban government, scientific authorities, and international environmental organizations such as the UNDP and the GEF during the past two decades. Second, proposals to further promote tourism development in the Sabana-Camagüey Archipelago pose tremendous challenges to the rational utilization of natural resources if beach tourism becomes the primary component of the development plans. But, as one of the Scientific Coordinators of the Sabana-Camagüey Archipelago Research Project in Havana told me during the course of a conversation on the subject, scientific and political efforts are currently being made to avoid the archipelago becoming
another Varadero Beach (still the main destination in Cuba for beach tourism) or another Cancún. And, third, like most developing countries that have deliberately based their economic development programs around the promotion of international tourism, Cuba is hoping that the successful growth and expansion of the industry can become the solution to current social problems that result mainly from a debilitating national economy that still looks to re-insert itself effectively into global capitalism. Even though a seeming overconfidence on a tourism-oriented economy may appear problematic, data from the Cuban Ministry of Tourism indicate that the island has maintained a balanced ratio between the number of international arrivals and the earnings derived from the industry in the past three years.

Clearly, tourism development in Cuba has come to stay. And this was not more readily seen than along the northern provinces of Villa Clara, Ciego de Ávila, and Camagüey bordering the Sabana-Camagüey Archipelago, where huge billboards announcing the upcoming tourist attractions ahead dot the rural streets that connect the three nearby provinces. Two billboards were particularly interesting to me as they had pictures of Fidel Castro with messages exhorting Cuban workers to construct *pedraplenes* to connect Cuba with the larger keys in the Sabana-Camagüey Archipelago chosen for tourism development purposes. In an obvious reference to the construction of *pedraplenes*, the message in one of the billboards read: “Ser constructor constituye hoy una de las condiciones más hermosas, dignas y bellas que se puedan ostentar en nuestra Patria” [to be a builder nowadays is one of the most beautiful and dignified conditions that can be upheld in our motherland].

In the new tourism-driven economy that now permeates most social relationships in Cuba; an increased competition to get access to hard currencies from international tourists is turning ordinary Cubans into business people as many choose to rent their homes for tourism purposes. In addition to offering the minimum requirements of an air-conditioned bedroom with adequate bathroom facilities, many licensed home owners also offer home meal services that generally consist of a delicious breakfast and dinner meal at a modest price. With this idea in mind, Eniel offered to take me to the home of a licensed home owner that he knows in the center of the city where I could have the chance of spending the night before continuing on my way to the Province of Camagüey early the next morning. Unfortunately, there was no space available as the two rooms used for leasing to international tourists had been reserved for two European tourists that would arrive later tonight. A tacit agreement among licensed home owners has appeared whereby they send the tourists they cannot accommodate to another licensed home owner in exchange for some type of commission. In this manner, I was able to find a nice place to spend the night at a home of a trained economist, who now devotes his time helping to accommodate international tourists (and anthropologists like me) crossing through the charming city of Ciego de Ávila.

**Grassroots Development TIG:**

*The Developing World Next Door*

By L. Davis Clements [dave@biomassrenewabletechnologies.com]
Professor, Oregon Institute of Technology
CEO, Biomass Renewable Technologies, Inc.

A hallmark of the “culture” of applied anthropology has been for the anthropologist to study the patterns, mores, beliefs, material culture, etc. of an “other.” The “other” often is different, if not isolated by location, language, poverty or other measures.

This summer, my wife, Emilia Gonzalez-Clements, an applied anthropologist, and I have discovered a new reality for “others” that share language, heritage, and much of the common material culture, but are marginalized by lack of access to sources of energy to match the need to serve growing populations, power to support jobs, business expansion and diversification, while maintaining a decent quality of lifestyle and economic survival. Within a 50-mile radius of our home in Oregon, we have one of the highest concentrations of renewable energy enterprises—solar thermal, photovoltaic, wind power, and bio-based energy in the world. Within the same radius there are shrinking communities and economies because the energy infrastructure cannot supply sufficient power to maintain jobs and quality of life. Opportunities and options are increasingly polarized. Much of the framework for development is dominated by external factors. Federal,
local, county and state policies are a network of conflicting goals and assumptions.

Our company provides bio-based renewable energy technologies, and I serve on the faculty of the Oregon Institute of Technology’s (OIT) Renewable Energy Engineering program. In that capacity, I was asked to supervise a county-wide project staffed by OIT students. Emilia volunteered to teach the team applied research skills and the anthropological perspective. The team has just completed the report for its first applied research project in what looks like a promising new practice as a technology provider/anthropologist team in this “new” developing world. Another project is underway, and we have been asked to conduct a full feasibility study based on the first project. Both projects require an understanding of the social, natural, economic and technical environments. Experience in the policy arena is extremely helpful. One client is a county planning commission; another is a two-county consortium of public and private groups and organizations. The goals are the same: identify economic development strategies based on local agricultural wastes that will give farmers value-added products for local and export markets, provide sustainable, renewable energy for new business development, and provide family-wage jobs to keep the communities viable.

The International Side of the Coin

By Emilia González-Clements [emilagonzalezclements@gmail.com]
Grassroots Development TIG Coordinator
Director, Fifth Sun Development Fund

As this new domestic focus begins, another focus is on hold.

Dave and I have been working in Northern Mexico for many years through our own small, development agency. Our current development initiative was at the project implementation stage. Through participatory planning, we had selected two projects, a co-op to produce cinder blocks for the local market in one of our two selected villages, and a community-funded water windmill for the second village. Everything was in place. Last summer, we were unable to go to the field due to health problems and to drug cartel-related violence in Northern Mexico. We also had received veiled threats from some local elites who resented our work with the marginalized members of the community and decided that there were real safety concerns for us and particularly for the students and interns that we might bring along. We were at the point of hiring a full-time applied anthropologist to manage the projects, but we waited and worried about our counterparts and community members.

This summer, the violence has escalated to the point that family members who live in the Monterey area advise us not to even try to travel to our field site in the mountains between Saltillo and Monterrey. Family members who now live in Texas and maintain homes in Mexico are not returning, even for short visits.

And, as if poverty, drought, re-concentration of land, drug-related violence, and inequality are not enough to deal with, the communities were devastated by Hurricane Alex on June 30-July 1. The rains and winds destroyed the roads, the economic mainstay crops (pecans and avocados), ruined a local church and several homes, tumbled gigantic boulders, drowned cattle and horses, and downed what few electric and telephones lines were in place. The entire valley is still cut off, isolated. The Mexican government is providing emergency aid, and we get updates from a friend who is on one of the rescue teams. We are evaluating our next steps.

Gender-Based Violence TIG Looks Forward to Seattle, 2011

By Hillary Haldane [Hillary.haldane@quinnipiac.edu]
Quinnipiac University
and
Jennifer Wies [Jennifer.wies@eku.edu]
Eastern Kentucky University

The October deadline for the SfAA annual conference in Seattle, WA is fast approaching. We encourage any of our members and readers who plan to submit a paper, poster, or panel abstract on issues directly addressing gender-based violence or connected to it in some
way to let the Gender-Based Violence TIG members know so we can advertise your sessions. As Jan Brunson, one of our TIG members recently noted, we have to be working together, and be aware of each other, to make headway against the scope and scale of GBV problems we face at home and abroad.

There are two key mechanisms for utilizing the GBV TIG to reduce GBV and increase our scholarly partnerships. First, please share opportunities for anthropologists to engage with this topic beyond the academy. For example, the United Nations Development Programme recently advertised a posting for a consultancy position with a focus on violence against women that would be ideal for an anthropologist who works in the GBV field. One of our chronic complaints in anthropology is that no one listens to us, but consultancy work for the UN and other such agencies helps us to inform the public of exactly what we know, and the amazing work that we do.

In addition, we would like to continue to utilize the GBV TIG to facilitate collaborations and partnerships via the annual meetings. For Seattle, we hope to hold a TIG roundtable discussion. We would like to have our readers and members suggest three to five key issues we should focus on as a TIG in the next twelve months, and we can then discuss our findings/results at the meetings in 2012. For example, one of the issues we believe is important to consider is the language we use in our work. Why gender violence instead of gender-based violence, or gender-based violence instead of violence against women? What is the importance to using one term over the other, and what is implied by the various uses? Another issue is the lack of representation from non-academic, non-Ph.D. practitioners. How can we do a better job of sharing our work with counselors, hotline volunteers, SART advocates? Please send us your ideas, and we will post the five we select for the meetings so attendees can think about them, circulate remarks, and even share manuscripts prior to the roundtable. If you are unable to attend the meetings, but would like your voice heard, please let us know so we can include you in the discussion.

American Indian, Alaskan Native, Native Hawaiian, and Canadian First Nation Topical Interest Group

Peter N. Jones [pnj@bauuinstitute.com]
Bauu Institute and Press

The deadline for session abstracts for next year’s annual meeting in Seattle, Washington is fast approaching. This year’s theme is “Expanding the Influence of Applied Social Science.” As a TIG we have the ability to sponsor member sessions; please let me know as soon as possible if any TIG members are planning a session that would be relevant for the TIG to sponsor.

Similarly, I am interested in forming a roundtable session that would explore and discuss how current applied social science is utilized - or not - in situations effecting indigenous communities or groups. Topics may include applied social science and natural resources, indigenous community health and applied social science, media and policy and applied social science, or any number of other themes. This year one of the goals of the Annual Meeting is to formulate policy statements on the progress a specific area has made, and to explore policies that help or hinder that area from achieving its goals. This roundtable session would result in a draft policy statement on applied social science and American Indian, Alaskan Native, Native Hawaiian, and Canadian First Nations that will then be distributed to the group for comments and suggestions, with the ultimate goal of being compiled, published, and distributed. In addition to specific policy actions that may be taken, this effort will help increase appreciation for the wide range of policy efforts that can be taken to improve conditions, and the roles that our members can take in effecting future public policy. Please contact me if you are interested in being part of this roundtable.

I would like to remind everyone that if they would like to share announcements, calls for papers, or other news with the TIG email list to do so. Please forward it along to me (pnj@bauuinstitute.com), and I will send it out.

As usual, if anyone is interested in joining the TIG email list, simply send me a request and I will put you on. Likewise, if anyone has anything they would like to send out over the list, please forward it.
A Vision for *Human Organization*: Notes from the Incoming HO Editor

Mark Moberg [mmoberg@jaguar1.usouthal.edu]  
University of South Alabama

I am deeply honored by the decision of the Publications Committee of the SfAA to select me as the next Editor-in-Chief of *Human Organization*. I also want to express my appreciation for the exemplary service provided by outgoing editors, David Griffith an Jeff Johnson, whose dedication to the highest standards of scholarship has consolidated HO’s position as the flagship journal of the applied social sciences.

One of the remarkable features of HO is that editorial transitions have always appeared seamless with regard to the content, operation and appearance of the journal. This stands in notable contrast to the recent experience of other anthropological publications, where transitions have sometimes produced stark—even traumatic—disjunctures. It is my desire to make the editorial transition as smooth as possible for our contributors by continuing HO’s online manuscript submission and review process and its enviable reputation for reasonable review and publication times. Beginning in January, 2011, *Human Organization*’s new home will be the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work at the University of South Alabama (look for a new submission e-mail address and detailed author’s instructions in a future issue of the SfAA News). Apart from the physical relocation of the journal’s operation, I envision a few subtle changes that will make the journal more “user friendly” and further enhance its standing in the applied social sciences. The key question facing the journal, I feel, is how to make it even more responsive to the broad range of activities and scholars that constitute public and applied anthropology.

Early in my editorship, HO readers will notice a modest change to the journal’s appearance, one which the Publications Committee entertained during the 2010 SfAA meetings in Merida. *Human Organization* is currently published in a double column format, which makes the online version of the journal difficult and cumbersome to read. As subscribers increasingly access the journal through digital media rather than hard copies, I believe this would be an appropriate time to initiate a switch to a single column format. This will have minimal impact upon the manuscript submission process, but I hope that the change will further broaden HO’s audience among individuals and institutions that access scholarly publications online.

Second, it is notable that *Human Organization*’s Editorial Board, while always drawing from diverse topical specialties, has tended to exhibit rather less geographic diversity. While many social scientists in the developing world engage in applied research and policy debate comparable to the professional activities of SfAA members, *Human Organization* is all but unknown to many of them. I wish to nominate a Board that is diverse both in specialization and national origin in order to further broaden the journal’s standing in the international applied social sciences. This will widen the journal’s pool of reviewers and contributors in a way that will enhance HO’s relevance to ongoing debates in public and applied anthropology.

At the 2010 SfAA meetings, more than one conferee asked me about my “agenda” as editor, the concern being that I would impose my theoretical or topical imprimatur on future issues of the journal. I want to affirm that my foremost goal as editor is to communicate fairly with reviewers and authors and to continue to publish the highest quality scholarship in a timely fashion. *Human Organization* will continue to explore vital issues of health, livelihood, social justice and culture change, among many others, through a judicious mix of theoretical sophistication and empirical rigor. And I hope to structure our work in a way that raises the profile of *Human Organization* and the Society beyond the Americas, where our scholarship is rightly well-known, to applied social scientists and policy makers worldwide. I look forward to working with the SfAA Board and especially the contributors and reviewers of *Human Organization* to attain these goals.

Seattle 2011 Planning: We Want Your Blood

By Darby Stapp [dstapp@pocketinet.com]  
Program Chair, 2011 SfAA Seattle meetings
Planning for the Seattle Conference is coming along swimmingly. Fans of *Twilight*, the immensely popular vampire-based romance novels and movies, will be excited to learn that we are planning a special event at the Seattle Art Museum in conjunction with its soon to open *Twilight* exhibit. The exhibit, *Behind the Scenes: The Real Story of Quileute Wolves*, addresses the inaccurate portrayal of werewolves in the *Twilight* saga as part of Quileute culture.

At the museum we will have the chance to learn from the Quileute themselves about their history, visual and performing arts, unique language and oral traditions, and ways in which their important cultural beliefs are kept alive today. The exhibition brings together rare, never-before exhibited art works and creates a public forum for the Quileute people to introduce their culture beyond what is depicted in the *Twilight* books and films. This is the first exhibition on historic Quileute art and seeks to provide an authentic, first-person account of the “real Quileute wolves.” The exhibit includes 30 objects, many never before exhibited, on loan from the National Museum of the American Indian, the American Museum of Natural History, the Washington State Historical Society and the Olympic National Park.

The *Twilight* phenomenon has drastically increased tourism in the Olympic Peninsula and there have been significant impacts on the tribe and the local community of Forks, WA. The Quileutes in particular, who live on a small reservation near Forks, were ill-equipped to deal with the tourism mania. Curator Barbara Brotherton, will lead us through the exhibit and participate in a panel on this topic; anyone with an interest should contact me to get involved. James Loucky and Julie Tate-Libby are helping coordinate the tourism presentations.

There will be a number of other special content-rich events during our meeting to take advantage of our Seattle location. Tours are being planned for those interested in topics such as sustainable agriculture, global health, contemporary tribal culture, ethnobotany, and museum collections management. We are also organizing a number of fun tours so stay tuned for those and we’ll also be suggesting a number of things that you can do on your own before, during, and after our meeting.

**Major Event: First Foods Summit**

Most exciting is the recent decision by the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR, [www.umatilla.nsn.us/](http://www.umatilla.nsn.us/)) and other Indian Nations to hold a two-day summit on what they call First Foods management initiatives.

The First Foods management approach is holistic and applied, and views natural and cultural resources as indivisible. Using a First Foods approach, tribes and other managers of natural and cultural resources can better understand and manage for the needs and rights of aboriginal communities.

Tribal representatives and applied social and natural resource scientists will converge in Seattle and work collaboratively to review First Foods concepts, identify subsequent initiatives, remove roadblocks to First Foods and cultural management, and identify potential policy needs and actions.

The summit will begin with presentations on the CTUIR approach to topics such as:

- River Vision: assessment, restoration, monitoring of waterways
- Big Game: assessment, population data, disease, and introduction of extirpated species
- Women’s Foods: assessment, monitoring, and mitigation
- Oral History: using oral history to increase first foods
Regulatory: the dilemma of fish consumption rates.


On Tuesday afternoon, the summit will divide into large and small groups to address First Foods-related issues such as diabetes, diet, health, cultural perpetuation, language, education, and natural and cultural resource management. A goal of the roundtables, in addition to increasing awareness and brainstorming, is to generate simple policy statements that identify specific policies (laws, regulations, guidance, procedures, internal direction, etc.) that are aiding or hindering first foods goals.

For example, even today in the Pacific Northwest, some federal agencies continue to prohibit tribal access to important resources. While some of this can be traced to lack of awareness and understanding, in other cases there are specific policies in place that tie the hands of resource managers. By bringing together tribal leaders and managers, agency managers, and applied social scientists from tribal, agency and academic settings, the First Foods Summit will take a step forward to making the policy changes needed.

Anyone working with indigenous groups or natural resource management must attend this summit. Teara Farrow Ferman at the CTUIR is our contact.

Culture and Ecology

Dovetailing nicely with the First Foods Summit is the participation in our meeting by the Institute for Culture and Ecology (IFCAE), a nonprofit organization based in the Pacific Northwest (headquarters in Portland, OR). The IFCAE mission is to improve human and environmental conditions through applied research, education, and community improvement projects (www.ifcae.org/). IFCAE is a diverse group of applied social scientists conducting collaborative, interdisciplinary research-based initiatives to foster vibrant and resilient livelihoods, communities, and ecosystems.

This year, IFCAE is participating with the SFAA to sponsor a number of sessions, workshops, and special events at the annual meeting in Seattle, WA. IFCAE will host discussions on topics related to Wild Forest Goods, Urban People-Plant Ecologies, Cultural Mapping for Natural Resource Management, Appropriate Technology, and the Nuts & Bolts of Applied Research Non-Profit Management. Many of these research activities are done in conjunction with state and federal natural resources agencies, local tribes, and small landowners.

IFCAE is also sponsoring an optional field excursion with Arthur Lee Jacobson, a local plant expert, to explore some of the many Edible and Useful Plants of Seattle. Tour participants will spend a couple of hours visiting a nearby Seattle neighborhood green space for a hands-on opportunity to learn about some of the rich flora important to local communities.
SfAA-member Melissa Poe is an IFCAE member and planning committee member helping plan natural resource content.

Political Ecology Society

The Political Ecology Society (PESO) will be holding its annual gathering with us, as they have in the past (http://jpe.library.arizona.edu/eco-1.htm). PESO has as its object the promotion of interdisciplinary scientific investigation of the political and economic principles controlling the relations of human beings to one another and to the environment. Joe Heyman is our contact.

School For Advanced Research

A major event at the Seattle meeting will be the School for Advanced Research (http://sarweb.org/) Plenary Session to be held Thursday, March 31, entitled, “Managing Migration: Lessons from the Guestworkers’ Experience.” With over 132,000 guest workers from a growing proliferation of supplier nations employed in the United States, and with a global debate surrounding legal and undocumented immigration, this plenary session will contribute a timely interdisciplinary perspective on the issue of migration. This session will include presentation by ten nationally-prominent scholars, followed by a light reception.

SfAA fellows Diane Austin and David Griffith are co-chairing a short seminar at the SAR on migration, which ended in early August. Following the Seattle meeting, the SAR will submit the manuscripts for peer review and published an edited volume (through the SAR Press).

We are also talking with Benedict Colombi, who has been co-chairing a SAR advanced seminar on “Indigenous Peoples and Salmon in the Northern Pacific,” to bring his team and findings to Seattle. This could be a nice contribution to the First Foods Summit.

SfAA/Humanities Washington Proposal

Building upon the migration topic, SfAA has submitted a proposal to conduct three community forums on migration/immigration issues. The proposal was submitted to Humanities Washington, a non-profit organization and public foundation providing cultural and educational programs to the people of Washington State. If funded, SfAA and SAR will provide scholars for the day long forums to be held on Saturday or Sunday (April 2 or 3, 2011) in Bellingham, Wenatchee, and Yakima, Washington. We’ll know in October.

To further address this timely and important topic, we are looking for additional sessions and papers on migration. Several sessions are expected that will directly address migration, while those interested in related topics such as human rights, education, and global health might orient sessions toward the migration process.

Global and Indigenous Health

With Seattle a major center of global health, our health planning subcommittee is busy organizing sessions and events with local groups such as the Washington Global Health Initiative (www.wghalliance.org/), the Program for Appropriate Technology in Health (PATH; www.path.org/) the University of Washington Department of Global Health (www.globalhealth.washington.edu/), and the Gates Foundation (www.gatesfoundation.org/).

With so much going on in the global health arena, the challenge for the subcommittee has quite a challenge in designing the program for our meeting. If this is a topic of interest to you, this is a good time to get involved.
Subcommittee members include Noel Chrisman, Ed Liebow, Carson and Neil Henderson, Peter Kunstadter, and David Rozen.

Multimedia Extravaganza

An exciting opportunity for our meeting is the availability of a 150-person theatre in the Grand Hyatt. We envision multimedia presentations, movies, documentaries, and performance art going on 24-7. Contact me if you want to make use of this great facility. Adam Fish is helping organize the event. An example of how we will use the theatre is Lushootseed Research’s plan to show a one-hour documentary about Vi Hilbert made by Welsh TV; people will be available to put Vi Hilbert in context and answer questions. Vi Hilbert was the founder of the non-profit organization Lushootseed Research, whose mission is to sustain Lushootseed language and culture and enhance cross-cultural knowledge, wisdom and relations, as shared and celebrated by the First Peoples of Puget Sound, through research, recording, publishing and the presentation of oral traditions and literature. You can read Vi Hilbert’s autobiography at www.lushootseed.org. Lushootseed Research and Jay Miller in particular, are helping bring a special Seattle resident, the last living student of Franz Boas, to come talk to us about her applied work and the influence that Boas had on her. Any guesses. We are pursuing another special person to come talk to us, but I am not authorized to talk about it just yet.

Workshops

The 2011 meeting will again feature several workshops where our members can learn about topics such as conflict management, the NAGPRA cultural patrimony process, and getting a job. If you are planning to offer a workshop, now is the time to tell us.

Graduate Education

We are looking forward to a large number of students at the Seattle meeting. The major graduate programs will all be there for their regular Friday afternoon information displays. All of the Northwest schools should be there, and some programs, such as Central Washington University’s Applied Resource Management Program, will have a session with past students to reflect upon program success and challenges. The general poster session, where many students begin their presentation career, follows the graduate program displays. The SfAA annual meeting is a great place for students and young professionals to build on their existing professional networks.

We need student volunteers to sign up for a 4-hour block to assist with a variety of meeting-related tasks.

Influencing Policy

One of the themes of our meeting concerns the need for applied social scientists to participate in policy making. There are simply too few of us in existence; we do not follow the social work model where dozens of licensed social workers can be found in most any community. We mostly work in unique settings, and therefore, if we are to improve the human condition, we must take the knowledge we gain in our workplace and use it to inform others.

We are using the Seattle 2011 meeting to examine the many dimensions of the public policy world and explore the ways and places where our members are involved. We are also designing various formats to generate simple policy statements that can be used to expand the influence of applied social science. This is not a simple chore and I would appreciate anyone who has an interest in applied anthropology/social science and policy to get involved. The plan is to publish these statements following the meeting.

I am also looking for student helpers to conduct a brief survey of meeting attendees about their experience with applied anthropology and policy (at all levels). It will be interesting, you’ll meet some fellow members, and you’ll learn something about policy in the process. E-mail me.

Call to Action

These are just a few snippets of things to expect in Seattle. The planning committee is increasing to nearly 50 individuals and we are all out there working to make this a productive, educational, and fun SfAA annual meeting.

This is a good time for us as professional social scientists to assert ourselves. The public, politicians, and bureaucrats now see the cost of non fact-based decision making and policy writing. We can use Seattle to demonstrate that facts and theory do matter and that applied social scientists have factually based perspectives that they should
consider. We need to start down this path now.

You can still assist us in developing an agenda that will help us meet our goals. If you have an idea or something you want to do, contact me as soon as you can.

**Remember, the deadline for submission is October 15, 2010.**


---

**SFAA TREASURER’S REPORT: AUGUST 2010**

By Sharon D. Morrison [sdmorri2@uncg.edu]
Treasurer, SfAA
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

This report is my second as the treasurer for the Society. During 2009, expenditures exceeded revenues, due in part to early payments on subscriptions to *Human Organization* that arrived in 2008 and contributed to a significant excess of revenues over expenditures in that year. This was balanced with an increase generated through membership dues and registration for the 2010 annual meeting. With the current investments and reserves in place, the Society remains in good financial standing.

**Current Financial Status**

At the end of 2009, the Society’s assets totaled $228,847.17. This included $87,891.17 in cash or liquid assets. The Society also had $6,399.89 in furniture and equipment and $134,556.17 in investment assets. The total assets were fewer than those held by the Society at the end of 2008 when the Society had $274,582 split between liquid assets ($115,179), furniture and equipment ($7,796) and investments ($151,636) and more closely resembles the situation in 2006 when the Society had $237,282 split between liquid assets ($64,899), furniture and equipment ($1,140) and investments ($171,243). The anomaly in 2009 reflected early receipt of payments for *Human Organization* subscriptions. Total revenues were $28,819 higher than in 2008. Expenditures were also $18,583 higher.

The Society continues to have three major revenue streams: Annual Meetings, membership dues, and publications. Revenues for Annual Meetings ($174,929) were just about at the projected ($175,190). This was due to the increase in early registration for the 2010 Merida meeting. Membership dues ($151,066) exceeded the 2008 levels ($142,932) and were just under the budgeted amount ($155,000). This was influenced by the generally robust (>70%) membership renewal history of SFAA and new membership associated with the 2010 annual meeting.

Actual receipts for subscriptions to *Human Organization* were less ($8515) than budgeted for 2009. Revenues from *Practicing Anthropology* ($7,418.37) and of monographs ($1,234.37) were also below what was projected. Expenditures were $12,402 less than projected. Actual expenses were greater than budgeted for the 2009 Annual Meeting (due to lower attendance), Publications (due to digitization costs) and Professional Services, including Web Page. Expenditures for all other categories were lower than expected.

**2010 Budget**

The 2010 budget adopted by the Board of Directors in December projects an increase in revenues and a decrease in expenditures over the 2009 budget. This includes total expected revenues of 450,652 including interest and dividends, and total expected expenditures of $431,104. The year-end financial forecast is positive.
The SfAA Podcast Project Heads Towards Seattle in 2011

by Yumiko Akimoto [YumikoAkimoto@my.unt.edu]
University of North Texas
and
Jen Cardew Kersey [jencardew@gmail.com]
Intrepid Consultants

Following yet another successful year at the Annual Meeting in Merida, Mexico, the SfAA Podcast project is going through a transition as we begin to prepare for the upcoming Annual Meeting in Seattle, Washington, in 2011. Jen and Yumiko will be co-managing the project in 2011, and Yumiko will manage the project in 2012. Yumiko will then train the next project manager in 2013. The goal of the project is to have a University of North Texas (UNT) student run the project for two years and have a team of UNT as well as local students to record sessions at the Annual Meeting and manage the social media efforts as well as the content on our website. The SfAA Podcast team is working closely with the SfAA IT Committee and the SfAA Board to organize the project.

Jen, Yumiko, and Christina Wasson (University of North Texas), the faculty advisor for the SfAA Podcast project, held a telephone conference in April to start off the fifth year of the project. Using the SfAA Podcast Procedures Manual Jen has created, Jen and Yumiko are holding training sessions over the course of several months as Yumiko goes through the training process. Despite the distance (Jen lives in Seattle and Yumiko is in north Texas), Jen and Yumiko have been in close contact via e-mail as well as other media.

This year, we plan to select team members as well as local students to help with the Podcast project earlier than previous years (in the fall). This will allow us sufficient time to coordinate and organize the project. We hope to work with a few student volunteers from UNT and several students from a local university / universities.

Yumiko is a master’s student at UNT pursuing a dual degree in applied anthropology and public health, with the concentrations in medical anthropology and community health. Yumiko, an international student from Japan, has a bachelor’s degree in anthropology from San Diego State University.

The www.sfaapodcasts.net website has had nearly 37,000 visitors in the last three years and has over 240 subscribers on the site. There are 13 sessions from the 2010 meetings now up at the website and through iTunes. Please check the website for details.

PA Editors Update

By Jayne Howell
and
Ron Loewe
California State University-Long Beach

The next issue of Practicing Anthropology includes an eclectic set of articles that highlight ways that anthropologists are applying anthropological knowledge in the US and abroad. One set of papers examines anthropology and legal advocacy through expert witness testimony in US courts and the development of policies that protect endangered cultures. Another set of papers falls into the broad category of “Anthropology, Students and Health,” with two types of projects in these broad themes. Two focus on student projects conducted in US hospitals and on food security in the US and Sri Lanka; the
other two focus on students’ health in the US, including programs that attempt to prevent obesity and drug and alcohol abuse. Finally, two other authors explore ways that anthropologists are involved in community projects, with one article analyzing the benefits of anthropologists’ collaboration with a community organization to reclaim African History in Virginia, and the other discussing a process approach to coping with HIV in the Caribbean.

As editors, we have a unique opportunity to see the breadth of the types of projects that SfAA members are engaged in. We welcome additional submissions from faculty, practitioners, and students. If you are interested in submitting a manuscript, please contact us at anth-pa@csulb.edu.

!!!!!!!!!!Practicing Anthropology - Editor Search!!!!!!!!!!

The Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA) announces its search for the next editor of its journal, Practicing Anthropology. The current coeditors, Professors Jayne Howell and Ron Loewe, will complete their term on December 31, 2011. The new editor(s) will assume responsibilities for a three-year term on January 1, 2012.

Practicing Anthropology’s editor is appointed by, and reports to, the Board of Directors of the Society for Applied Anthropology. On appointment, the editor becomes a voting member of the SfAA Board. Practicing Anthropology is a quarterly publication that focuses on timely issues and breaking topics related to the application of the social sciences to contemporary issues. PA’s reputation is based on publishing relevant and concise articles and commentary that appear quickly so as to be valuable to projects, organizations, and practitioners in the field. Practicing Anthropology is a benefit of membership in the SfAA; there are also approximately 500 institutional (library) subscribers.

The journal’s editor determines the content of the publication within certain broad guidelines, executing this responsibility through the nomination of an editorial board as well as the review and selection of manuscripts. The editor reports biannually to the SfAA Board of Directors.

Applications should describe prior editorial experience and outline institutional support (such as editorial office space, equipment, editorial assistance, and other in-kind or financial support) for the proposed editor. The editor should expect to devote 10 hours per week on average, with additional time prior to issue publication. Essential to a successful editorship is to have a good student editorial assistant, preferably with combined interests in anthropology and English.

The statement of application should also recount the applicant’s particular interests and how these might influence the future direction of the journal and its contents. Applicants are expected to be members in good standing of SfAA.

Interested individuals should contact the SfAA Office for additional information and sample copies of past issues. Applicants may wish to communicate with previous editors for a description of the workload, the resources required, and the benefits of this office. The SfAA Office will provide addresses and contact information for previous editors. PO Box 2436, Oklahoma City OK 73101-2436; Phone: 405-843-5113 l Fax: 405-843-8553; www.sfaa.net; info@sfaa.net

Notes from NAPA

By Mary Odell Butler [maryobutler@verizon.net]
President, National Association for the Practice of Anthropology.

Greetings from NAPA!

NAPA is the AAA section charged with representing the interests of full and part-time practitioners of anthropology within AAA. NAPA is certainly not the only organization representing this growing group of anthropologists, nor should we be. Right now practitioners are spread out among many organizations within and outside of AAA. NAPA would like to reach out to other organizations that support anthropologists who practice in a search for common ground from which we can build and strengthen the value of practice as good anthropology.

Society for Applied Anthropology
In my time with NAPA, there have been many steps to bring anthropological practice in to the mainstream of AAA. This is a really good thing. But practice is dynamic, operating at the forefront of changes in how people organize themselves, how they move across space, how they communicate. We need to be nimble in negotiating the uncertain terrain that opens before us as we try to develop solutions in contexts of globalization, new diseases and new systems for managing them, environmental degradation in interconnected ecosystems. To do this, we need to build bridges among the organizations that seek to support the professional development of anthropological practice and anthropological practitioners. We can be resources to each other in meeting these challenges.

SfAA and NAPA are natural partners. Our membership has a significant overlap. NAPA has in the past co-sponsored the SfAA annual meeting. For many years, SfAA has provided the NAPA Governing Council with a venue for its Spring Meeting, a real convenience for us since most of the NAPA leadership regularly attends this conference as SfAA members. Many of us have been officers in both organizations. There are many ways in which we can build on this history to advance the state of the art in anthropological practice and to meet the needs that are common, if not unique, to anthropologists engaged in practice in any way.

Practitioners need better access to scholarly resources. Practitioners entering the non-academic workplace are often surprised by the lack of research supports that they are used to having in the academy. For example, academic library privileges may not be available. Most employers have someone who will borrow items from local libraries or universities, but the kind of exploratory work that deepens our perspective on our research topics is no longer available to us. Absent this resource, the development of a substantive method and theory of anthropology in practice is difficult. A program that improves the access of non-academic practitioners would be an asset both to individuals and to the state of the art in anthropology.

The cumulative growth of practice as a substantive field depends on the timely publication of our work in ways that are accessible to our colleagues in anthropology. Practitioners have limited time to publish because of the demands of full-time employment and the high cost of our time to employers. NAPA members publish in the NAPA Bulletin, soon to be Annals of Anthropological Practice or in journals such as Human Organization. But the dynamic nature of practice means that the value of developments can attenuate with the publication delays common to more academically-oriented journals. Venues that allow for rapid publication of brief research summaries - such as electronic publications - facilitate the appearance of our research in a timely manner and at a low cost, an advantage to the membership of both of our organizations.

Practitioners encounter ethical issues that need to be discussed and worked through in the context of practice. As is evident in the ongoing debate about revision of the AAA ethics code, practitioner’s ethical positions are not always well understood by anthropologists who do not practice. Like all anthropologists, we respect the rights of our research participants and are very concerned with protection of their interests. However, often our clients “own” the data under the terms of our contract with them. This means that our ethical practice must incorporate protections at the point of data collection rather than at the point of publication. We need to be careful about what we collect, how we record it in the data, and we need to become masters at “sanitizing” qualitative data so that not only personal indicators but clues to identity are removed. The ethics underlying the practice of a discipline that relies on qualitative data and the trust of those we study requires a more specific development of ethical standards that comes from discussion among many partners.

Practitioners need training in what practice involves, both professionally and substantively. Practice tends to be multidisciplinary and requires an understanding of the multi-layered environments in which our anthropology is done, what is expected in the non-academic working environment, what kinds of jobs practitioners have, how anthropology fits in. Right now Practicing Anthropology is one of the few places that anthropologists contemplating practice can find role models and mentors specifically focused on practice. NAPA conducts workshops at the AAA meetings to provide such training. A few years ago, a very successful NAPA workshop on evaluation anthropology was offered at the SfAA meeting and drew a sell-out crowd. We could do more of this kind of sharing of resources. We have many opportunities to improve exchanges and collaboration between our associations at professional meetings. Our overlapping membership means that we are often at the same place at the same time. If you plan to attend the AAA meeting in New Orleans, NAPA will have numerous events that may be interesting to you and your students. For example, NAPA will host an Employers Exposition that will showcase agencies and businesses that regularly employ anthropologists. Representatives of employers - very often anthropologists themselves - will be available to talk to both professional anthropologists and students about what they do, the role that anthropologists play in their organizations and the kinds of opportunities that are available. The Employers Expo is one of NAPAs activities to help practicing anthropologists explore and obtain jobs. We invite you to join us for these and other
activities that NAPA will host at this meeting. If you can’t make it to New Orleans, we’ll see you in Seattle in the spring.

Members in the News

Peter Van Arsdale publishes Humanitarians in Hostile Territory

Peter Van Arsdale, with co-author Derrin R. Smith, has just published a new book, entitled Humanitarians in Hostile Territory: Expeditionary Diplomacy and Aid outside the Green Zone. The book is a guide to the ethics, theory, and practice of work outside so-called Green Zones of safety. On behalf of governments or NGOs, on missions ranging from complex humanitarian emergencies to post-war reconstruction, social scientists in interdisciplinary teams are operating in settings where the line between civilian and military projects is increasingly blurred. The publisher is Left Coast Press (2010). Van Arsdale is chair of the SfAA Committee on Human Rights, a member of the Committee for Human Rights of the American Anthropological Association, and is a senior lecturer at the Josef Korbel School of International Studies at the University of Denver and a senior researcher with eCrossCulture Corporation. Derrin Smith was a political officer at the U.S. Embassy in Beirut, Lebanon, working on terrorism finance and sanctions, trafficking in persons, Iraqi refugees and internally displaced persons, and broader issues involving human rights, labor, and democracy.

Carmen Garcia-Downing Receives Rosa Parks Living History Makers Award

Ms. Carmen Garcia-Downing is a recipient of the Rosa Parks Living History Makers Award for improving the lives of others in the Tucson community. The League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) recognized 25 honorees for their contributions to the Tucson community through advocacy, health, education, arts and environment, public government service, business and faith-based efforts. Ms. Garcia-Downing was recognized for her community advocacy and leadership contributions in the area of health. She is a Research/Minority Outreach Specialist at the Rural Health Office in the Community, Environment & Policy Division of the University of Arizona Mel and Enid Zuckerman College of Public Health.

SfAA Members Elected to the National Academy of Sciences

The National Academy of Sciences today announced the election of 72 new members and 18 foreign associates from 14 countries in recognition of their distinguished and continuing achievements in original research. Included in this list of newly-elected members were three active and long-time SfAA members:

H. Russell Bernard
Emilio F. Moran
Larissa Lomnitz

The election was held April 27, 2010 during the business session of the 147th annual meeting of the Academy. Those elected today bring the total number of active members to 2,097. Foreign associates are nonvoting members of the Academy, with citizenship outside the United States. Today’s election brings the total number of foreign associates to 409.

The National Academy of Sciences is a private organization of scientists and engineers dedicated to the furtherance of science and its use for the general welfare. It was established in 1863 by a congressional act of incorporation signed by Abraham Lincoln that calls on the Academy to act as an official adviser to the federal government, upon request, in any matter of science or technology. Additional information about the Academy and its members is available online at http://www.nasonline.org.
Announcements

Professors Beyond Borders

The motivation for forming the Professors Beyond Borders organization is that real-life problems can best be addressed by interdisciplinary teams of experts. Depending on the specific project, PBB will put together teams of PBB members who have the expertise and experience necessary to effectively address the needs of a particular project in a local community or region overseas.

Since the focus of PBB is to simultaneously build sustainable development capacity in local communities and regions, as well as the capacity of higher education systems on the ground to effectively address the local and regional sustainable development needs of local communities and regions, we expect that humanities faculty with teaching expertise will regularly be a part of PBB teams as well. Teaching methods, service learning, didactics, curriculum development will all be important components of PBB projects.

To join PBB please fill out a registration form on the PBB web site. We will then keep you informed of upcoming PBB projects and activities. We also hope that some universities and colleges will want to start PBB chapters on their campuses. Information about PBB chapters can also be found on the PBB web site [http://www.professorsbeyondborders.org/home.htm] or by emailing us at info@professorsbeyondborders.org.

From The Editor...

Drug Wars, Cartels and Gangs... Where's the Outrage?

By Tim Wallace [tmwallace237@gmail.com]
North Carolina State University

So much bluster about the Islamic Center in NYC near Ground Zero, it makes you wonder what all the fuss is about when compared to some really big problems we are facing really close to home! The problem I want to focus on in this brief column is the danger on the other side of our southern border from drug wars going on there. Someday soon, if it hasn't happened already, the leadership of our Mexican and Central American neighbors could be held hostage to the demands of drug cartels and gangs. Some worrisome signs are appearing in the news.

The Associated Press reported (8/24/2010) that bullets from street shootouts in Juarez, Mexico, ground zero in the drug cartel wars, were whizzing into El Paso, Texas, though no one was hit—yet.

Yesterday it was discovered (NPR, 8/25/2010) that Mexican gangs had massacred 72 migrants from South and Central America as part of extortion and ransom schemes.

Decapitated bodies are regularly found in Mexico, and in several Central American countries. Authorities often attribute these cases to “settling accounts among gangs and drug dealers.”

A recent news article from Guatemala said that 40% of Guatemalan territory is controlled by drug cartels (Prensa Libre 8/23/2010).

Mexico and Honduras are among the countries with the highest murder rate in the world.

The New York Times recently (8/22/2010) had an article with a headline this headline: “Venezuela, More Deadly than Iraq, Wonders Why.”

Not infrequently the grossly underpaid Mexican and Central American police forces that are supposed to protect and serve are the ones doing the robbing and killing at the bidding of the drug lords and gangs.
These news items are such that it might suggest a revolution or insurgency of sorts is underway in some of our neighboring countries. How are we in the US responding to these events? In my opinion—not much, certainly not enough.

Mexican President Felipe Calderón asked the US for help, particularly with gun control and better efforts to reduce demand among US illicit drug consumers. According to the Raleigh News and Observer (8/26/2010), President Obama proposed a “spending surge” to try and capture dollars leaving the US. But that amount is peanuts compared to the $20-25 billion in US cash Latin American suppliers and traffickers are bringing annually south into Mexico, Central America and northern South America. By way of comparison, this huge sum is equal to more than half of Guatemala’s GDP. How can our neighbors fight back when they are awash in drug money?

Have we taken a serious look recently at our own “war on drugs?” I think we lost that one some time ago. The amount of drug money flowing into Mexico, Central America is a torrent that is swamping the ability of those governments to meet the challenge. If we don’t get to work to figure out a way to reduce demand or aid the security forces of Mexico and Central America, the problems, as we are seeing now in northern Mexico, will spread. Latin Americans have been moving north to the US for economic reasons, but now we are seeing many people emigrating due to the lack of security. People don’t have many choices of where to go. What will we do if Mexico and some Central American countries become failed states, controlled by drug money? What will we do if all of Mexico and Central America becomes a battle zone? If we in the United States do not attend to this problem, the US will have converted a war on drugs into a real shooting war, no less threatening than our two wars in the Middle East and Asia. So, where is the outrage about what is going on the other side of the border? Why aren’t we lobbying to have more aid sent to our neighbors who are in real trouble? Why don’t we try and develop more effective policies regarding illegal drug consumption?

Next year marks the tenth anniversary of 9/11, and there is as yet no monument, no permanent memorial at Ground Zero. Why are we spending our time arguing over whether an Islamic Center should be located near Ground Zero? If this were truly an important issue, shouldn’t we be demanding that local and federal authorities work together to get the memorial built? That is how we need to remember those that lost their lives that day. There were Jews, Catholics, Protestants, Muslims, and people of other faiths who lost their lives on 9/11. Let us also honor their memory with getting outraged at our inattention to the battle being waged on the other side of the border.
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