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It has been an honor and a pleasure to have served as your President for the past two years. As my term comes to an end, I will hand the gavel over to Roberto Alvarez at the Business Meeting in Denver. I thank you all for the privilege and look forward to continued service to SfAA in other capacities during the years to come. This last Presidential message to you is focused on the future of our organization.

As part of our “Beyond 75” initiative, we are taking steps to bring our processes and procedures into the 21st century. Our bylaws, the “sacred text” that guides what we do and how we do it, have not been updated since 1998. (Prior to this, bylaws changes were made every few years.) One of the initiatives the Board has wanted to implement is online voting, which was not an option in 1998; our current bylaws state that we must use paper ballots. In preparing a bylaw revision to allow online voting, we saw several other inconsistencies and discovered that the bylaws are currently confusing and difficult to follow and interpret. The Board therefore took on a full review of the bylaws and identified several other potential changes in how we operate that we may want to adopt.

Changing the bylaws requires a vote of the membership. The Board will develop new bylaws and they will appear on the paper ballot (hopefully the last paper ballot!) next fall. We have agreed that the new bylaws should:

- Preserve the intent of our Founders
- Be written clearly and concisely, and be well organized
- Bring us into the modern age re: electronic communication, voting, etc.
- Reflect good governance practices (oversight, fiscal management, representation)
- Promote representation and participation of our membership
- Maximize member voice

In the spirit of good governance, we have designed a bylaw revision process that provides a maximum opportunity for our membership to become informed and participate in the process. The process includes:

1. Communication to the membership about why we are doing this, who has been involved, and what the process will entail—this column begins to accomplish this.
3. Provision of a discussion of each of the substantive changes being considered (provided below).
4. Provision of a way for members to provide their opinions about the substantive changes being considered. If you are reading this electronically, comments may be made at the end of this article. If you are reading a hard copy, you may respond via email directly to me (Merrill@u.arizona.edu). In addition, substantive issues will be discussed at the Business Meeting in Denver.
5. Member comments will be documented and summarized in the May SfAA News; there will also be an email blast with this information in May, and members may make comments at that time.
6. The Board will consider all comments and feedback and develop new draft bylaws for member consideration on the fall ballot.

While this entire endeavor was sparked by our desire to move to online voting, that we believe that this issue is non-controversial. We will allow for online voting, but continue to offer a paper ballot to those who cannot access the online system. The substantive issues on which we are seeking member input include:

- **Defining of who we are:**
  1. Should we add a tag-line to our name that recognizes our cross disciplinary and international membership?

- **Board composition:**
  2. Should we expand the size of the Board of Directors?
  3. Should we create Board seats to represent particular constituencies?
  4. Should appointed Editors continue to be Board members, and if so, should they continue to have voting privileges?
  5. What model should we choose for the Treasurer’s position?

- **Nominations and elections issues:**
  6. Should we keep the 2-year member requirement before a member can participate in voting?
  7. Should the term for the Nominations and Elections (N&E) Committee continue to be 2 years or should it be extended to 3 years?
  8. How can the N&E Committee have a closer relationship with the Board?

Below we provide a full discussion of these issues, in some cases with pros and cons identified. We urge you to consider the discussion below and comment, and to also attend the Denver meetings and participate in discussions at the Business Meeting and at the Roundtables.

1. **DEFINING WHO WE ARE**

Our name, the Society for Applied Anthropology, is focused on one social science discipline, Anthropology. However, from the inception of our organization the intent was to engage a wide range of social scientists to address contemporary social problems. Records indicate that our founders discussed having a name that expressed this interdisciplinary focus, but that the legal paperwork had already been drawn up and they did not want to postpone incorporation.

Today, our membership survey indicates that 83% of our members who have doctoral level degrees are anthropologists; the proportion decreases when we look at masters and bachelors level degrees. Short of changing our name to reflect
our membership composition, the Board has approved a “tag-line” that clarifies who we are: “A Worldwide Organization for the Applied Social Sciences.” This tag-line would be incorporated into our bylaws and become part of our public image.

**Question 1: Should we adopt the tag-line: “A Worldwide Organization for the Applied Social Sciences”?**

2. **BOARD COMPOSITION**

The Board of Directors has been discussing its composition—how many members should the Board have, what membership constituencies should be intentionally represented, and who on the Board should have voting privileges? Our current bylaws state that the Board is comprised of 14 members. These include 10 positions elected by the membership—the President and President-elect/Past President, the Secretary, 6 at-large members, and one seat reserved for a student—and 4 members appointed by the elected Board—the Treasurer and the editors of Human Organization, Practicing Anthropology and SfAA News. Candidates for the elected positions are vetted by the Nominations and Elections Committee, which is also elected by the membership. All members of the Board of Directors, including those who are appointed, currently have voting privileges.

**a. BOARD SIZE**

The size of the Board has not grown since 1998, even though the SfAA membership has grown significantly. We are considering if the size of the Board should or should not be expanded. The related question of composition is addressed in separate notes.

**Question 2: Should we expand the size of the Board of Directors?**

**Yes:** Expanding the board adds more people to represent the SfAA membership. As our membership grows, and our fields of interest differentiate, a larger Board size will bring better representation.

**No:** The current size of the board works well, and larger boards can be more complicated to coordinate and bring to resolution. One related consideration is that if the publication editors are no longer voting members of the board, this allows room for three additional voted-in-office members without expanding the overall board size. (See Editors discussion below).

**b. REPRESENTATION OF MEMBER CONSTITUENCIES ON THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

The issue discussed here is if there should be specific designated board positions for some major constituencies, and what exactly they should be. Currently our bylaws call for one Board position to be designated for a student member. Other positions are elected “at-large.” But there could be other designated Board positions. For example, should there be a slot for practitioners (non-academic anthropologists)? For international (non-U.S.) applied anthropologists? Other constituencies?

**Question 3: Should we create Board seats to represent particular constituencies?**

**Yes:** Creating Board positions to represent constituencies ensures that some major constituencies are always represented; at-large voting tends to bypass important but non-dominant constituencies. A guarantee of inclusion of some constituencies is a pro.

**No:** Creating constituency positions may result in only “token” representation. Further, it will be difficult to select which constituencies merit designated representation. Finally, designated representation tends to fragment the organization and its membership.

**OPTIONS FOR 2013 BYLAWS:**

1. No change. Retain the designated student position, but do not create other designated positions.
2. Identify specific constituencies to be represented on the Board. Identification of these constituencies could be decided by a membership vote, by a Business Meeting vote, or by consensus of the sitting Board members.
3. Ensure constituency representation by having designated constituency representatives on the Nominations and Elections Committee, rather than on the Board, which recruits candidates to run for the Board and Officer positions.

c. EDITORS

Currently, the Editors of our three publications are appointed by the Board, and as ex-officio members of the Board, have full voting privileges and Board responsibilities. We have been discussing the role of the Editors and their responsibilities to the Board.

Question 4: Should Editors be Board members, and if so, should they have voting privileges?

Yes: The editors should be members of the Board with full voting privileges. SFAA Editors have long served on the Executive Board as voting members. Their service contribution to the Board has been significant through the years. Historically, Editors have made important contributions to SFAA governance and policies. There are several strong reasons why Editors should continue on the Board as voting members.

1. SFAA Editors directly represent a large and key constituency of our membership: those who publish and read our publications. Editors are in contact and have exchanges with a diverse constituency within the SFAA. That allows Editors to provide the Board with valuable perspectives on a wide range of issues.

2. The SFAA Editors need to be at Board meetings and with voting responsibilities to defend and protect the interests of their publications and readership. They need to understand a wide range of issues that the Board addresses so that they can assess the impact of Board decisions on our publications. Furthermore, Editors must be well informed about the history and policies of the SFAA, and so they provide a key level of functionality to the Board actions and reviews. Voting rights, responsibilities and equality of participation in Board decisions also sustain the commitment of the SFAA Editors to their publications.

3. Board members are elected representatives of the membership charged with administrative and fiduciary responsibilities. The Board continually reviews and monitors the SFAA Editors and their publications carefully. Additionally, their work is itself publicly vetted every time a new issue is published. The Board selects Editors through a rigorous and transparent process. Editors are representative of a clear sector of the Society, i.e., those who write, publish and communicate their ideas, experiences and research to the rest of the membership. This is an example of a representative democracy.

4. From a functionality perspective, Editors provide continuity to the Board since they serve longer terms—between 3 and 6 years normally—versus three years for At-Large Board Members. This helps provide institutional memory on past policies, decisions and outcomes.

5. The Board has not had any issues or problems with Editors having voting responsibilities. Furthermore, the SFAA is a unique organization with a venerable history. We should not be driven by what other professional organizations do in terms of editor roles on their board.

No: While it is important for there to be good communication between the Board and the Editors, because they are not elected by the membership, they should not vote on the full range of Society business. The editors of our publications provide a significant contribution to the functioning of our Society. Their insight should certainly be valued and considered by the Board, but their role as editors does not necessarily include organizational policy-making responsibilities. Below we list some reasons why Editors of our publication should not be voting members of our Board. Arguments against Editors voting on the Board fall into two categories—workload for the editors and principles of “good governance.”

1. Workload: Society governance and editing the publications of the Society are both major undertakings that require a great deal of time and attention. In addition to issues related to the Society’s publications, Board members are asked to study and make decisions about budget and financing Society activities, overseeing the Business Office, filling all Committee vacancies and serving as liaisons to the Committees, participating in planning activities and addressing issues that impact the future of the Society, making decisions about the annual meeting, and any other issues that arise. Although the Board meets face-to-face only two times per
year, much of its business is conducted online throughout the year. Editors’ responsibilities are also year-round and are even more demanding than Board participation. While communication between the Board and the publication editors is crucial, it is not necessary for editors to participate in Board activities that are not related to the publications.

2. Good governance: As the governing body of the Society, the Board should represent the membership of the Society. Representative democracy requires the consent of the governed, through the electoral process. Editors are appointed by the Board based on their qualifications to fulfill the responsibilities of editorship, not for their “representativeness.” The membership does not participate directly in this decision, and it would be cumbersome and logistically difficult to put editorship positions to the members for a vote.

3. While editors have a unique relationship with authors, they do not “represent” authors. Further, authors are not necessarily Society members. In the most recent issue of Human Organization, for example, only 7 of the 13 authors are Society members. Editors can provide an important perspective in Board discussion, but since they are not elected by the membership, they should not be voting on Society business. Of course, editors can always be invited by the Board to participate ex officio in discussions specific to their publication or the Society’s publishing program generally.

Considerations of Board size are discussed in a separate note. Here we would like to point out that if Editors are relieved of Board responsibilities, 3 additional elected positions can be opened to our membership without having to expand the size of the Board. This would bring the ratio of members to Board member to approximately 1:173.

OPTIONS FOR 2013 BYLAWS:

1. No change. The bylaws should indicate that the editors are appointed by the Board and are considered to be officers of the Society, with full voting privileges and responsibilities on the Board.
2. Editors serve on the Board without voting privileges, but responsible for all other Board member expectations.
3. Editors report to the Board and are invited to Board meetings to discuss issues relevant to their publications.

   d. TREASURER

Over the past 5 years, the annual budget for the Society for Applied Anthropology has increased from $319,000 in 2008 to $509,000 in 2013. With increases in membership, contributions, and the size of the annual meeting, the role of the Treasurer will continue to be of key importance for the Society for Applied Anthropology members.

Currently, the Treasurer is appointed by majority vote by the Board of Directors. Potential candidates are vetted for budget management experience and skills and previous participation with the Society. The Treasurer is a member of the Board of Directors and has full voting rights at the Board of Directors meetings. Through the bylaws revision conversation, potential alternatives to this Treasurer model have emerged. Regardless of the model, the Treasurer would continue to serve the Board and the membership, and be a member of the Board of Directors. The responsibilities of the Treasurer would also remain the same.

Question 5: What model should we choose for the Treasurer’s position?

1. The Treasurer continues to be an appointed seat, but serves as an ex officio member without voting rights. Since the Treasurer is currently appointed, removing the voting right would ensure that voting members of the Board are elected by the membership.
2. The Treasurer would be on the slate of candidates for election by the full membership. Candidates would submit materials to the Nominations and Elections Committee, the same as candidates for all other Board positions. The Nominations and Elections Committee would ascertain the nominees’ budget management experience. In this model, the Treasurer would continue to vote as a Board Member and representative of the membership at large.
3. The Board vets potential candidates and presents a candidate for the Treasurer to the membership to be voted upon and approved. This could take place at the Annual Business Meeting. This would create a feedback loop from the membership, and provide support for establishing the Treasurer as a voting member of the board.
3. NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS ISSUES

a. VOTER ELIGIBILITY

Our current bylaws state that members of SfAA may vote “on issues concerning the composition, the purposes and the commitments of the Society” only after paying dues a second time. During the first year of membership, there are no voting privileges. This requirement was enacted to ensure that people who are not members but who submit abstracts in the fall for our annual meetings (and therefore are required to become a member), are not voting in our elections, which also occur in the fall. The pros and cons of this arrangement are detailed below:

**Question 6: Should we keep the 2-year member requirement for voter participation?**

**YES:** Individuals who join SfAA solely to enable them to submit an abstract are not necessarily engaged in the broader interests of SfAA. Limiting voters to those who sustain membership beyond the first year is a way to create a voter pool that shares a commitment to the organization and a familiarity with organizational issues and activities.

**No:** Limiting voting privileges to those who have paid dues for 2 years not only eliminates those who join specifically to submit an abstract, but also those who joined earlier in the year because of their interest and identification with the applied social sciences. Extending voting privileges to these individuals can strengthen our organization and nurture their commitment to SfAA. Some one-time members may end up voting, but overall, voting participation has been low and it is not likely that those who are not committed to the organization would take the time to complete a ballot.

**OPTIONS FOR 2013 BYLAWS**

1. No change. Requirements for voting in an SfAA election include having paid dues two times.
2. Remove the requirement for voting that restricts voters to those who have paid dues two times.
3. Create a cut-off date, prior to the abstract solicitation, for voting in the fall election. For example, if someone joins between January and June, they can vote in the fall election, but if they join between July and December, they cannot.

b. NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

The current bylaws establish an elected Nominations and Elections Committee composed of 4 members who serve staggered 2 year terms. The membership elects the Committee members, and one of these members is designated by the Board as the Chair. This Committee is responsible for soliciting nominations for itself and for the elected officers and at-large members of the Board of Directors, for proposing a slate of candidates for these positions, and for hand counting the votes. (Our current bylaws do not allow for electronic elections; the new bylaws will allow for voting online.) The N&E Committee operates separately from the Board. No N&E members currently serve on the Board.

**Question 7: Should the term for the N&E Committee be extended from 2 to 3 years?**

**Yes:** It would be more practical if the election were for three years. The first year is difficult because the members have to become familiar with the list of Society members and go over their web pages to get feedback about their research and anthropological work/interests in order to identify them as possible candidates for the open positions. It is also hard because the nominations need to agree with the overall goals of the Society. The second year becomes a little bit easier because the “dynamics” and process is already learned but this is the very last year of the membership to the committee. If we add a third year, we can take advantage of the knowledge and “dexterity” already acquired during the two years and selections will be easier. At the same time, we can count on members of the committee who have already the experience in “coaching” the new members.

**No:** Because terms are longer, turnover on the committee will be slower, and hence fewer different individuals will be participating.

**Question 8: How can the N&E Committee have a closer relationship with the Board?**

The N&E Committee is responsible for identifying prospective Board members, but currently has little knowledge of what the Board does or how it operates. It is important for prospective Board members to understand the commitment
required to be an effective Board member before they stand for election. Our bylaws should create a stronger linkage between the Board and the N&E Committee.

OPTIONS FOR 2013 BYLAWS:

1. The N&E Committee Chair, elected by the membership and designated by the Board, should serve as an ex-officio member of the Board of Directors, without voting privileges on the Board.

2. The Past-President should serve as an ex-officio member of the N&E Committee, without voting privileges on N&E. This would ensure that the Committee has at least one member who is familiar with the responsibilities of being a Board member. It would bring a fuller understanding of the scope and level of work required into the committee discussions without imposing on the Chair. It will, however, lengthen the commitment of the Past-President by 1 year.

3. A member of the Board should be assigned by the President to be the liaison to the N&E Committee. This person would not be an N&E Committee member, but would serve in consultation to the Committee.

I look forward to a robust discussion of all of these issues at the Business Meeting and in Roundtable discussions that are on the Conference schedule.

Special Elections Note:
Rachel Mason was recently elected to the Board of Directors but she is unable to serve because her employer has determined that she has a conflict of interest. In accordance with the bylaws, the Executive Board will appoint a substitute. The appointee will serve until the 2014 Business Meeting. This at-large Executive Board position will appear again on the fall ballot and the winner will serve out the remaining year of the term starting at the Business Meeting in 2014. For a full list of the current Executive Board members, please go to the SfAA website.
https://www.sfaa.net/officers.html.

SfAA Human Rights and Social Justice Committee:
Our Chance to Be the Change We Want to See in the World

By Mark Schuller [mschuller@niu.edu]
Chair, Human Rights and Social Justice Committee

The next generation of the committee will be facing many challenges and opportunities, and it welcomes your input as an SfAA member.

One opportunity to build upon the activist work is to join our discussion about the membership survey. Last fall almost 900 SfAA members filled out an over-100 question survey. The results show that the membership is engaged in many levels of activism, and want to see this work continue. Sixty-five percent of us are engaged in some form of social justice issues or activism. Many of us work alongside social justice groups and activists, collaboratively in research design, etc.

One item for continued concern is that most of us do not engage the media or publish regularly in venues accessible to the public. This is one of several areas that the Committee is attempting to help. Since 2010 we have done Activist Toolkit workshops, sharing specific skills. According to the survey on trainings, working with the media was the most popular, but others included community organizing skills. Please help shape the direction of these trainings by attending the roundtable on the survey Friday afternoon - as part of SfAA’s strategic planning process.

A challenge as well as an opportunity facing not just the Committee but the membership as a whole is how to put our values into practice as a Society. The annual meeting is our biggest expense both collectively and individually. The controversy regarding last year’s hotel put the question to us all: how do we as a Society respond, not just reactively but proactively, so that our considerable collective funds are doing the most good while reducing our social injustice “footprint”?

Society for Applied Anthropology
This begs the question: what values do we share as a Society? What ethical principles should help guide the decisions of selecting meeting hotels? Should we have a policy, and if so, what should it look like?

As evidenced by our profession’s ethical codes, advances in ethical, socially conscious action and policies often follow crises of conscience. But how do we put our policies into practice, without edging out lower-income communities that might benefit most from our collective engagement as applied anthropologists, and without pricing ourselves into only a handful of the most expensive states and cities in the country that pass a rigid litmus test?

Please join the Committee as we deliberate and propose a policy that reflects your ethical, social, and political commitments. The Committee is hosting a discussion on Socially Responsible Meetings, on Saturday from 3:30 to 5:20 in Colorado B. Special. Thanks go to Betsy Taylor for her work putting this together. If you’re interested, please stay and join us.

To help start the conversation, following is a draft outline of such a policy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Human Rights/ Social Justice Component</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Up to 2 years before the meeting | Select a host city                        | • Union town  
• SfAA member linkages with local HR/SJ organizations  
• History of community engagement  
• Potential of our presence to contribute to local organizing  
• Others? | SfAA Board queries membership, HR/SJ committee about potential linkages |
| 18 months before meeting | Select hotel                              | • Union strongly preferred  
• Locally owned  
• Minority owned  
• Contribute to local causes  
• LEED certified  
• Has local businesses / vendors  
• Others? | SfAA board makes decisions based on CMA recommendations. If there is a cost differential (e.g. unionized hotel costs $15 more) the board can poll membership. |
| 6 months before meeting | Establish dialogues with local HR/SJ organizations | • Plan sessions inside and outside the hotel  
• Consider action items that a large infusion of cash and people power might benefit from | Local host committee in dialogue with HR/SJ committee. Report to the CMA and board for inclusion into program. |
|                          | Verify HR/SJ components of hotel           | • Review of management policy  
• Contact labor representatives (if no union, a meeting with a group of workers)  
• Others? | Local host committee in discussion with hotel management, workers, CBOs. Report to the board. |
| Deadline for meeting room block | Investigation of allegations of violations (if necessary) | • Determine whether allegations of misconduct are true. If true, do they violate force majeur clause in contract?  
• If so, hotel is moved.  
• If not, investigation is shared with membership via email. | Board appoints local host committee and HR/SJ committee to investigate and write a report. This report is shared with membership. |
| Any time up to the meeting | Investigation of allegations of violations (if necessary) | • Determine whether allegations of misconduct violate force majeur clause in contract.  
• If so, hotel is moved.  
• If not, investigation is shared with membership via email. | Board appoints local host committee and HR/SJ committee to investigate and write a report. This report is shared with membership. |
| At meeting                | Engage local HR/SJ organizations          | • Sessions (teach-ins, actions) with locally-based HR/SJ groups held both inside and outside the hotel. | Local Organizing committee, HR/SJ committee, interested |
Speaking of future generations of activists, we would also like to take this opportunity to congratulate the winner of the 2013 Human Rights Defender Award: Ruth Goldstein at University of California, Berkeley.

Following this article is an excerpt from Christine Ho’s Issue Briefing #4. On the same topic of immigrant detention is Steve Pavey’s Issue Briefing #3. Jim Phillips wrote the latest one, on the ongoing and sometimes forgotten human rights crisis in Honduras. Expect one soon on Mali. For these and all of the Issue Briefings, visit the Committee’s page at: http://www.sfaa.net/committees/humanrights/.

You are welcome to be a part of our collective efforts. Please join us and share your ideas at our annual business meeting Thursday, 2 to 3:50 p.m. in the Matchless Room. We will begin our meeting with a discussion of Emerging Human Rights and Social Justice Issues of the Day, facilitated by Christine Ho.

I would like to thank the people who have been working at social justice and human rights. It has been an honor working alongside a dedicated group of committed activists.

U.S. Immigration Detention: An Inhumane System Violating Human Rights

Christine G.T. Ho [christineho@fielding.edu]
Fielding Graduate University

The U.S. immigration detention system consists of approximately 250 privately-run prisons sprawled across the country in remote locations to warehouse unauthorized immigrants. Immigrant detention has tripled over the past decade. This spectacular growth has benefited mainly the privatized U.S. prison industry. In 2011, Corrections Corporation of America and GEO Group, Inc., the two largest contractors for Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), reported annual revenues of $1.73 billion and $1.6 billion respectively (National Immigration Forum 2012). During President Obama’s first term, 1.4 million immigrants have been deported, which is more than were deported during the eight years of the Bush Administration.

Few are aware that the detention system violates international human rights laws which guarantee immigrants the right to a custody assessment, a detention review, and options for release by an immigration judge, except those detained at the border. The system also denies immigrants due process, including access to legal counsel, legal information, interpretation services and judicial review, as well as the ability to challenge detention and deportation decisions. Statistics show that 84% of immigrants in detention and 58% in deportation proceedings have no legal representation.

Other human rights violations include arbitrary detention and “mandatory detention” (compulsory imprisonment without custody assessment or detention review for minor crimes committed long ago). Mandatory detention has effectively nullified any challenge (Zavella 2011) by eliminating the right of appeal and judicial review of any wrongful, arbitrary or discretionary decision for both “legal” and “illegal” immigrants and by protecting immigration authorities from law suits and judicial review of mistakes and biases. Unprecedented summary removal at the border has made border officials judge, jury and executioner, while immigration authorities are allowed to imprison any noncitizen, without bond, a process protected from judicial review.

According to human rights law, detainees must be provided with access to medical care. In violation of the law, detainees have died because medical staff and guards have failed to respond to medical emergencies. ICE itself has recorded 107 in-detention deaths since October 2003. Also to be challenged is the use of shackling, attack dogs, solitary confinement, as well as lethal force and Tasers. At least four fatal shootings and another death involving Customs and Border Patrol (CBP) agents have been reported in the media since June 2010 (Amnesty International...
2012). Appalling conditions have inspired a class action lawsuit filed in the U.S. Ninth Circuit in November 2012, demanding bond hearings for detainees held for more than 6 months.

Equally cruel is housing detainees thousands of miles away from families, lawyers and immigration courts. The New York Times has reported that many detainees with legal grounds to contest deportation are routinely transferred to more remote jails without notice. Even worse, tens of thousands of detainees have been transferred from major cities to Mississippi, Louisiana and Texas, under the Federal Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, which is notorious for rulings against immigrants (Bernstein 2009).

A culture of fear fuels public support for the deportation of approximately 11 million unauthorized immigrants, as well as the militarization of borders and an end to immigration. The result is skyrocketing rates of detention and huge profits for the privatized prison industry. More humane detention guidelines exist but are not enforced. Applied anthropologists could improve the situation by holding ICE accountable for its inhumane practices. In the final analysis, immigrant detention will persist as long as national borders endure, but detention need not be inhumane.

References Cited

Author Note: Christine G. T. Ho, Ph.D. is an anthropologist and professor in the School of Human and Organization Development at Fielding Graduate University. Her vision of more humane migration policies is contained in her recent book (with James Loucky), Humane Migration: Establishing Legitimacy and Rights for Displaced People. Sterling, VA: Kumarian Press, 2012.

Civil Fracking Rights: Community Response to Natural Gas Development in NY

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

Duncan Earle [DEarle@marymountpv.edu]
Global Studies
Marymount College

Hydraulic Fracturing and New York State

I came to Otsego County, New York twenty five years ago, to a gentle valley nestled on the banks of the Susquehanna, and still call it home. For years I owned a 90-acre blueberry farm and wetlands which I sold just before the landmen came, offering gradually increasing sums of money for our natural gas mineral rights. Had they knocked on my door when I owned the land, I probably would have signed. Who knew?

My move took me to a little knoll, a 19th century hunting camp suitable for hobbits, just above the red roofed barn of Grandpa Norfolk’s farm. When the landmen came, he signed a lease: $3.00 an acre, a far cry from the $5,000 acre signing bonuses received in Pennsylvania five years later. Who knew?

While living in the towns of Milford and Oneonta, I taught for 13 years at SUNY-Oneonta, publishing, “Too Wet To Plow: The Family Farm in Transition” in 1987. That research documented the decline of dairy farming in surrounding counties. As the hydraulic fracturing wars heated up in New York State, Paul Buckowski/Times Union: Protests in Albany, NY 2/4
York, it was a logical step to ask how many of the farms interviewed in Too Wet had deeded their mineral rights to the myriad of out of state and out of nation natural gas drilling companies.

Beginning 11 years ago, NY landowners were offered gradually increasing signing bonuses for leasing their agricultural and woodland for future natural gas ventures. At the time, looking at neighboring Pennsylvania, the industry assumed that drilling permits would be issued without much interference from environmental regulators in the State. But NY declared a moratorium on drilling and opened a period of debate on the Department of Environmental Conservation’s (DEC) 1200 page Environmental Impact Statement (SGEIS). The first comment period yielded 66,000 responses; a second round, ending on Jan. 12, 2013, resulted in 204,000.

In upstate NY, we are witnessing the way the penetration efforts of mature capital markets now involutes into the rural US “backwaters” in the wake of the recession and political changes abroad—squeezing new kinds of profit out of natural “resources” at the expense of local people in the manner of Third World operations. Having worked with the Zapatistas in Chiapas for the last 15 years, it is clear that now it is OUR internal places of rural poverty and marginalization under assault, places described by the EPA as having “no significant human activity,” literally squeezing the last bit of value out of the American hinterland.

In response, individual townships in NY have used home rule in an attempt to chart their own development course, by passing bans and moratoriums. In November 2011 the town of Dryden became the first of these to be sued in New York State Supreme Court, winning one stage of a lawsuit brought by a natural gas drilling company. In another case, Middlefield also prevailed, though it was sued by a landowner claiming that the town interfered with her right to use her land. These cases test the ability of individual towns to invoke home rule; that is, to use local zoning ordinances to prohibit heavy industrial economic development. In the months leading up to this, local organizations came together to provide information, legal aid, and political power to divided communities facing hard choices both for and against fracking. As this complex development war continues, frack action mobilization comes to resemble the Zapatista social movement in Latin America. If the EZLN was the first virtual uprising, the frack battle is the first virtual civil rights movement, a struggle for autonomy in development decisions, fought out in the American hinterlands, by a US citizenry with no international rights.

Community groups began forming in 2007. For example, Shaleshock Alliance is “a major outreach and information hub about fracking in the Southern Tier and Finger Lakes region, connecting people to the growing movement to protect our communities...” Like the Occupy movement and like the Zapatistas, “....[I]t is a loose network of groups and individuals. Landowners and renters. People with leases, and people without. No single person or group can represent Shaleshock as a whole...”

Sustainable Otsego was also founded in 2007. Sustainability remains the focus of the group, “a loose, minimally structured network of local activists and supporters focused on Cooperstown and Otsego County...” In 2009, as local elections loomed ahead, with the potential to gain some control over town and county governance, the group became more specifically active; “one of scores of organizations statewide in New York who oppose current drilling techniques as too unsafe and costly to be permitted.”

Other groups became unifying sites for community advocacy all over the state. While monitored by individuals, the list serves attached to these organizations are like having a team of 150 researchers active at any one time, following up on scientific reports, press discussions, state agency deliberations, industry and stock exchange pronouncements and federal oversight processes nationwide. Like the Zapatistas, Occupy and any social movement, the NY groups go up and down as they move through the organizational life cycle. Again, like the Zapatistas, there are times to work outward and times to look inward as they develop and reassess tactics and strategy. The 204,000 comments just submitted to DEC is an example of what can be done while working outward. As biologist Sandra Steinberger stated: “In short, the fight against fracking in New York is now officially a citizen uprising.”

Anastasia Hudgins (IUP): Warnings at PA flowback pond

Society for Applied Anthropology
New York has had powerful guidance from the example of Pennsylvania’s largely unregulated model of gas extraction. Groups work closely with community organizations in bordering Pennsylvania counties who are living through the environmental, social, and economic impacts of explosive drilling. In turn, New Yorkers are reaching out to newly developing networks in North Carolina, where shaky political process led to the midnight passage of a fracking bill in June 2012.

**Beyond Wells: If You Build It, They Will Drill**

Though NY has not yet made a final decision on whether fracking will be allowed, or what the regulatory process will ultimately look like as part of the segmentation of gas extraction and exploitation, plans for a new 120 mile Williams-Cabot gas pipeline were unveiled in spring 2012.

This pipeline will carry Marcellus Gas from Brooklyn Township, PA to Schoharie, NY, to connect with other major pipelines moving gas to the coasts. Landowners who refuse to allow the company access will be subject to eminent domain should the pipeline be permitted. About 40% have refused access to their land. A community group Stop The Pipeline and its related Unconstitutional Pipeline list serve has been instrumental in galvanizing interstate, multicounty support for the analysis of the project and a related movement to convince FERC not to issue the permit. As required by law, Williams and FERC hosted a number of science fair style informational sessions in our townships, and voiced consternation and surprise at the opposition they met in NY.

For upstate NY communities along the pipeline route, the fight is about more than the movement of gas from the Marcellus gas fields to purported northeast markets. Though Williams adamantly declares that their project has nothing to do with fracking New York citizens argue that “If you build it, they will drill.” Moreover, Williams told stockholders that the Constitution Pipeline could eventually lead to liquid natural gas (LNG) exports. For Williams, getting the pipeline in place now means huge competitive advantage if fracking begins in the NY Southern Tier.

State and national environmental agencies also questioned the environmental feasibility of the project, and made it clear that they saw the connection between the pipeline and fracking and the pipeline and climate. Most significant were comments from the DEC and the EPA. The DEC directed Williams to study the cumulative impacts in the event that fracking occurs “Since the location of the proposed Project route has a high potential for development of natural gas extraction ...the draft EIS must evaluate the cumulative environmental impacts associated with these potential activities.”

The EPA’s letter includes the potential for air pollution in the wake of climate change, noting that “... climate change will continue to occur and therefore the effects of climate change on your project should be considered so that adaptations can be made as appropriate.” This latter directive is interesting given the fact that the push for natural gas extraction received support from legislation exempting it from the clean air and clean water acts (the Halliburton Loophole). Moreover, the EPA is proposing an
exemption on pollution control technologies on compressor stations in rural areas that, according to EPA, have no "significant human activity." A similar rule allows the use of lesser quality pipe in areas with lower rural housing concentrations, providing for higher short-term profits at huge environmental and health costs the rural landscape. There is a global pattern here.

Collateral Damage: So What about People?

Though there is continual commentary in the press and literature about environmental issues and fracking, what is singularly missing is any substantive discussion of people, their lives, their rights, and their futures. We talked about it last month with a Navajo friend as we drove through uranium rich New Mexico, where a fracturing practice called "in situ leach mining" was being protested by Navajo families. We explained how rural populations in the northeast were facing the destruction of what might well be called their traditional way of life.

“You’re all Indians now,” she said, commenting on this shared colonial experience.

Even as a UN Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas is finalized, our rural populations, native and non-native alike have no such protections. We think once again of Chiapas and the Zapatistas and consider that there is no STRUCTURAL difference; their marginalization is tied to their victimization by forces of market economies seeking profits when and where and as much as possible. In that setting it was often called internal colonialism. Using a global term and taking a local look, New York landowners are smallholders involved in a social movement of grassroots origin, springing up in desperately divided communities, assisted by local groups and legal and education campaigns. Theirs is a protest against huge transnational forces (gas companies that are Norwegian, Canadian, Chinese and Dutch owned), against threats of vast and long term ecological destruction that has already begun, and the “end of country” as one author puts it. This is rural US colonization in the midst of hard, recessionary, desperate times—when people are most vulnerable to the landmen and fall victim to such environmental injustices as toxic and water table contamination, noise and air pollution, pipelines through wetlands, truck traffic, rising housing costs, and falling property values.

If Not Gas, Then What?

The decision to frack is rumored to be imminent in NY, even though the Feb. 13 regulatory deadline was passed, pending health studies. In this, it is critical to face the realities of land use and demography in NY’s southern tier. Turning Oneonta, NY into a clone of Montrose, PA might bring short term income to a struggling farm population, but it will destroy the economic base brought by other long standing and/or sustainable industries. Three of these, wine, beer and Greek Yogurt are dependent on clean reliable, local water supplies. Tourism is dependent on clean air, clear roads and the sounds of silence. From the blue waters of Glimmerglass Lake, to the banks of the Susquehanna, Otsego County sells its idyllic (and bucolic) character. Picture the 10,000 cars arriving for Baseball Hall of Fame Day competing for road space with 1000 truck trips per well.

Community organization is the first stage of resistance in this version of the development wars. Stage two is civil disobedience. In Horseheads, NY, where a gas storage facility is being built in a salt cavern under Seneca Lake, three women were arrested when they chained themselves to bulldozers. An extension of these protest events is, of course, uncivil disobedience. Suffice to say, in some states (NY, Colorado) many anti-frackers are aged sixties hippies; in NC, they are aged Panthers. The 21st century adds new technological, virtual and economic dimensions to monkey wrenching; for some, a more satisfying option than long term care.

There is growing resistance to this market “penetration” at the land margins in rural America, and its maturation must continue. Just as the anti-fracking network needs to know who they are up against. They also need to know what products to boycott or sometimes they can buy a few shares of stock in an energy company in order to become stockholders. This has become a growing movement on some college campuses. If there are 204,000 antifracking letter
writers in New York, that becomes a growing pool of consumers and aware voices that could easily make the connections as part of a PRO advocacy process along with an ANTI advocacy program.

Proactive planning for communities is also critical. A by-product of town discussions about fracking, zoning and development is a move to create long term development plans. As much as those opposed to fracking hate to think of defeat, our towns need a Plan A and a Plan B. If gas doesn’t come, how will they create new avenues of development? If gas does come, what can the towns ask for, beyond road repair, which will make quality of life better for all citizens, not just those receiving lease payments?

The Zapatistas have always asked those of us on the outside of their movement, “How do you do Zapatismo where you are?” They organize and make change at the level of subsistence because that is their identity; we, as Americans, may have to do it at the level of consumption, because that is our identity. As New Yorkers were penning comments in December, the Zapatistas were marching, silently, saying, “Do you hear it? It is the sound of your world crumbling.”

In New York, we say, listen: it is the sound of our people finding their voices.

---

1 Gas drilling lease; Mason-Dixon Oil and “J. Norfolk”. August 22, 2002; on file Otsego County Courthouse
5 Among numerous summaries of these cases see http://www.celdf.org/non-rights-based-fracking-ordinances-ny
6 Municipalities and Natural Gas Extraction.. http://www.newyorklawjournal.com/PubArticleFriendlyNY.jsp?id=1202
7 http://www.opendemocracy.net/marc-edelman/one-third-of-humanity-peasant-rights-in-united-nations
8 http://shaleshock.org/about-2/
9 http://www.sustainableotsego.org/
10 Williams monthly report to FERC; http://elibrary.FERC.gov/idmws/file_list.asp?accession_num=20130122-5236
11 http://www.stopthepipeline.org/  
12 http://elibrary.FERC.gov/idmws/file_list.asp?accession_num=20121106-5145
13 Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2008-0708-0866
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The War for Turtle Island: The 8th American Revolution Has Begun

By Brian McKenna [mckenna193@aol.com]  
University of Michigan-Dearborn

“Perspectives must be fashioned that displace and estrange the world, reveal it to be, with its rifts and crevices, as indigent and distorted as it will appear one day in the messianic light”

Adorno, Minima Moralia, 1951

The First American Revolution was an improbable affair. It was sparked when the Spanish whipped 75 Pueblo religious leaders for practicing idolatry, killing four. Fueled by a fierce desire to rid his homeland of the invaders, who’d been there nearly a century, the Pueblo Shaman Po’Pay, one of the 75, led a revolt in 1680. It was a bloody reckoning that succeeded in a full-scale Spanish withdrawal for twelve years. The rebellion is largely credited for the longevity of Pueblo people to the present.

In 2005, a seven-foot high white marble statue honoring Po’Pay was placed in the Capitol Rotunda (see a video of the New Mexico unveiling is below). Senator Pete Domenici, Republican from New Mexico, celebrated the festivities. On the surface this appears to be a remarkable contradiction, since, by today’s standards, Po ‘Pay would likely be considered a terrorist.

Brian McKenna
The victors get to name the terrorists. But Po’Pay is a riddle for Washington, a riddle we all need to address.

The Hollywood film, “Avatar” did a magnificent job in addressing this riddle, depicting a native defense of its homeland against cruel invaders. But it was not about the Pueblo. It was a thinly veiled denunciation of U.S. terror on native peoples. Such is the power of art.

*Avatar* fashions a perspective that Adorno might have liked. It’s not perfect. The majority of viewers I spoke with were not capable, without prodding, of making the connections between the film and US imperialism today. It’s not *Hearts and Minds* (Davis, 1974) and *In the Year of the Pig*, (de Antonio, 1968) two excellent Vietnam era documentaries that told the story bluntly. Still, it’s a start. And it’s a challenge to anthropologists. If Hollywood is telling a version of the tale, in a popular vein, why don’t we? What will the anthropologists of the 22nd century - if they ever exist -- say of us?

**Welcome to Turtle Island**

Anthropologists seem to forget that Karl Marx, in his last days, studied Louis Henry Morgan’s work with the Iroquois (1877) to gain a better understanding of primitive communism, helping him to imagine what kind of new world might be possible, post-capitalism.

Morgan was followed by legions of other anthropologists through the 1920s, 30s and 40s (like Boas, Mead, Kroeber and Stewart) studying the natives in the place that gave anthropology its original Raison d’Être: North America.

The Iroquois called it “Turtle Island,” a referent tied to its mythical power. The name Turtle Island came into wider usage in the 1970s by many Native American tribes, Native rights activists, and environmentalists. The writer Gary Snyder (1974) believes that understanding North America under the name of Turtle Island helps shift conceptions of the continent. So do I.

And so does the observation that Turtle Island was mostly communist, not capitalist, over the millennia.

Anthropologist Jack Weatherford’s *Indian Givers, How the Indians of the Americas Transformed the World* (1988), was one of the first to reveal, for a popular audience, how American Indians gave us much of our food, cuisines, medicine, architecture, ecology, and revolutionary inspirations. Indians succeeded in staging one of the most important revolutions of our time, the “Land and Liberty” uprising of Zapata and his armies in 1911, what he calls “the first major victory against the whites in over 400 years of intermittent struggle” (Weatherford 1988: 163).

Stanley Diamond had it right in the classic *Reinventing Anthropology* (Hymes 1972), in a searing essay that struck a sword at the profession’s core. Diamond threw down the gauntlet, “Unless the anthropologist confronts his own alienation . . . and seeks to understand its roots, and subsequently matures as a relentless critic of his own civilization, the very civilization which objectifies man, he cannot understand or even recognize himself in the other or the other in himself” (Hymes, p. 403).

Can you recognize yourself in American Indians and American Indians in yourself?

There is an unspoken connection linking Po'Pay's Pueblo Rebellion to Zapata and other revolutionary movements of Turtle Island: the American Revolution of 1776-1783, the Age of Tecumseh, the Civil War, the U.S. Communist/Socialist movements of the 1930s, the world historic rebellions of 1968, to the cusp of the 8th revolution today, glimpsed briefly in the Occupy Movement of 2011-12.

*The War for Turtle Island* has raged for 521 years. We need a new narrative of North American history, one that explores the country’s transition from primitive communism to primitive accumulation which is our lot today. And we need this story to propel us towards critical action to take back Turtle Island.

But that is not the story most anthropologists tell. Instead a growing number of anthropologists have abandoned Turtle Island to work as part of the global counterinsurgency (see Kelly, John, ed., *Anthropology and the Global Counterinsurgency*, 2010, University of Chicago Press; and Price, David, *Weaponizing Anthropology* 2011).
Indian activist Vine Deloria famously warned his fellow Indians that if you see an anthropologist coming, run in the other direction! In books like “Custer Died for your Sins,” Deloria said, “Every summer when school is out a veritable stream of immigrants heads out to Indian Country. Indeed the Oregon Trail was never so heavily populated as are Route 66 and Highway 18 in the summer time. From every rock and cranny in the East they emerge, as if responding to some primeval fertility rite, and flock to the reservations. “They” are the anthropologists . . . [they] make OBSERVATIONS. During the winter these observations become books by which future anthropologists will be trained, so that they can come to reservations years from now and verify the observations that have been studied . . . . Each summer there is a new battle cry, which inspires new insights into the nature of the ‘Indian problem.’ . . . They go to the anthropological wars [ed. conferences], testing whether this school or that school can endure the longest. And the battle fields, unfortunately, are the lives of Indian people” (Deloria 1969: 83-84).

When the Indian rebellions of the 60s and 70s took place (Alcatraz, Wounded Knee, AIM etc.) it took the anthropologists by surprise. And when the resistance took place, anthropologists were largely on the sidelines. Today, fortunately, many anthropologists are Indians themselves and are working in a variety of capacities with non-Indians in the struggle to defend and take back their land and cultures. In books like “A Companion to the Anthropology of American Indians” (2004, Thomas Biolsi, editor), dedicated to Vine Deloria, Jr., one can marvel at the vast outpouring of critical literature in solidarity with American Indians over the past forty years. At the same time, while much has changed over the past forty years, much has not. For most, American Indians are now just another specialty.

Peggy Barlett identifies a paradox in a profession, anthropology that honors holism in theory but defers from holism where they work: the campus. “For . . . anthropologists [our] loyalty [is] to the place we did our fieldwork,” she said, “we’re experts on Papua New Guinea or sophisticated about Paris. There’s no prestige in being knowledgeable about the particular town or bioregion where our university may be located. This attitude transmits to our students a notion that, well you don’t have to know anything about where you are to be a successful person and a knowledgeable citizen. In this particular era, that’s a dangerous habit” (McKenna interview).

The End/s of Anthropology was the theme at the American Anthropology Association’s 108th annual conference on December, 2009, expressing deep concern for anthropology’s relevance. Seemingly irrelevant at the conference were the great mass of Ph.D. anthropologists toiling as adjunct instructors barely making it on $25-30,000 a year, with banks hounding their backs to repay student loans which can be over $100,000.

There are so many elephants in the room of American Anthropology that it is starting to look like a zoo.

Obliteration

Activist anthropology? What does that mean in these dark times? Fear and despair saturate the land. The American Empire is in descent, millions are dead from immoral wars over the past half-century - from Vietnam to El Salvador, Nicaragua to Iraq. The manufacturing base is in tatters as jobs are offshored to “profit centers” in third world megacities. Education, the basis of democracy, is evaporating with the climate itself, as universities downgrade into knowledge factories open to the highest bidder. Corporations are now officially defined as people while real people are zapped into zombies.

We live in very dangerous times. In his book, “The University in Chains: Confronting the Military-Industrial-Academic Complex,” (2007) social theorist Henry Giroux carefully documents how a new form of authoritarianism has swept the country - largely unnamed and unrecognized - turning the university into a “hypermodernized militarized knowledge factory.” He credits President Eisenhower for sounding the alarm in his famous 1961 farewell address, in which the President eloquently made the case against the “misplaced power” and “unwarranted influence” of the military in civic life. Giroux charts layer upon layer of sophisticated methods which the National Security State brings to bear upon a university system that presently looks like a deer caught in the headlights. He is blunt, “Given the seriousness of the current attack on higher education by an alliance of diverse right-wing forces it is difficult to understand why liberals, progressives and left-oriented educators have been relatively silent in the face of the assault (Giroux: 185).”

According to Laura Nader, “it is often the case that the critical potential of a discipline is obliterated as soon as the disciplines gets institutionalized and transformed into an industry” (Nader 2008: 100). Nader argues that the thrust of American anthropology has supplied the ideological support for imperialism and colonialism, studying down not up, studying away not in their own backyards.
BA and MA graduates in anthropology, especially (those who mostly work in their own backyards of Turtle Island), find themselves ill-prepared to navigate a world with an anthropology degree that puts a premium on critical thinking, not critical activism to take back Turtle Island. Merrill Singer argues that we need to start teaching community organizing using Saul Alinsky as one of the models.

American Indian anthropologists are among those leading the way. For example Kay McGowan, a Choctaw anthropologist, recently addressed the United Nations in support of the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which she helped draft (Rickert 2010). It passed in 2007, with 143 member states voting in favor (and only four countries opposed, including the United States). In December 2010, following acceptance by the other three countries, President Obama announced that the U.S. would formally support the declaration; however, its acceptance is legally non-binding.

Anthropology needs to return to its roots and create a unified project that rigorously aligns itself with the American Indian project of independence, liberation and revolution in the continual creation and recreation of a new world.
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A Baseline Cross-Cultural Competence: The Decisive Edge for a 21st Century US Military Mission

By Robert R. Greene Sands [robertsands10@yahoo.com]
DoD Language and Culture Consultant
Adjunct Professor at Norwich University

“...in the 21st century, military strength will be measured not by the weapons our troops carry, but by the languages they speak and cultures they understand (Obama 2009).”

Introduction and Motivation

My name is Robert Greene Sands. I am an anthropologist; I have a Ph.D. in anthropology and have supported for five years the US Department of Defense Language and Culture effort. This commentary is an exploration of what I provide to the Department of Defense (DoD)—research, policy development, and instruction on cross-cultural competence (3C). Why do I and the other social and behavioral scientists in the DoD research and develop learning programs to promote 3C as a critical and enabling set of skills and abilities among our military forces? For a variety of reasons; some which are:

Society for Applied Anthropology
Because the front lines of conflict no longer apply to the traditional frontlines that we as a military prepared traditionally—the frontlines now merge with alarming frequency in those areas and with those groups that are victims of living with little or no human security. Women and children among all civilians impacted by the dissolution of battlelines suffer the most.

I think it’s way past time that we redefine what we mean by war because there are no front lines in the wars in today’s world...The primary victims in today’s wars are women and children (Secretary of State Hillary Clinton in Reticker 2011)

Because the cold war polarity that dichotomized our conception of us versus them no longer applies, our friends, allies and enemies are now a post-modern gestalt of not just nation-states and traditional state actors, but are also tribes, kin groups, ethnic and religious groups, and even terrorist groups—some large, with complex organizations, and more often than not radical groups with just a few members.

Globally there has been a trend for state governments to lose power also through devolution to sub-state, regional, provincial, and local political entities. All these developments have led [to]... the emergence of a varied, complex, multilayered international order more closely resembling that of medieval times (Huntington 1996:35)

Because the notion of our and others’ security no longer is a narrow interpretation promoted by weapons and bullets, security is also defined by the stability of borders and governments and the ability to build partnerships that can provide for the human security of those who have little ability to defeat the forces that deny that human security. Our mission now includes:

...empowering host nation forces, providing appropriate assistance to humanitarian agencies, and engaging key populations. These long-term efforts increase partner capabilities to generate sufficient security and rule of law, address local needs, and advance ideas that discredit and defeat the appeal of violent extremism (McRaven 2012)

Need

Warfare in the 21st century is far different today than just 20 years ago. Conventional warfare was about kinetic force and bending an adversary by might and strength. Skills valued were those related to mastery of weapons and placing ordnance on target. Courage and valor were defined by conflict. Militaries were distinct from the population and occupation was an enduring stage of war. Contemporary warfare, or perhaps stability operations, continues to be an exercise in military strength, but more and more is composed of missions that depend on: skills to forge sustainable partnerships with a host of actors that once had no voice or role in conflict’s duration or conclusion; and making sense of others’ behavior that can make a difference in considering future behavior. Today, final victory may be subsumed into the larger and more consuming equation of international stability. Warfare now is about countering insurgency and the rise of terrorism through an array of strategies that foster collusion and collaboration, not acquiescence. Many military missions “.....will largely take place outside declared combat zones, using a small footprint approach that includes precision operations, partnered activities with foreign Special Forces operations, and capacity building so that partner countries can be more effective in combating terrorism on their own (Panetta 2012).”

Promoting our national security will involve building international security and will involve partnering with allies, including less stable nation-states, non-state actors and cultural groups (ethnic and tribal associations) to help construct stable governments responsive to their population’s human security needs. Stability fends off the creep of terrorism and minimizes the threat of destabilizing insurgency. And these efforts are best employed “left of bang” (prior to conflict when conditions already have spun into sustained violence) and will involve efforts consisting of missions that aid in “....forming a government, humanitarian assistance, reconstruction efforts, infrastructure development, reintegration and reconciliation programs, and establishing military and police forces (Flynn et al 2012:14).”

3C

3C has been identified as critical to Department of Defense (DoD) expeditionary military and civilian personnel. 3C is the ability to navigate in complex interpersonal and cross-cultural situations, interpret or express ideas/concepts
across worldviews and cultural divides, and make sense of foreign behavior. At its foundation, 3C engages several baseline (Sands 2012) skill-based competencies: among them cultural learning; cultural self-awareness, perspective-taking and sense-making. Utilizing cross (inter) cultural communication skills and having language proficiency are also important as are the more complex behaviors such as conflict resolution (negotiations), building rapport and partnership building. Supporting 3C development is a collection of enablers, states and traits that enhance competence.

3C is a cross-disciplinary endeavor, therefore the colleagues in the DoD I engage with on research and instruction represent the spectrum of behavioral and social sciences: anthropologists, psychologists, human geographers, and intercultural communications and international relations experts. The initial conceptualization of 3C was important for international business and marketing, expatriates and foreign exchange students. It also has been applied in fields such as medical anthropology where it is important to discern worldviews and meaning of behavior of ethnic and cultural groups. However, elements inherent in DoD missions and operations that dramatically affect military and civilians are not experienced in non-military cross-cultural events and interactions. Developing and sustaining learning programs that consider these elements is driving much of contemporary 3C research in the DoD.

Dissecting 3C

Knowledge

“I never visited Indochina, nor did I understand or appreciate its history, language, culture, or values. When it came to Vietnam, we found ourselves setting policy for a region that was terra incognita” (Robert McNamara in McFate 2005:42).

Cultural knowledge—knowing the foundational elements of culture is important. Human behavior is predicated on and reflected in a system of shared beliefs and values, and is expressed through domains of activities. As anthropologists we know beliefs are ideas that are held to be true by a society; values are shared beliefs that are meaningful judgments of personal attributes and reinforcement of qualities important to group members. These beliefs, values and behaviors are learned and shared across generations. Culture is more or less an organizing concept or process that generates and sustains human behavior. Cultural knowledge provides the why behind a group’s behavior by discerning the formation and sustenance of those beliefs and values. Military leaders are now well aware of the need for this context, “...we have learned many lessons over the last 10 years, but one of the most compelling is that - whether you are working among the citizens of a country, or working with their government or Armed Forces - nothing is as important to your long term success as understanding the prevailing culture and values (Odierno 2012).”

Regional knowledge—awareness of region is also critical; reading the natural and built landscape can elicit and derive meaning from patterns of behavior of a people reflected in the imprint of human activity on the physical landscape (Sands 2013). Human geography provides keys to how and why people make places, how society is reflected across spatial dimensions and in the way people interact in places and finally, how the landscape reflects social and cultural processes that drive human behavior. Regional knowledge considers how cultural domains and processes such as governance and economic systems, belief systems, language, technology, systems of affiliation, cultural heritage, development, and security and so on are expressed in the built landscape and also determined by the natural landscape and earth’s natural processes such as climate. Basically tying culture to a location combines the need to understand specific expressions of cultural domains and processes through observable patterns of behavior delineated to place and space. Translating this knowledge to a useable interface is difficult. “We’re exceptional at mapping defense-related activities, facilities, homes, bridges, and the like, but how do you map a tribe, a culture, or an entire society (Flynn and Flynn 2011: 7)” Drones or other surveillance platforms cannot identify and build understanding of those areas of growing populations that US Military is likely to find themselves in the near future. A much more intimate and population-centric approach to helping define and locate culture will be critical to establish friends, allies, populations in danger, and conversely, locate areas of instability where terrorism and insurgency could grow.

Baseline Skills

All the knowledge of others does not guarantee 3C—the strongest obstacle to knowing and interacting with other is self. There are several critical competencies that operationalize culture/region knowledge and promote the two major thrusts of 3C—successful cross-cultural interaction and forecasting future behavior—while in some ways neutralizing self: cultural self-awareness, perspective-taking and cultural reasoning/sensemaking. Cultural collisions occur when systems of beliefs and values differ dramatically as has been the case in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom. Many variables could initiate or sustain these collisions or flash points and often times the flash points
are common to deployment/assignment in foreign cultures and involve domains such as religion, kinship/family, and governance, among others. Minimizing flash points depends on mitigating the effects of any number of biases. DoD personnel, like all people, unconsciously and consciously, thin slice (bias formation) information presented to them. Thin slicing is the human shortcut to find patterns in events based only on narrow windows of experience (“thin slices”) (Gladwell 2007). People build mental models, schemas or frames and apply them to the world around them ostensibly to promote more effective processing of information. Specifically, individuals construct a series of models that are influenced and conditioned by biological and cultural factors. People use these models to make sense of their world—it becomes their worldview. These models also provide frameworks in which to consider the importance of the information they process.

Discerning the array of individual and cultural group attitudes and behaviors that are now, and will become, a major focus in future DoD operations is paramount: beliefs, values and behaviors of extended kin groups, tribes, ethnicities, and even nations different from the American military or intelligence officer’s engenders different and necessarily divergent ways of thinking about the world. When prompted to think like them to better understand their behavior, for example, an individual’s intuition gets in the way as information about people from other cultures is processed through existing cultural models or schemas constructed and reinforced over a lifetime. Individuals get mired in their own conclusions looking for supporting evidence and confirming bias while ignoring contradictions to one’s first impressions. Individuals pride themselves on their intuitions; backtracking is difficult and often a matter of pride.

Rob Johnson, author of an ethnography on the CIA, suggests that individuals naturally assume that others cognitively process and perceive the world in the same way they do. This orientation results in biases based on social, psychological, and cognitive processes entrenched from a lifetime of enculturation. Consequently this adversely impacts trying to understand meaningful information and resultant behavior of those from a different culture. These long-developed and entrenched expectations no longer apply and “the task of breaking free from one’s customary perspective on their behavior in order to generate culturally appropriate explanations for the behavior …is far more complex.” To Johnson, ‘trying to think like them’ “…all too often results in applying the logic of one’s own culture and experience to try to understand the action of other” (2005:75).

In essence, the human proclivity to thin slicing produces unintended consequences, relies on restrictive cultural models for context, and becomes an impediment to understanding people’s thoughts and resultant behaviors, thereby restricting the ability to derive meaning from those actions. Developing 3C can mitigate the effects of slicing and bias and can promote more “truthful” representations and meaning of others’ behavior. To help manage bias when cultural surprises trigger slicing or biases is dependent on developing an understanding of one’s cultural influence (lens) and engaging perspective-taking skills and the process of sense-making.

Cultural Sensemaking and Perspective-Taking
Sensemaking is the deliberate effort to understand events. It is a process that humans engage in when making sense of their universe. This process is not uncommon to intelligence analysis. In his book, Sensemaking: A Structure for an Intelligence Revolution, Moore refers to sensemaking as “...mindful planning and questioning that leads to foraging for answers.... [and promotes] a theory or systematic interpretation of the issue that subsequently must be explained” (Moore 2011:8).

India’s nuclear tests on 11 and 13 May 1998 came as a complete surprise... The real problem was an assumption by intelligence analysts and policymakers that the Indians would not test their nuclear weapons because Americans would not test nuclear weapons in similar circumstances.... The intelligence and the policy communities had an underlying mind-set going into these tests that the B.J.P. [Bharatiya Janata Party] would behave as we, Americans, would behave (McFate 2005:26).

Cultural sensemaking refers to the process by which people make sense of different cultural behaviors, and is often a response to a surprise and/or a failure of expectations of people’s behavior. Incoming information can be refitted into
an appropriate model/frame forming a perspective that is more aligned to the cultural reality of someone from another culture. People react to culturally different information by trying to find an existing model that allows them to consider meaning. If people notice data/behavior that does not fit the existing frame, that surprise will initiate sensemaking to modify or replace the frame with one more appropriate. Initiating cultural sensemaking “left” of surprise can only produce a more accurate representation of behavior from the perspective of the cultural other.

Rasmussen and colleagues posit a model of cultural sensemaking that includes steps of data seeking, applying data/information to cultural expectations, and if necessary modifying the expectations based on data that comes from observation, experience, or new information of those from different cultures (Rasmussen and Sieck 2012a and 2012b). Assuming that another’s mental state (series of models) reflects similar cognitive processes as others across the human condition is problematic. Without having the appropriate context to cultural behavior through background knowledge, including covert or hidden meaning and understanding unwritten rules that guide sociocultural behavior, an incomplete perspective will be produced.

Perspective-taking can be defined as the ability to see events as someone else would see them. This aids making sense of other people’s behavior, and can help predict what people may do or say next. Perspective-taking requires insight into others’ thoughts, motivations, and concerns and can help in understanding what drives decision making processes. It is suggested that general knowledge of the underlying concepts and principles of culture as a process is important to deciphering other people’s behavior. Regional (culture-specific) knowledge—context/location-specific information about the cultural dimensions, domains, and components of a cultural group, kin group, tribe, ethnicity (even commonly-shared behavior across a region)—is useful to promote a more accurate and valid perspective.

3C and Learning

Building curriculum on 3C involves transfer of declarative and procedural knowledge of 3C. Most educators know effective learning often occurs in scenarios and exercises or outside a classroom in the “natural” environment when application of knowledge and process becomes “baked” in through experience. Active discussion and student interaction during the more structured learning experience engages example and offers personalized application while aligning scenarios and exercises to training opportunity provides more naturalistic environments. A healthy chunk of what I do revolves around building learning programs in 3C that fit organizational and mission need, the learning environment, and the individual’s professional development.

Research also indicates that “tools” such as culture priming can also aid in perspective-taking and enhancing sensemaking. Cultural priming theory posits that psychological stimuli or conditions can change an individual’s response to a later stimulus. Tools (cognitive primes or conditions) can be developed to prepare or “prime” an individual to act or behave in a way consistent with expectations of an individual from another culture or cultural group. Essentially these primes can aid in the process of reframing perspective and can also facilitate perspective-taking. Skillfully applying cultural priming may better aid in predicting the effects of actions and events of others from a different culture—left of bang. The Center for the Advanced Study of Language is currently working on the development of a priming tool to be used by intelligence analysts (Dien 2012).

Continuing Efforts in 3C

Facilitating successful partnerships, eliciting and appropriately analyzing data gathered from others, and framing that data to better help predict future behavior are capabilities essential to mission success. Promoting cross-cultural competence through tools such as cultural priming can provide a dimension of understanding not clearly developed, nor evident in today’s DoD and intelligence workforce. In addition, cross (inter) cultural communication strategies and skills and more advanced competencies such as cross-cultural negotiations and rapport building are critical to building and sustaining partnerships.

Areas of future ongoing and future research needs are means to assess someone’s 3C, the connection of 3C to existing DoD language instruction and development, the role of 3C in leadership development as well as explicating the developmental sequence of 3C to better be able to address how it is taught across the spectrum of military education and training. Along with my wife and colleague, Dr. Allison Greene-Sands, I am co-editing a volume on 3C in the DoD that features an array of social and behavioral scientists discussing cutting-edge research, policy development, learning programs and connection of 3C to other readiness needs. Intriguing research and development questions in this volume and elsewhere consider:

- the deleterious effects of negative cross-cultural experience on one’s 3C
• the relationship between influence, leadership and 3C
• the appropriate level of perspective-taking that an individual must have to be operationally effective? Is it possible to have a first person experience if one is from a different culture? Is there an effect of too much perspective-taking?
• the development of a proficiency measure to capture the KSAs, including 3C, for assessment and planning
• In the end, promoting knowledge and cognitive-flexible and interactional skills are critical and necessary for success across the more “softer” mission sets that will be such as Security Force Assistance, Building Partnership and Humanitarian Disaster and Relief or operational missions by Security Forces, Female Engagement Teams, Cultural Advisors or Provincial Reconstruction Teams. Successfully navigating cultural complexity will depend on deciphering meaning, understanding self and other(s) and building bridges through partnerships.

Author’s Note: Dr. Sands is a Language and Culture Consultant for the US Department of Defense and an Adjunct Professor at Norwich University. From 2008 to 2011, Sands was Culture Chair then Chair of the Cross-Cultural Competence Department and Assistant Professor of Anthropology at the Air Force Culture and Language Center (AFCLC) and Air University at Maxwell AFB, AL. While at AFCLC, Dr. Sands was also the Director of the Minerva Initiative for Energy and Environmental Security. Sands is currently co-editing a volume on cross-cultural competence in the military. The views of the author are strictly those of the author and do not represent any official view of the DoD or organizations that might in any way be connected to language and culture programs nor does it represent any DoD official existing or future policy or strategy.
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Working in Fisheries Research from the Southeast to Alaska: A Career Profile

By Palma Ingles [bunnypevas@hotmail.com]  
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I moved to Anchorage, Alaska three and a half years ago, after living in Florida 28 years. I guess you can say I went from one extreme to the other for the U.S. I first worked in Alaska as a contract researcher for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries in the summer of 2002, but later that year I moved back to Florida to work for NOAA Fisheries Southeast. But, it was always in the back of my mind that someday I wanted to come back to Alaska.

I was the first anthropologist hired by NOAA Fisheries in the Southeast Region, for the regional office in St. Petersburg, Florida. I was part of the group of six or seven anthropologists who were initially hired by NOAA Fisheries to staff each region of the country. I spent seven years there doing ethnographic research and social impact analysis for the policy end of fisheries management in Federal waters. I also did extensive research in the Gulf of Mexico looking at the impacts of Hurricane Katrina.

If you work as anthropologist for any natural resource management group, you quickly realize you are the minority in a sea of biologists and other specialties. For the first six years I worked at NOAA Fisheries I was the only anthropologist in my office. At that time, many natural resource agencies were trying to figure out how to incorporate humans into the equation for ecosystem management. In many agencies humans are not considered a part of the ecosystem. It is ironic in natural resource management that the study of humans is not given the same priority as the study of biological systems, but yet, humans are the ones changing the landscape, and putting pressures on the natural resources. At the time I left NOAA Fisheries Southeast, we had two anthropologists, five economists, and 13-14 biologists in my department. I wish I could say that nationally the numbers of anthropologists working for agencies that manage natural resources had increased, but the numbers remain small when compared to the number of biologists.

In 2009, I transferred to a job in Anchorage with U.S. Fish and Wildlife as a coordinator of a program in the Office of Subsistence Management. As I mentioned earlier, there are few positions in my specialty around the country for anthropologists and Alaska is the only region of U.S. Fish and Wildlife that has positions, by title, for anthropologists, and those are only in the Office of Subsistence Management where I work.

Alaska, it truly is a beautiful, magical place. The landscape changes before you on a daily basis. The challenges of living here are endless, but worth it. Alaska is home to Denali, the highest mountain peak in the
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ingenuity of the people who have lived in the Amazon and Alaska for many generations. Like communities in the Amazon, Native communities in Alaska struggle with their own identities within the country that governs them. The world is changing around them and preserving their cultural heritage is becoming more difficult. Social cohesion is diminishing as villages are plagued by alcoholism, violence, and limited opportunities for youth. Alaska has one of the highest per capita suicide rates in the country. At the same time, community ties are strengthened through the continuation of some cultural practices such as potlatches and other festivals that draw in community members.

The cost for living in small villages continues to increase in remote villages in Alaska, which pay the highest price of anywhere in the U.S. for heating fuel and gasoline and most food items. Some villages do not have stores or health clinics. Many depend on subsistence resources to help feed their families. All other foods, clothing, building materials, and whatever else is needed must be brought in by plane or boat, greatly adding to the cost. Unemployment is very high in many of the bush villages with few jobs outside those created by State and Federal entities. Community members continue to migrate to the larger cities such as Anchorage or Fairbanks to seek employment and better education for their children.

The cornucopia of foods that is seemingly endless in the Amazon is absent in most of Alaska. The Amazon is alive with sounds and creatures. Whereas in Alaska, the silence in remote areas is noticeable and in many places there is little wildlife, especially after all the rivers freeze up in the winter. Hunger is a reality in many of the outer villages in Alaska, especially if the returning salmon fail to show up in the amounts needed to sustain subsistence users, or the migration of moose and caribou take the animals away from the villages that depend on them. The topics for research are endless here.

To call myself an anthropologist in my current position is somewhat a misnomer. I am the coordinator of the Partners for Fisheries Monitoring Program (Partners Program). The program funds organizations in small remote communities that hire researchers who work with fisheries research projects funded by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS). These projects count and monitor fish stocks, primarily focused on one of the five species of salmon that people depend upon for subsistence. By design, the Partners Program hires researchers who have a background in fisheries biology or anthropology. Currently, there are seven fisheries biologists who work in my program and no anthropologists. I have had to familiarize myself with fisheries monitoring projects and become more familiar with fisheries terms and ways of counting fish stocks to get in sync with the people in my program. In return, I have tried to incorporate some anthropology into the yearly workshops I hold for my team. The biologists do some social science research when they collect data on subsistence harvests with people in the communities they work with.

At times I feel disengaged from anthropology and miss the opportunities for doing ethnographic research I had when I worked for NOAA Fisheries. I was hoping when I took this position I would be able to do some community research. But, my department monitors grants for anthropological and biological research and does not participate directly in the research. Federal funding for research is becoming scarcer with the current national budget negotiations. My first two summers here I had the opportunity to travel to the five remote areas where people in my program work and visit the projects they work with. Unfortunately in the summer of 2012, my department did not have the travel funds to pay for my travel to work with people in my program, so most of my contact with them was limited to emails and phone calls. I am hoping there will be travel funds this summer.
Since I moved here, Anchorage has had the most snow ever recorded, last winter with over 135 inches; the most number of days in a row with rain, something like 35 with no rain for three to four days then another 20 days of rain; the coldest July on record; one of the coldest summers on record; the earliest snow on record for Anchorage, September this year; and the latest snow on record last winter in mid-May. Alaska, unfortunately, is on the forefront of climate change and we are already seeing major impacts here. Permafrost is thawing, leaving buildings uneven on their foundations. Erosion of riverbanks is increasing as the land thaws. Coastal villages are experiencing stronger storm surges in the winters because there is less ice in place to protect them. Some coastal villages are flooding as sea levels rise. Hundreds of our villages are being impacted by climate change, and plans are being made to relocate several villages that are becoming inundated with water. Animal migration is changing as the climate and food sources change. Researchers are trying to figure out why fewer salmon are returning to the rivers, an important source of food for subsistence communities.

Alaska is on the forefront of climate change and one consequence is the many conferences each year held here, especially in Anchorage. I attend all that I can that relate to what I do such as the Alaska Marine Sciences Symposium, Alaska Forum on the Environment, and meetings looking at the decline of Chinook salmon populations. Through these venues, I have been very fortunate in meeting wonderful, interesting people from all over the state who come to the conferences. They are very concerned about having enough subsistence resources and how climate change will affect their communities. These meetings offer an opportunity to interact with people who live a subsistence lifestyle in outer villages. I have learned that you don’t have to be paid directly to do anthropological studies, and in my situation, you find your own opportunities to do research and never stop learning about the environment around you.

When I moved to Alaska I thought I would do it for three to four years and then return to Florida. My neighbors and friends here, who are all from the lower 48, told me when I moved here if I stayed too long I would never leave. They were correct. One neighbor, also from Florida has been here over 30 years. At first I thought I would not put down roots, and would remain a visitor in this strange new place. But as time goes by I realize more and more that Alaska is different and it would be hard to leave here for good even though I know deep in my soul, I am a tropical person. At times I feel totally out of place. I don’t do well when we have less than five hours of daylight in December, or when the days go from dark, to grey and overcast, back to dark for weeks at a time. I plan to eventually live in a warm place in the winters, but hope to keep a place in Alaska for the summers. I know mentally I need more light in the winter, but when the Alpine glow hits the mountains as I drive home from work, I realize I live in a place like no other in the United States.

SfAA Oral History Project:
Conversation with one of SfAA’s Founders: An interview of Charles P. Loomis

By John van Willigen [ant101@uky.edu]
SfAA Oral History Project, Chair
University of Kentucky

Interview by J. Thomas May and Peter K. New.

Charles P. Loomis was one of the small group of founders of the Society and served as its president, 1949-1950. Trained as a sociologist he was awarded the Ph.D. from Harvard in 1933. He served as the president of the American Sociological Association. His research program was focused on rural life and agriculture. He was very much involved in policy research for the United States Department of Agriculture during the New Deal in the early 1940s leading up to the creation of the SfAA. Following World War II he served as the chair and then research professor in Michigan State University’s Department of Sociology and Anthropology. He was one of a number of sociologists that were important to the early development of the SfAA.

This interview was done by Tom May and Peter New in 1979 at Las Cruces, New Mexico and edited by John van Willigen. The transcript apparently was edited by Loomis, and I assumed that the text in parentheses were added by him. Through Tom May, the transcript is now part of the Society’s oral history collection at the Louie Nunn Center for Oral History at the University of Kentucky Libraries.
MAY: I think that for our purposes we might now move to some discussion around the topic of your contact with the people who became known as the ‘founders’ of the Society for Applied Anthropology. You have provided us with an excellent description of several contexts for this contact—the Department, your own intellectual interests, etc. I assume, as a corollary of that, that the travel and the commitment to keep up with your profession and the bringing of these academic scholars to the Department furthered that. Perhaps you could now give us your recollections of your initial contact and discussions around the idea of formalizing the group into an organization.

LOOMIS: I wish that I could do this better than I can. It is hazy. And I can’t place everything in a time orientation. But, one of the important developments in the Department of Agriculture (and I don’t know if it is on the Kelly Interview or not) was that M. L. Wilson happened to be in Rome at one time. He was looking in on a FAO office. He was standing in a corridor, and he began talking with a young fellow, Ralph Danhoff, who had just finished a Ph.D. thesis at the University of Michigan on the Coulee, or Boulder Dam (later this became the Hoover Dam). And they talked about this. I can tell you the results of the study but it is probably oversimplified. These construction stiffs are really tough guys and you have all sorts of problems that result when you get a bunch of people of this type a long way from the city. So just to have order, they developed a rigorous system of ‘cards’. If you had a card, you could be there. If you didn’t have a card, they ran you out. Well, you lost your card if you misbehaved. This was one of the cases of a real totalitarian operation. Well Ralph described this and he had followed that longitudinally. According to him, they never were able to bring that back to a democratic system. It was impossible.

And that fascinated M. L. Wilson. He must now hire this young man. So he brought him in and he became one of my colleagues. We were going around the country (again, this points to the kind of freedom that we had). M. L. wanted us to go to talk to the people at Harvard; the people working in industrial relations—[Elton] Mayo and [Fritz J.] Roethlisberger and all of those. So we would go up and interview these people and come back and talk with M.L. about this.

I think that it could have been in some of those excursions up to Harvard before I came that I met with Connie [Conrad] Arensberg and Eliot Chapple and came to know of similar interests. I am just not sure about this. But this could be. In any case, when I was made visiting professor, in those years, Eliot Chapple and Connie Arensberg, and I think Bill [William F.] Whyte, were there at the time. You see, I think that Bill was doing his street-corner society study at that time. Somehow they invited me to join that group. They invited me to this, I didn't initiate it.

LOOMIS: I was so interested in my own publication work, and I was trying to find a way to make what we wrote have meaning for activities that were being carried on. And Chapple and Coon’s book (Principles of Anthropology) fascinated me, because it is very usable in many ways. At least it can be talked about with applied people.

You probably know that Chapple and Connie Arensberg, had this thing, one of the early small group analytical devices where you look through a one-way mirror and you have these things going and you watch the interactions and you study and you do statistical analyses of the interaction. Well, I was tremendously interested in this. That is about all that I can recall.

MAY: Your recall is that these excursions brought you into sustained contact with the group for your own interests, as well as acting as an outpost for M. L. Wilson.

LOOMIS: Yes, it was for my interests particularly with Mayo, and Roethlisberger and those people. I don't think that Roethlisberger and Mayo were even in that original group. There was an overlapping there. And they knew of this interest. “Why was Loomis involved in this?” So, that could have been the reason why they invited me. Also, they were interested I suppose in looking at this rural sociology. You see, there would be this relationship between applied anthropology and rural. And it may have been that I was just a rural sociologist and had been doing these studies. And, of course, at one of the early meetings, I presented the Dyess Colony Project data I mentioned earlier. I presented other things at their meetings, so that they immediately saw the applicability of it.
Then I think that the reason why I became President was because quite early, when I saw how this thing was developing, I wrote all of the rural sociologists and told them what we were trying to do in applied anthropology. And we got quite a large number of members who were rural sociologists. It could well have been just Chapple and Arensberg. Especially Arensberg would have known because of his and Kimball’s rural Irish study. I think that they probably knew of kindred interests. But it wasn’t from Washington or from other contacts.

MAY: So that when they invited you and encouraged your interest, it was essentially a Cambridge-Harvard group.

LOOMIS: Well, yes, in the early days. But then, they were on the outreach, and Margaret Mead came in. If Bill Whyte was not already in it, he was there. They were trying to think of people who would have a similar interest. And they wouldn’t think, as Eliot always said, that they had to go out and beat the bushes to learn something about human behavior.

NEW: Would it be fair to say that this early group of Chapple and Arensberg and some of these people formed the nucleus of the Society in part to broadcast their own work?

LOOMIS: No, I didn’t ever get that feeling. It could be. You could say, "Well, look, this is what we are doing. You ought to see if it has wider use.” But they never… Well, the instrumentation of these discussions was certainly there. We certainly learned about that over and over. So, one could say that.

But, as some of your other interviews will show, there was this difficulty between Eliot and Lloyd Warner and that came into relief. The Warner thing is going in one direction and Eliot and people like George Homans who want to keep things in hard-nosed, specific terms so that you can really talk about prediction went in another. This was an interest of several of those people, and that is the reason why something like sociometry would have a meaning. There was a core of that. But of course, Margaret Mead did not fit that too well, and there were others like that.

MAY: Was there any other organizational outlet or support mechanism for people doing applied rural sociology at the time which was at all analogous to the group in Boston?

LOOMIS: I don’t know among the anthropologists. They knew one another and there was certainly a number of people like Ned [Edward H.] Spicer and these many anthropologists who were working with Indian problems and the Japanese projects, who were in interaction with one another and came in later. But, I don’t believe that there was any group. Also Sol Tax at the University of Chicago could be mentioned. He stayed clear of the Society.

[Break for lunch]

MAY: I think that we left off with your description of your leave from the Department of Agriculture in 1942 to go to Harvard. You mentioned that you were there for two years. Could you summarize the chronology of what followed for us?

LOOMIS: The position at Harvard was a fill-in for Zimmerman, who was on leave with the Army. It was for two years. Then I came back to the Department of Agriculture, and almost immediately, I moved out of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics into what was called the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations (OFAR) in the Department of Agriculture. In other words, I had developed this international interest and some connections which led to work especially in Latin America as the war unfolded. I was there in the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations until I went to Michigan State.

MAY: What year was it that you went to Michigan State?

LOOMIS: That was in 1944 and I remained the Head of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology until 1957.

MAY: So that the period in the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations was fairly brief?
LOOMIS: Yes, it was. I was there for a little more than a year, during 1943-44.

NEW: Could we now spend a little more time on your second round back at Harvard? Just before lunch break, you had mentioned that through M. L. Wilson earlier, you had met Professors Chapple, Arensberg, [F. L. W.] Richardson and those people. Also, that this related to your own interests, and those of Wilson in industrial relations. When you then went back to Harvard, you also mentioned that they invited you to meet with them, and you gave some talks. You indicated your growing interests in the interaction thing that Chapple was working on. If you recall, I would like for you to discuss what was it that got the group to say, “OK, let us form this thing or organization called the Society for Applied Anthropology?”

LOOMIS: Just to correct one thing. I think that in my developing relations with the people who did later form this group, say Freddie Richardson, Elliot Chapple, Homans and the others, that I was just trying to feel how I had come to be invited into the group who were to form the Society for Applied Anthropology. This was not a strong contact. My coming back earlier was largely with people that they knew. For instance, Freddie Richardson knew Roethlisberger extremely well. And of course, Homans did too. And I had come back largely from Wilson's interest in Roethlisberger and Mayo, working on industrial problems. But they knew... I just thought that that might have been a way that they became aware that I had similar interests. I did not know them well before we formed the Society.

But moving then back to your other question of how the impetus for the development of this organization took form, I have to admit that I was not a driving force in this. Really, Freddie Richardson and Elliot Chapple were the main driving force on that, as I saw it at the time. But they had immediate support in Connie Arensberg and others who knew one another quite well. I don't think that Sol Kimball was in it at this time.

But you see, Arensberg and Kimball, who did the Irish study, were tied in to a group there that was called the Junior Fellows. It was related to the club that Whitehead, Henderson, Homans and these people were members of. It was important to them and this provided one nexus that made an immediate group. I think that you probably know of the development of it there on campus led by Henderson.

NEW: This is the Society of Junior Fellows.

LOOMIS: Yes. I had no connection with that group at all. But these other people did. As a matter of fact, that is the group that was so active and involved in so many ways with the analysis of Pareto's work. I was there at Harvard at the time but not a part of that as Homans and Merton were. I don't know to what extent Arensberg and Kimball were in that particular thing. But they were in this Junior Fellows group that I was not in at all.

I don't think that anybody had any decision to make about this. I think that it is just one of these things that happens. That here comes somebody in from the outside and he doesn't know of or get these connections. I think that this was the way it was.

But whether it was this way or not, I think that Henderson had no use for Sorokin. And Sorokin, of course, was in charge of my work. Henderson had no use for any of Sorokin's people, or for sociology in general.

He thought it was hogwash. That would have been the way it remained unless a colleague of his, William M. Wheeler told him, “You should read Pareto.” And when he read Pareto, he saw that Pareto, unlike other sociologists, made some sense to him. And that then began the seminar on Pareto that was to be so important in Parsons' and Homans' development. And it tied in, to a certain extent later, with the Junior Fellows.

NEW: Now in the early days, how long were you involved in the activities of the Society of Applied Anthropology?

LOOMIS: Chiefly as one who attended meetings, presented papers, and talked with these people during this period. I think that we may have had two annual meetings which I as a charter member attended during the period while I was at Harvard. I had quite a good many informal talks, one way or the other during this period with Chapple and Richardson and others.
I can give you one example that comes to mind. We met someplace and they happened to say, “Well, let’s go over to the Business School” I think that this was Freddie Richardson. We went to chat with Roethlisberger. I can remember coming out of that meeting, and Freddie, who was the only one of the group who really ranks with the Boston 400, said that this class stuff, all of this emphasis on class, was a “bunch of shit.” I can then remember that Roethlisberger said, “Well, tell me what does motivate society if it is not class. If class is shit, what does motivate society?” I remember that. That gives you some sense of the kind of interaction. It wasn’t only on applied anthropology, it was on general problems.

I just really can’t claim to be one of the architects in the early years of the Society except that we in rural sociology were always doing what they claimed that they were doing. They knew that.

NEW: You also mentioned that in the early days you made quite an effort to get the rural sociologists to join the Society as well. What did you feel, in those days, would be the benefits for rural sociologists to join with this group?

LOOMIS: I felt, and still do, that this interdisciplinary relationship when it is understood the way that it should be (especially with anthropology, sociology, and social psychology) can approach practical problems more effectively than a single discipline can. But, you have to also see this against the background of M. L. Wilson seeing it this way in the Department of Agriculture, and bringing in colleagues who were trained in this.

The first thing that I did when I went to Michigan State University which then had a Department of Sociology, was to get the name changed to the Department of Sociology and Anthropology. This was something following the developments at Harvard, too, of Social Relations. Well, of course, I was approaching it differently than was Harvard. But I felt that specialists really could not deal with these applied problems.

MAY: One of the things that I am interested in concerns your own interest in agriculture and rural sociology, as opposed to those people in the Society who were more interested in urban and industrial problems. Am I correct in thinking that the central thrust of that group was toward industrial and urban problems, as contrasted with rural problems?

LOOMIS: You are thinking of the Society?

MAY: Yes.

LOOMIS: I don’t believe so. Now Bill Whyte might be over on the urban side. There was quite a great interest in it. But then you had Margaret Mead and you had Arensberg and Kimball who had done the Irish Countryman. No, I don’t think that it was that really.

MAY: During the period, 1942-44, were the people who were beginning to participate actively and form the Society on the fringe of the conventional disciplines, in terms of what we know about career patterns for rural sociologists or industrial sociologists? Now, admittedly, this is something of a naïve question.

LOOMIS: Well, I don’t think that it is naïve at all. It is crucial because there is some real theoretical background for such a hypothesis. I think that I would answer it by saying "yes, but maybe for a different reason than you think of. I think that the people who are center are often busy with the center. And the people who are brilliant and starting are in quest of new ways of looking at things, and also of improving their rank. So I would think it might be that. I would say that there probably is some of that kind of relationship.

Now I am thinking chiefly of my own colleagues in sociology. But it would also go over to Eliot Chapple and a combination of anthropology and what not. And also to Richardson. This would be true. Those people were on the make and able. All of the big shots were up here, and much of the difficulty was that those slots that they wanted to be in were filled.
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Harry F. Wolcott, one of the world’s premier educational anthropologists and longtime SfAA member died at the age of 83 on October 31, 2012 from complications of Parkinson’s disease and esophageal cancer. He served on the SfAA board from 1983-1986, and he and his students have kept educational anthropology central to the Society. Harry majored in science at Berkeley and went on to his Ph.D. in educational anthropology at Stanford in 1964 with George and Louise Spindler. He joined the faculty at the University of Oregon in 1964, where he taught, did research, and mentored students in both education and anthropology throughout his career. He was an active member of SfAA, served as president of the Council of Anthropology and Education (1972-1973), and thoroughly enjoyed writing, travel, and uncovering insights and creativity with everyone he met. His sly humor was legendary: I recall once he referred to a well-known but rather unremarkable Anthropology Department as being absent when elan was being handed out to new programs during the time of Boas. Another time Harry and his partner Norman Delue declined to visit a local museum with me. “I have a rule that you should not engage in culture for more than two hours a day,” Harry said, “and we’ve already done that, so now it is time for something else!”

Harry’s books and articles are full of insight and inspiration. One of the themes that runs through his work is that ordinary people are often caught up in institutions that then shape their behavior, much like the characters in the BBC series “Downton Abbey,” or those in the HBO drama “The Wire.” By focusing on real people in these workplaces, Wolcott puts school and community social structures in sharp perspective. A teacher from outside of Kwakiutl society ends up teaching in a school, and in spite of a calling to help young children and to do good, the teacher becomes assigned the role as “the enemy,” a surprising cultural category that the teacher had never contemplated (“The Teacher as Enemy” in Education and Cultural Process, George Spindler, ed., 1974). A perfectly nice man becomes employed as a principal of a school, and finds himself “The Man In The Principal’s Office” (1973). Innovations are brought to a school, and the school suddenly becomes a moiety system despite best efforts of participants to cross these unexpected borders to the other side (Teachers vs. Technocrats, 1977).

A second theme of Harry’s work was fieldwork. He enjoyed, contemplated, and wrote about the work of doing anthropology. In The Art of Fieldwork, he explores ethnography, from developing a project, entering a field setting, interviewing and taking notes, developing a robust analysis, to struggling through the days of writing an article, a dissertation, or a book. This was quickly followed by Ethnography: A Way of Seeing (1999), and Ethnography Lessons: A Primer (2010). His many articles and books on doing ethnography within and without schools made him a champion of qualitative methods. Harry was never averse to quantitative approaches, and later he and one of the champions of positivist ethnography, H. Russell Bernard, became great friends. Typically, Harry humorously once mentioned that he thought of Russ as his twin who was raised by different parents. When asked if a project was “good anthropology,” Harry invariably replied that it didn’t matter; what mattered was whether it was good research. Tom May, Executive Director of SfAA, noted that Harry’s wit was part of his skill as an “intellectual prankster,” which, as Tom noted, “we could all learn from.”

Harry was quick to see the value of anthropology applied to new situations. A trip to Zimbabwe in 1973 found Harry on a Fulbright in Zimbabwe, where he figured out how he could spend time in the beer gardens of that city. His consummate professional eye caught the importance of places where blacks and whites met in a segregated country, and so in 1974 he published The African Beer Gardens of Bulawayo: Integrated Drinking in a Segregated Society. Harry gave form to educational anthropology through his work on U.S. school systems, but he was quick to accumulate cross-
cultural experiences in other places. He gained two Fulbright awards to Bangkok, and was invited for visiting positions in Sweden, the University of Malaya in Kuala Lumpur, and McGill University. Harry’s personal life also became a topic for his ethnographer’s pen. His frightening and dramatic encounters with a runaway who had left home and school for a dangerous life on the street led to *Sneaky Kid and Its Aftermath: Ethics and Intimacy in Fieldwork* (2002).

Harry’s easy going manner and engaging conversations made him an enjoyable interlocutor with whomever he met and an influential mentor to students and colleagues. In his final book, *Ethnography Lessons: a Primer*, Harry reviewed five of his major studies to explore his adventures in thinking ethnographically, enjoying metaphors and serendipity, and becoming friends with publishers and colleagues like Mitch Allen, whose guidance at Alta Mira and Left Coast Press led to this and other books. Much of his sparkle and wisdom is found in his writings, but much more remains in the memories of applied anthropologists, educational researchers, administrators, and many others whose paths crossed his. Harry is survived Norman Delue, his long time partner since 1968, as well as a brother Roy, a niece and several nephews and their families. Donations for a new University of Oregon scholarship in his name can be made to the UO Foundation, 1720 E. 13th Ave., Ste. 410, Eugene, OR 97403-1905 (www.uofoundation.org); please designate to the Harry Wolcott Memorial Fund.

Photo copyright by Steven M Bialostok, University of Wyoming, used with permission.
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Natural Resource Distribution and Development in the 21st Century

How does a society assure equitable access to basic resources for a variety of vastly different and often competing constituents?

This question has meaning to all sectors of society both nationally and internationally - urban populations, rural communities, agricultural and industrial complexes, resort settings, and resource development projects, to list only the most obvious. The question is central to modern society and the nation state, and when framed forthrightly should stimulate a fundamental discussion and exchange. The venue for the 73rd Annual Meeting of the Society, Denver, Colorado, is an ideal setting for this conversation.

Join us at SfAA-Denver (March 19-23) and at NWAC-Portland (March 27-30).

**Treasurer News**

By Jennifer R. Wies [jennifer.wies@eku.edu]

Eastern Kentucky University

At the biannual Board Meeting in November 2012, the Society for Applied Anthropology 2013 Budget proposal was discussed and approved by majority vote of the board. The budget of $509,165 includes anticipated expenditures of $497,110. The projected revenue for 2013 exceeds the proposed revenue for 2012 by $21,823. This increase is due to the influx of monies from the modest increase in membership dues and a similarly minor fee increase for the annual meeting registration.

Overall, most of the Society’s budget items remain stable from year to year. For example, it is expected that the production costs for both *Human Organization*
and *Practicing Anthropology* will remain stable, with the expectation that we continue to increase the on-line subscriber base.

I will identify a few of the changes in budget lines here.

1. The Society’s contracted management firm, Professional Management Associates (PMA), has requested an increase for office space rental costs (from $9,600 in 2012 to $13,200 in 2013) to support moving to a larger space. This is an exciting opportunity for PMA and will provide additional office space to support the Society for Applied Anthropology Internship Program. PMA will absorb the cost of two additional computer work stations with the current equipment rental budget.

2. In addition, we anticipate an increase in revenues from the annual meetings, which continue to be a significant component of revenue generation for the Society. The annual meeting revenues are spread over a three-year period, thus the 2013 budget includes figures from the 2012 meetings in Baltimore, the 2013 meetings in Denver, and the 2014 meetings in Albuquerque. In total, the annual meetings budget line increases from $191,670 in 2012 to $208,295 in 2013.

3. Finally, a budget line that has been decreased is the revenue projection for the monograph series, as the revenues from the monograph series will likely continue to decline.

The 2013 budget yields a net of $12,055, which combined with donations to the awards funds, provides for a projected transfer of $20,570 in contributions to the trusts. The Society’s funds are in excellent condition. I welcome any questions you may have about the Society’s finances.

**Artisan Production and the World Market: SAR/SfAA Plenary and Workshops**

**Join us in Denver!!!!**

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

Kate O'Donnell [O_donnellk@hartwick.edu]
Hartwick College

On March 22, the intercultural group of artisans and the scholars who work with them will discuss ongoing work in all areas intersecting with the production, marketing and consumption of crafts, boutique food products and cultural heritage tourism. Co-organized by Jeanne Simonelli (WFU), June Nash (CUNY), and Katherine O'Donnell (Hartwick College), *Artisan Production and the World Market: Collaborating in Theory, Methods, Practice* is the SAR/SfAA 2013 Seminar and Plenary and Workshop Extravaganza.

During two days together in Santa Fe in October, Jeanne, Kate and June were joined by weaver Rosalinda Santiz-Diaz (Kinal Antetik and Jolom Mayaetik, Chiapas), potter Karen Charley (Hopi), cultural interpreter Lupita Mclanahan (Canyon de Chelly, Az.), Christine Eber (NMSU), Lea McChesney (U Toledo), Duncan Earle (Marymountpv), and Betty Duggan (NY State Museum). The meeting was exhilarating and exhausting, including taking Rosalinda to meet Lupita’s neighbors at Canyon de Chelly.

Our seminar becomes the basis for wider discussion and workshops at SfAA. Please join us on Friday, March 22, starting at 1:30 PM. In Part 1, we’ll present our collaborative foci as describe above. Part 2 consists of interactive workshops for those working with cooperatives; those working on business models; and those interested in internet marketing: 1) How to Accompany and Assist a Cooperative: Best Practices; Business Models; 2) Business Plans: A Visual Analytic; and 3) Marketing: From the Personal to the Virtual. The workshops are free and open to all!
Please email Jeanne Simonelli at simonejm@wfu.edu if you are interested in one of the workshops. In addition, look for other papers and a roundtable leading up to the Plenary. And join us for the reception afterward. (Make sure you check the program for any last minute changes!)

**The SfAA Podcast Project: Find us at the Meeting, in Denver and from Home!**

Megan Gorby [megangorby06@gmail.com]
Chair, SfAA Podcast Project
University of North Texas

Jo Aiken [jonieaiken@gmail.com]
Associate Chair, SfAA Podcast Project
University of North Texas

We are looking forward to this year’s Annual Meeting in Denver, Colorado, as there have been some exciting changes for the SfAA Podcast Project! So, whether you will be participating in the conference from home by tuning in to the Twitter account for live updates at [www.twitter.com/sfaapodcasts](http://www.twitter.com/sfaapodcasts) or if you will be at the conference, team members will have “SfAA Podcast Project” under their nametags. We look forward to hearing your feedback.

For those attending the conference, the Podcast Team would like to invite everyone to attend the Roundtable discussion on the project. Here we will be presenting the results of the data concerning the SfAA Podcast Project from the SfAA Membership Survey. Following this presentation will be a discussion on how the Podcast Project could improve and answering any questions participants may have.

For those unfamiliar with the questions on the survey from the Podcast Project, those were:

1. Were you aware of the Podcast Project, prior to taking this survey?
2. How many podcasts have you listened to?
3. Have you used any podcasts for teaching purposes?
4. Have you recommended any of the podcasts to others?
5. Have you utilized the podcasts for any other purposes?

6. To help us decide which sessions to podcast, please tell us what topics would be most helpful to you.
7. On a scale of 1-5, where 1 means “not helpful at all” and 5 means “very helpful,” how helpful would it be to you if we were to expand the number of sessions that are podcasted at each of the Annual Meetings?

Some of the major results we found in the analysis of the data were:

1. An overall of 40% of 730 respondents knew about the Podcast Project prior to the survey. Students were as likely to have heard about it than not, where full-time, part-time, unemployed, and retired individuals were less likely to know about the project than not know.
2. Of the 290 who answered, 51.7% had not listened to a podcast, while 35.9% had listened to 1-3 podcasts and 12% had listened to 4+ podcasts.
3. Of 290 respondents, 6.5% had used the podcasts for teaching tools, the majority of which (84%) were full-time employees and students.
4. Of 290 respondents, 15.2% had recommended the podcasts to others, again the majority of which were full-time employees and students at 86%.
5. Of 138 respondents, 89.9% had not used the podcasts for any other purposes.
6. Many topics were given that will be discussed in more detail at the roundtable.
7. Of 138 respondents, 51.5% chose “4-5 highly helpfulness” if the Podcast Project expanded the amount of sessions recorded while 13.7% chose “1-2 low helpfulness.”

Other preparations for this year’s meeting include sending out a call out for suggestions last month, which asked participants which sessions to record. Thank you for everyone that subscribes to the website, Twitter, and Facebook accounts and was able to take the survey! In addition to this, and new to the selection process, was having the Board
finalize the session selection to ensure the list was of widespread interest and coordinated well with the Meeting’s theme.

The SfAA Podcast Project also began recruiting local volunteers. If you are a student, or know students in any discipline that lives in the Denver area and may attend the SfAA conference, please encourage them to send an email to sfaapodcasts@gmail.com for more information on assisting the Podcast Project. Benefits include free registration and SfAA Membership for one year.

The final announcement we have is to announce this year’s audio professional. We are very pleased to introduce Randy Sparrazza to the team! From 2003, Randy has been out in the field as a location sound engineer with Regional Sight and Sound. He has worked with a wide variety of high impact clients, including: regional TV commercials, indie movie productions, NFL films and CBS Sports. Randy joins the project with several great ideas on how to improve the recording and audio files that will be made available to the project’s website within 2-3 weeks of the Annual Meeting. For more information, check out the SfAA Podcast Project’s Team page at www.sfaapodcasts.net/sfaa-podcast-team/.

SfAA TIGs

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

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

Several important action items have taken place over the last several months that may be of interest to the group. First, the United States Department of Agriculture released its USDA Policy and Procedures Review and Recommendations Report on Indian Sacred Sites. In 2010, Secretary of Agriculture Thomas J. Vilsack directed the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s (USDA) Office of Tribal Relations and the USDA’s Forest Service (Forest Service) to engage in dialogue with American Indian and Alaska Native (AI/AN) Tribal leaders to find out how USDA can do a better job of accommodating and protecting AI/AN sacred sites while simultaneously pursuing the Forest Service’s multiple-use mission. Secretary Vilsack requested information about unintended consequences of land management decisions affecting sacred sites and AI/AN communities whose cultural survival is often deeply rooted in these sites. As stated during the release of the report:

This report and its appendices constitute a review of law, policy, and procedures, with recommendations for changes based on Tribal consultation and public comments.

This report reflects an interpretation of some of the voices of AI/AN people as requested by Secretary Vilsack. It provides the Secretary with information about how USDA and the Forest Service are protecting AI/AN sacred sites on National Forest System (NFS) lands and how USDA and the Forest Service might improve the manner in which sacred sites are protected.

This report does not, by itself, change policy or have any effects, significant or otherwise, on the human or natural environment and does not constitute final agency action. In developing this report, the Government neither required nor requested that Tribes provide specific information about the nature and location of their sacred sites, nor were AI/AN people asked to reveal the beliefs and practices associated with these sites.

You can download the full report here.

At the same time as the release of the USDA report, the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Energy, and Interior signed a Memorandum of Understanding concerning the protection of Native American sacred sites. You can read more about the MOU here.
Finally, the Federal Court in Canada recently made a very important ruling concerning Métis and non-status Indian rights. The court found that the federal government has jurisdiction for Métis under s. 91(24) of the Constitution Act, 1867. This case effectively finds that Métis are “Indians” within the meaning of s. 91(24). The issue of jurisdiction for Métis is an important one. For decades Canada has only assumed jurisdiction for Métis north of the 60th parallel. This exclusion has increasingly created a divide between Indians and Métis as economic restrictions have come into place. As the court noted Canada's own documents admit that Métis are more exposed to discrimination and other social disabilities and that “in the absence of Federal initiative in this field they are the most disadvantaged of all Canadian citizens.” You can read more about the decision here.

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. You can send it to sfaa-native-tig@googlegroups.com.

As usual, if anyone is interested in joining the TIG email list, you can go to http://groups.google.com/group/sfaa-native-tig and join.

Food Insecurity In Rural Appalachia: The Gender-Based Violence of Women Affected by Incarceration

By Jennifer R. Wies [jennifer.wies@eku.edu]
Eastern Kentucky University

In the Fall of 2012, Eastern Kentucky University students enrolled in Medical Anthropology- Service-Learning explored the issue of food insecurity among women affected by incarceration in Clay County, Kentucky. Service-learning is a way for students to directly apply their “in-classroom” knowledge to the world around them by engaging in the preparation, action, monitoring, reflection, and assessment of a research project. Anthropology classes are an excellent venue for service-learning because students can apply theoretical frameworks about social inequalities and “take it to the streets.” Furthermore, by engaging community members in relevant, contemporary issues, the students are serving the community and creating a space for reflection and open communication.

Food insecurity is defined by the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology as “limited or uncertain availability of nutritionally adequate and safe foods or limited or uncertain ability to acquire foods in socially acceptable ways.” I identified the narrowly defined research participant pool based on 1) previous experience working with impoverished women, 2) reviews of the existing literature, and 3) preliminary contact with families in Clay County.

In Kentucky, 17.7% of the population lives below the federally-recognized poverty line, placing them at risk for food insecurity. In Clay County, residents represent a disproportionately high rate of poverty, with 34.4% of the population living in poverty and a median household income of $20,175. According to U.S. Census data, 58.9% of Clay County residents over the age of 25 are high school graduates, and only 7.5% of people over the age of 25 possess a bachelor’s degree or higher.

Compounding the prevalence of household poverty is the high rate of households reporting an incarcerated male household member. Approximately 7.4% of adults in Clay County are incarcerated in federal prisons and detention centers or local jails and lockups. This rate is substantially higher than the overall United States population, where 3.1% of the adult population lives under correctional supervision in the form of probation, parole, jail, or prison.

The 18-item USDA U.S. Household Food-Security/Hunger Survey was used to ascertain food insecurity among the participants. This survey asks questions (using a 12-month recall) related to anxiety about food budget and food supply, experiences of running out of food, experiences of inadequate food or food quality in the household, and examples of reduced food intake and the consequences therein. We measured the presence and degree of food insecurity among women-headed households affected by incarceration using a sample of 16 individuals. Eleven of the households reported that children lived in the home, while 5 households reported no children present.
The results indicate a high rate of food insecurity among women-headed households affected by incarceration in Clay County. Only 5 participants were classified as food secure, meaning that the households showed no or minimal evidence of food insecurity.

Startlingly, 68.75% of the participants were designated as food insecure to varying degrees. One household (6.25%) reported food insecurity without the presence of hunger. This designation means that food security is present in the participants’ concerns about the adequacy of the household food supply and adjustments are made to household food management, including reduced quality of food and increased coping behaviors (but little or no reduction in members’ food intake is present).

Nearly a third of participants (31.25%) reported food insecurity with moderate hunger, marked by reports that food intake for adults in the household has been reduced to the extent that adults (though not children) have repeatedly experienced the physical sensation of hunger.

A significant portion of the participants (31.25%) responded to the survey in a way that indicates their households experience food insecurity with severe hunger. In these households, adults have repeatedly experienced more extensive reductions in food intake and households with children have reduced the children’s food intake, indicating that the children have experienced hunger.

The significantly high rate of food insecurity (68.75%) among the participant population far exceeds the national average, where 8.7-10.4% of American households experience food insecurity. The findings suggest two areas for further action within and by the community. First, social service organizations may consider the unique needs among women-headed households affected by incarceration, who report limited access to resources to obtain food for adults and children living in their households. Second, the results call for additional research to be undertaken to explore the factors influencing food insecurity and potential sites for reducing food insecurity and hunger in Clay County, Kentucky.

The poverties identified in our findings illustrate the structural inequalities that scar our world—mass incarceration, employment shortages, discrimination, and unequal resource distributions to social services and education. As we continue our efforts in this region, these data compel us to expand the focus of structural violences to understand the poverties of women in Appalachia and their experiences with food access and hunger.

Grassroots Development Topical Interest Group

By Emilia González-Clements  emiliagonzalezclements@gmail.com
Fifth Sun Development Fund

The work of the members of the Grassroots Development TIG is ultimately based on working with small rural producers. These small producers, like the rest of us, live in a global environment.

"China Rises"

My family will soon experience a bit of this global environment. My grandson, 11, is studying Mandarin Chinese here in Portland, Oregon. Next week, a boy from China is coming for a 10-day home stay, as part of a group of other grammar
school visitors. Meanwhile, we are learning about China, and found the interactive web site, www.nytimes.com/chinarises.

“China Rises” is a four-part television series originally released in 2006, an international production of the New York Times, Discovery Times, The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, ZDF, France 5 and S4C.

The Oldest Civilization on Earth, Reborn China. The scene of the most extraordinary economic, social and political transformation of our time. But it is also a nation struggling with an enormous population, a strained environment, and unequal distribution of wealth and opportunity. Four documentary films portray the triumphs and disappointments of remarkable individuals caught up in an epic story.

This is China Rises.

The issues shown in the four films are familiar to anthropologists: rural to urban migration, impact of industrialization, environmental degradation, and so on. So are the attempts at cultural survival and environmental justice.

I propose that each of us view this series as a basis for a discussion of these issues at our upcoming meeting in Denver.

When I attended the 1995 Fourth World Conference for Women in Beijing, I saw very little of the rural areas even during the hour-long bus ride to the actual conference site, and I was amazed by the immense city.

“A $20 Billion Play on Modern Energy”

Jeff Siegel, publisher of Green Chip Stocks, wrote on January 25, 2013, about his hometown, Baltimore, Maryland and its revitalization. His focus is on investment opportunities in renewable energy. He predicts the growth of “megacities”.

Trillion-Dollar City Migration

...In less than 40 years, the global population of city dwellers is set to reach 6.3 billion, up from 3.6 billion today, with most of this growth happening in developing countries. And in just 13 years, there will be 37 megacities across the globe—each boasting populations in excess of 10 million (22 of these cities, by the way, will be in Asia).

The result: Existing urban infrastructures and resources are going to be stressed to the point of collapse, if immediate efforts aren’t taken to prepare for the influx of this new generation of city residents. The threat of such a crisis is certainly enough to make governments across the world take notice. But it’s also provided the sweet smell of opportunity for investors. And it’s for that reason that, over the course of the next fifty years, we’re going to witness a trillion-dollar transition to what’s being called “smart cities.”

Check out the rest of the article where he mentions options such as urban farming, urban fish farms, storm water capture, next-generation toilets, renewable energy, mass transit and walkable communities. www.energyandcapital.com/editors/jeff-siegel.

The sheer numbers of people and the size of their built environment boggles my mind. As I work with small rural producers in Mexico and Oregon, I’m glad that other applied anthropologists are helping solve contemporary human problems in all these arenas. I’m also glad my grandson is studying Chinese.

What could be the impact of these “megacities” on the groups we work with?

Open Invitation/2013 SfAA Denver Conference
If you are interested in development work, join us at the 2013 annual conference in Denver. The GD TIG is presenting a panel, followed by an open forum in conjunction with our official meeting. Meanwhile, contact me at emiliagonzalezclements@gmail.com.
Students are always welcome.

*Fracking Denver: Sessions, Discussions, TIG Organization—Wednesday, March 20*

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

In Longmont, Colorado, gas wells and schoolyards stand side by side. In Pennsylvania, residents are trying to gain ground against unregulated drilling. And in New York, grassroots organizations are hoping to stave off a final decision concerning fracking. But what is anthropology doing?

The multiple methods surrounding the extraction of fossil fuels have been a source of social and environmental conflict in locations worldwide. In the last five years, high volume hydraulic fracturing or *fracking* has become the most controversial of these processes, even as the Gulf states recover from the BP spill and West Virginia mountains crumble in the search for coal. Hydro-fracking refers to the process of extracting natural gas from deep shale layers by injecting millions of gallons of water and chemical based “frack fluid” under high pressure. The process is contentious, environmentally damaging, and threatens the social fabric of rural (and urban) communities around the world.

While communities are becoming well versed in the potential environmental impacts of fracking, it is only in the last year that the cumulative effects of social and economic disruption and change have come into the discussion. In states where fracking is already underway and in those where permit and regulation battles continue, relying on the “science” is a continuing cry of those on both sides of the issue. However the “science” remains limited in both scope and quantity, and is largely concerned with the natural, environmental impacts of the process. There is little regard for how the overall effects of exploration, drilling, and boom bust cycles effect human lives on a day to day basis.

A growing number of international social scientists have been working with, and in, communities since drilling began in force in 2007. In November 2012 a group of these presented papers at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association in San Francisco. These papers represented a variety of studies about fracking, fracked communities, the energy commodity chain, and the degree to which “low intensity” crises have affected the health and wellbeing of those living in energy rich locales. An informal planning session was held to gauge interest in additional, coordinated research by anthropologists and others who would like to see social science included in the assessment of the risks and hazards surrounding all energy extraction, but especially fracking.

**Denver Sessions**

SfAA Denver continues this during a roundtable and sessions on Wednesday, March 20. Tom Pearson has organized two events: *Fracking and the Hydrocarbon Commodity Chain, Part 1 (Colorado C; 8:00-9:50)* highlights research on new forms of environmental politics and community organizing taking shape in response to hydraulic fracturing. The proliferation of hydraulic fracturing has spurred conflicts in communities throughout zones of shale gas development. Increased demand for raw materials used in hydrofracking, especially water and sand, has also introduced similar
conflicts in numerous communities outside of drilling zones. Geographically dispersed but linked by the hydrocarbon supply chain, such communities are grappling with new questions around land use, property rights, landscape destruction, environmental degradation, water, and local authority to regulate natural resource extraction and energy development. The session includes:

Thomas W. Pearson (UW-Stout), Mining for Frac Sand in Wisconsin: Local Democracy, Community Organizing, and the Politics of Landscape

Ashley Collins (UC-Denver), Growing Local Food and Domestic Energy: Farmers and Energy Corporations Struggle Over The Demand for Water Use in Colorado

Elizabeth Long (Rice University), The Politics of Respect: Anti-Fracking Activism in New York State

Kari Colosi (Binghamton University), Home Rule and the Environmental Politics of Shale Gas Drilling in New York State

Amy Samuelson (UW-Milwaukee), “We need water, not gas!” A Romanian community takes on Chevron

Part II is a Roundtable Discussion on Community Organizing (Colorado C; 10:00-11:50). In it, applied and practicing anthropologists working in Colorado and other geographic regions will join local community organizers and activists from the Denver area in a roundtable discussion on the social and environmental impacts of hydraulic fracturing, unconventional energy development, and the hydrocarbon commodity chain. Community organizers and anthropologists will share experiences, lessons, strategies, and analyses addressing the impacts of fracking. Please join the discussion with Ashley Collins (UC-Denver), Michael Fitch (UC-Boulder); Ken Zimmerman (Oregon Public Utility Commission) and Jeanne Simonelli (Wake Forest University).

Break for lunch and more planning and discussion, then return for Fracking in Focus: Observations from an Ethnographic Field School (Colorado G 1:30-3:20) chaired by Anastasia Hudgins and Amanda Poole (IUP). The session features:

Gabrielle Lehigh (IUP), Shaping Water: How Identities Influence the Environmental Conversation

Devin Hogan (IUP), Community Relations with a Transforming Natural and Social Environment

Elye R. Schenk (IUP), Waterways of Awareness: The Currents That Drive - Pennsylvania Senior Environmental Corps

Anastasia Hudgins and Amanda Poole (IUP), The Fracking Field School and the Politics of Knowledge Production: An Anthropological Intervention

DISCUSSANT: Simona Perry (c.a.s.e. Consulting)

By this time you should be so fired up that you will want to help organize a TIG that will create and further networks of exchange for those working in this area, facilitate rapid, peer reviewed publications, support community action and bring social science into the analysis and decision-making involved in energy extraction. Approved by the SfAA Board, the organizational meeting for the ExtrACTION TIG will be Wednesday at 5:30, back in Colorado C.
Tourism and Heritage Topical Interest Group: SfAA Annual Meetings Preview

By Melissa Stevens [melissa.stevens7@gmail.com]
University of Maryland, College Park

Student Paper Competition

The second annual Tourism and Heritage TIG Student Paper Competition started with the submission paper abstracts this past fall, four of which were selected to be presented in a specially organized paper session at the Denver SfAA meetings (session details are listed below). Those four papers are also now in the running for the top paper prize, which includes a $500 award. The winning paper will be announced in Denver at the paper session and at the TIG business meeting. The selected papers are:

Teresa Kline (Franklin and Marshall College) “Responsible Tourism in Samoa: An Exploration of Attitudes in Samoa towards Responsibility in Tourism”

Kimberly Berg (SUNY Albany) “Hidden Heritage: Underlying Ideologies at Three Welsh Heritage Sites”

Ennis Barbery (U of Maryland) “Negotiating Authority, Sharing Heritage Resources and Increasing Relevance along a National Historic Trail”

Nadine Dangerfield (U of Maryland) “Creating a Sense of Place in the Anacostia Trails Heritage Area through Native Interpretation of the Anacostia River”
The cash awards for the first and second annual paper competitions have been generously donated by TIG members. In order for the competition to continue to support and celebrate future tourism and heritage scholars, a more permanent fund will need to be established. Please consider making a contribution to the TIG’s fund for the annual cash award for the winning paper. Your donation will be tax-deductible and you will have directly provided support toward the continued growth and development of tourism and heritage scholarship. For details, please contact Tim Wallace (tmwallace@mindspring.com). The 2014 competition will begin with the submission of paper abstracts in September. More details will be published here in the Tourism and Heritage TIG column in the May and August SfAA Newsletters. For more information on the competition, please contact Melissa Stevens (melissa.stevens7@gmail.com).

The SfAA Annual Meetings in Denver

The Tourism and Heritage TIG meeting will be held SATURDAY 12:00-1:20 in the Denver VI meeting room. We invite everyone interested in the anthropology of tourism and heritage (including students) to join us as we discuss the annual student paper competition, plans for TIG involvement in next year’s SfAA meetings, and other tourism and heritage-related topics. We would love to have your input and ideas.

Student papers selected from the 2013 Tourism and Heritage TIG Student Paper Competition will be presented during a special paper session entitled The Next Generation of Tourism and Heritage Scholarship, held SATURDAY 1:30-3:20 in Colorado B meeting room. The selected papers are now in the running for the $500 prize to be awarded to the top paper. The papers include an exploration of how various definitions of “responsible tourism” can be synthesized to create a more inclusive operational definition; a study of how historical narratives presented at heritage sites reveal implicit political ideologies; an examination of the limits of sharing authority over heritage resources in public archaeology initiatives; and an exploration of how the incorporation of a Native sense of place enhances interpretations of U.S. heritage areas.

The Valene Smith Tourism Poster Competition is now in its seventh year. The competition is endowed through the generosity of Valene Smith, one of the founders of the study of tourism. Dr. Smith’s groundbreaking book, Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism established the foundation for the study of this topic. The award is given to support the research of future leaders in the field of tourism studies, and this year’s submissions represent an interesting variety of topics by many promising students. The tourism posters will be displayed during the general poster session (THURSDAY 1:30-3:30, Colorado F). Stop by to see cutting edge tourism research and to meet the students presenting their work.

Other sessions of interest to tourism and heritage scholars include:

(TH-06) THURSDAY 9:00-11:00
Colorado F
Non-Student Posters

(TH-121) THURSDAY 4:00-5:50
Colorado A
The Impact of International Tourism on the Sustainability of Local Systems and Heritage

(F-11) FRIDAY 8:00-9:50
Denver I
Tradition, Tourism, and Community in Sololá, Guatemala: Reports from the Ethnographic Field School of North Carolina State University, Part I

(F-41) FRIDAY 10:00-11:50
Denver I
Tradition, Tourism, and Community in Sololá, Guatemala: Reports from the Ethnographic Field School of North Carolina State University, Part II

(F-98) FRIDAY 1:30-3:20
Colorado H
Recording Cultural Heritage
Please note that the event details listed here are from the Preliminary Program. Please consult the final version of the Program for any possible changes.

Future Columns Call for Papers
The Tourism and Heritage TIG would like to see your work published here! Please send us your travel and research stories, book and film reviews, or general tourism and heritage-related musings to Melissa Stevens (melissa.stevens7@gmail.com) for consideration for inclusion in future newsletter columns. Pieces should be no more than 1500-1750 words in length, including references. Please do not use endnotes or footnotes. Submissions for the May newsletter must be received by April 15, 2013.

Stay connected to the Tourism and Heritage TIG through:
TourismTIG List-serve: to subscribe, contact Tim Wallace (tmwallace@mindspring.com) or Melissa Stevens (melissa.stevens7@gmail.com)
Facebook: www.facebook.com/pages/SfAA-Tourism-Topical-Interest-Group/139663493424
Twitter: www.twitter.com/sfaatourismtig

Student Corner

By Andrew Tartar [andrew.tartar@ufl.edu]
Chair, Student Committee

The Student Committee is taking a break from our normal column of student micro-essays this month; we’ve been incredibly busy preparing for a range of student events at the upcoming meetings, judging the submissions for the Student Endowment Award for travel to the conference, and judging the submissions for our newly created—and not yet named—Student Paper Prize.

We’re happy to announce that we held successful elections for several student committee positions. Thank you to everyone who applied for these leadership roles. We’d like to welcome Michael J.T. Fitch (U Colorado) as our incoming Communications Coordinator, Deborah J. Andrews (U Florida) as our incoming Treasurer, and A. Rey Villanueva (U Texas San Antonio) as our incoming Vice Chair. We’d also like to thank out-going members Paul Boshears (Treasurer), A. Rey Villanueva (Communications Coordinator), and Andrew Tarter (Chair) for two years of excellent service on the Student Committee.

We hope to see many of you in Denver! We encourage you to check out the upcoming meeting program (available on the SfAA web site) for information on all the student-related events, including our paper panel on revolution—the theme for this year’s student micro-essays in the newsletter, and for submissions to our new Student Paper Prize.

If you are attending the conference in Denver, be sure to come to the Student Welcome and Orientation event on Wednesday evening, to learn about all the excellent student opportunities at the meeting. See you soon!

Please note that I will be available on Thursday at noon in Denver to address any questions or comments you may have regarding Practicing Anthropology. You may also find me coming to your talk to ask you to submit. Feel free to contact me at pracanth@vt.edu if you have questions, concerns, or want to submit a manuscript. Remember to consult our website at https://www.sfaa.net/pa/paaauthor.html for “Information for Authors” regarding submission criteria.

SfAA Members in the News

Dr. Erin P. Finley selected for Margaret Mead Award

The Boards of Directors of the American Anthropological Association (AAA) and the Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA) have selected Dr. Erin P. Finley to receive the Margaret Mead Award for 2012. Dr. Finley was selected for her book, “Fields of Combat: Understanding PTSD Among Veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan,” published by Cornell University Press in 2011. Dr. Finley is currently an Investigator with the Veterans Evidence-based Research Dissemination and Implementation Center (VERDICT) at the South Texas Veterans Health Care System. She is
also an Adjunct Assistant Professor with the division of Clinical Epidemiology in the Department of Medicine at the University of Texas Health Science Center San Antonio. The Award will be formally presented at the 73rd Annual Meeting of the Society for Applied Anthropology in Denver, Colorado, on March 22, 2013.

The Margaret Mead Award is sponsored jointly by the two associations and presented annually. The Award is presented to a young scholar for a particular accomplishment, such as a book, which employs anthropological data and principles in ways that make them meaningful and accessible to a broadly concerned public.

The Award honors the memory of Margaret Mead who in her lifetime was the most widely known woman in the world, and arguably the most recognized anthropologist. Mead had a unique talent for bringing anthropology into the light of public attention. With Mead’s approval, the Award was initiated in 1979 by the SfAA; it has been presented jointly with the AAA since 1983.

Dr. Finley received her Ph.D. in medical anthropology in 2009 from Emory University. She received her undergraduate degree in anthropology (with high honors) from Emory in 1999; in 2006, she earned the Masters of Public Health degree from the Rollins School of Public Health at Emory. Dr. Finley’s primary research interests include PTSD and the implementation of evidence-based treatment for veterans.

“Fields of Combat” is a careful and sensitive description of the suffering from, and healing of psychic wounds of war trauma. The book documents the cultural context of the struggle by returning soldiers for social re-incorporation and re-creation of a productive life. The author uses a careful analysis of the socio-cultural context from which the soldiers derive to explain the response to war.

“Fields of Combat” has received exceptional reviews in prominent professional journals, including the Journal of the American Medical Association. Noted scholars in the field have described the research as “ground-breaking” and the book as “elegantly written”. One scholar concluded, “Margaret Mead would have loved it because (the book) deals with an incredibly important topic and clearly demonstrates the power of anthropological research.”

Additional information on the Mead Award and the prior recipients may be found on the SfAA website—www.sfaa.net.

Allan F. Burns Selected for the Sol Tax Award for 2013

President Merrill Eisenberg announced today that Prof. Allan F. Burns had been selected to receive the Sol Tax Distinguished Service Award of the Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA). The Award will be presented on March 22, 2013, at the 73rd Annual Meeting of the Society in Denver, Colorado.

Allan Burns is Professor Emeritus at the University of Florida, where he held for several years the Jessie dePont-Magid Chair. During his lengthy tenure at the University, he served as Chair of the Department of Anthropology as well as Associate Dean of the College of Liberal Arts. He also held appointments in the Center for Latin American Studies and the College of Medicine.

The Sol Tax Award is presented annually to an SfAA member in recognition of long-term and exceptional service to the association. The Award carries the name of a distinguished applied anthropologist who provided during his lifetime crucial support and service to the Society.

Prof. Burns was elected by the membership to serve as the President of SfAA from 2010-12. Earlier, he had been the Program Chair for the very successful Annual Meeting in Cancun, Mexico, in 1993. He has also held
AAA Awards the Textor Award to Elizabeth Briody, Tracy Meerwarth and Robert Trotter

The American Anthropological Association awarded Robert B. Textor and Family in Anticipatory Award to Elizabeth K. Briody, Tracy L. Meerwarth and Robert T. Trotter II for their work on Plant Culture Project.” AN Online, “Working collaboratively and in with the General Motors’

the Ideal Culture Project helped bring about organizational General Motors, and in the course of this work developed an approach that can be used by others seeking organizational change. The Ideal Plant Culture project used a cultural models perspective to help the GM community understand their own culture, identify areas that the community wished to change, and devised tools to assist the community as its members pursued desired changes.”

-See more at: http://www.anthropology-news.org/index.php/2012/10/01/2012-aaa-award-winners-part-1/#sthash.BUxrrk4p.dpuf

Stan Hyland Wins the 2012 Solon T. Kimball Award

Stanley E. Hyland, Professor of Anthropology at the University of Memphis and Head of the School of Urban Affairs and Public Policy, won the 2012 Solon T Kimball Award for Public and Applied Anthropology. “The award recognizes his contributions to the development of public policy aimed at issues of poverty and social inequalities in Memphis, TN and the mid-South, and his intertwined contributions to the development of anthropology as an applied science through what Hyland calls “an ecological approach to policy change. The Solon T Kimball Award for Public and Applied Anthropology was initiated by royalties from Applied Anthropology in America (Elizabeth M Eddy and William L Partridge, eds, 1978), a volume dedicated to Solon Kimball. The award honors outstanding achievements in the development of anthropology as an applied science. The award has been presented every other year since 1984 at the American Anthropological Association annual meeting. It offers an opportunity to honor exemplary anthropologists for outstanding achievements in applied science that have also had important impacts on public policy.”


Mark Schuller New Book: Killing with Kindness: Haiti, International Aid, And NGOs

Set in Haiti during the 2004 coup and aftermath and enhanced by research conducted after the 2010 earthquake, Mark Schuller has published KILLING WITH KINDNESS: Haiti, International Aid, and NGOs (Rutgers University Press, September 2012). This book analyzes the impact of official development aid on recipient nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and their relationships with local communities. Written like a detective story, KILLING WITH KINDNESS offers ethnographic comparisons of two Haitian women’s NGOs working in HIV/AIDS prevention, one with public funding (including USAID), the other with private European NGO partners. Schuller looks at participation...
and autonomy, analyzing donor policies that inhibit these goals. He focuses on NGOs’ roles as intermediaries in “gluing” the contemporary world system together and shows how power works within the aid system as these intermediaries impose interpretations of unclear mandates down the chain—a process Schuller calls “trickle-down imperialism.”

**SfAA Member Christine Ho Wins Social Justice Award**

Christine G T Ho was honored by the School of Human and Organization Development at Fielding Graduate University with the 2013 Social Justice Award, which she received for introducing new curriculum to the School of Human and Organization Development for the study of systemic inequality and diversity, for co-founding the Transformative Learning for Social Justice Concentration (doctoral level major), and for serving three terms as Chair of the HOD Social Justice and Diversity governance committee. It is the first time the School has given this award since 1997.

**From the Editor of Practicing Anthropology**

By Anita Puckett [practanth@vt.edu]
Virginia Tech

The nine individually volunteered articles in the next issue of Practicing Anthropology (Spring 2013, Volume 35, Issue 2) represent three different focus areas within applied anthropology. Three articles focus on the how the constitution of ethnicity in zones of United States military conflict (Iraq and Afghanistan) create life and death situations that can be mitigated or even solved by application of anthropological methods or insights to implementations of United States military policies. Another three articles focus on how applied anthropologists are addressing the highly negative impact of neoliberal economics at local levels. One focuses on undergraduate research that examined how to add value to the cultural and natural resources of rural Appalachian communities dominated by the neoliberal paradigm, while another probes how to establish cultural protection labeling and certification for consumer products, investment portfolios, and international development projects. The third in this section builds on this protection labeling and certification argument by describing how environmentalists and others use the strategy of product certification and labeling for environmental and labor protections. The last section presents three articles that offer different paradigms for the application of anthropological methods or approaches to pressing contemporary social, medical, or ethnographic research problems through discussions of multi-sited ethnographies, incorporation of anthropological approaches in United Kingdom medical student training, and informant/researcher collaboration building in the Philippines.

The next issue of Practicing Anthropology will have a partially guest-edited section in which several undergraduate ethnographic research reflections are framed by the supervising professor’s comments on how to best utilize undergraduates in applied anthropological research projects. This issue is then complemented by several individually volunteered articles, including one on how the applied anthropologist can assist United States humanities scholars in their student research trips abroad.
Announcements

Pacific Northwest (PNW) LPO News
Alaska, British Columbia, Washington, Oregon, Western Montana, Idaho, Northern California

By Emilia González Clements [emiliagonzalezclements@gmail.com]
Fifth Sun Development Fund

PNW LPO Vision

To serve the interests of practicing anthropologists who either reside in the area or work in the area by offering venues for professional reflection and development. Such venues may include:

- Yearly or quarterly gatherings for socializing, sharing information, and discussing the issues in our field;
- Seminars or learning events on topics of interest to the membership;
- Sponsoring an in-depth exploration of topics of interest which may yield to individual and group publications;
- Strategy sessions on being effective in the policy arena.

Meeting at Northwest Anthropology Conference-Portland, Oregon

One suggestion from the 2012 SfAA Conference LPO meeting was to work closely with the annual Northwest Anthropology Conference (NWAC), being hosted by Portland State University, March 27-30, 2013.

1. LPO Meeting at NWAC

Ken Ames, Program Chair, is arranging a meeting for us at the conference. Check the program for the date, time and place.

2. PNW LPO members are invited to attend and to submit abstracts for volunteered papers.

The usefulness of Anthropology as a discipline, of Anthropological knowledge and training, has been seriously challenged across North America over the past year. While our field has certainly been defended, we as Anthropologists need to redouble our efforts to show how the practice of Anthropology matters. We know it matters, and at this conference, we want presentations by representatives of Tribes, Academia, Federal Agencies, and private sector consultants demonstrating how the field of Anthropology is not only alive and well, but crucial. The conference also strongly welcomes symposia and papers on any Anthropological topic in all four subfields.

The conference will be held at the University Place Hotel in Portland, OR. Please make reservations directly with the hotel at 1-866-845-4647 and mention the Northwest Anthropological Conference. Other reservation sources, such as travel websites, on-line reservations, or the national reservation system, may indicate that there are no rooms available due to the block of rooms being held for this conference.

Please see the preliminary schedule or learn more about our vendors. We are now accepting symposium, paper, and poster abstracts. Please register by February 10 for the reduced registration fee.

Contact
Dr. Ken Ames, Faculty & Chair Emeritus
Phone: 503-725-3049
Fax: 503-725-3905
Email: amesk@pdx.edu

Anthropology Department
Portland State University
P.O. Box 751
Portland, OR 97207

Society for Applied Anthropology
A Word from COPAA

Nancy Romero-Daza [daza@usf.edu], University of South Florida
Lisa Henry [lisa.henry@unt.edu], University of North Texas
Sue Hyatt [suhyatt@iupiu.edu] IUPIU

In order to enhance collaboration between academic programs and practicing and applied anthropologists working in non-academic settings, the Consortium of Practicing and Applied Anthropology Programs offers its annual Visiting Fellow Program (VFP). The recipient of the 2011-2012 VFP award, the Department of Anthropology at the University of Memphis, hosted Dr. Jean (Jay) Schensul from the Institute for Community Research (ICR) in Hartford, Connecticut in April 2012. The visit, which was scheduled to coincide with the department’s 35th anniversary celebration, brought together faculty, students, alumni, and community partners. Keri Brondo reports on the activities carried out as part of the program:

“Over the course of Dr. Schensul’s three-day visit, our faculty and students participated in a range of opportunities, including:

1. [A] “showcase” of select academic-community partnerships and dialogue around best practices for collaborative research in the Mid-South. Featured as a panel discussion were collaborations between anthropology, non-profit management, and public health faculty with Shelby Farms Park Conservancy, Lemonye-Owen College Community Development Corporation, and St. Jude Children’s Research Hospital’s Connect to Protect Memphis. Presenters described the nature of their collaboration, challenges they have encountered in building partnership (e.g., deciding on methodologies, resources to support engaged work, how they found collaborators, etc.), and tips and troubleshooting for doing engaged scholarship. This panel discussion was followed by a lively dialogue and commentary by Dr. Schensul, in which she provided the national framework for university-community collaborations. In her feedback, Dr. Schensul emphasized the importance of transdisciplinary approaches to social justice research. The event concluded with a viewing of project posters that highlighted the University’s Strengthening Community Grant Initiative, a program that supports university-community collaboration developed under a participatory and collaborative framework of engagement. This event was held on Thursday afternoon, April 19, 2012.

2. A well-attended “hands-on” workshop on participatory action research (PAR) methods for Anthropology faculty, graduate students, alumni, and their community partners. Participating community partners included: Memphis Healthy Common Table, Shelby Farms Park Conservancy, BRIDGES, Greater Memphis Greenline, Overton Park Conservancy, Methodist Healthcare, LeBonheur Hospital, C.H. Nash Museum at Chucalissa, and the City of Memphis’ Department of Housing and Community Development. Several representatives of these community organizations are also department alumni, reflecting the strong relationships our department maintains with former students. When students leave our program they often move on to become community research partners and graduate student practicum supervisors. This event was held on Friday morning, April 20, 2012. During the workshop, participants group-modeled PAR projects, presented them and obtained feedback from attendant faculty.

3. “Ask a Practitioner” Brown Bag lunch with applied anthropology graduate students on April 20, 2012. Consultation on applied collaborative/participatory project design and anthropology core curriculum.

4. [T]he “Praxis Makes Perfect” conference in honor of the 35th anniversary of University of Memphis’ Department of Anthropology, held on Saturday, April 21, 2012, and attended by Dr. Shirley Raines, the President of the University of Memphis. The culminating event was a keynote address on Community-University Engagement by Dr. Schensul during our evening Gala reunion celebration at the Peabody Hotel.”

As Brondo states, some of the benefits of the VFP for her department included “(1) enhanced alumni/faculty partnerships and new as well as stronger academic-community research partnerships; (2) new appreciation of and
strategies for incorporating PAR methodological training in graduate curriculum and specific faculty and student projects; (3) intellectual exchange surrounding the theory and practice of participatory action work in distinct geographic settings (Memphis, TN and Hartford, CT); and (4) strengthening the visibility of PAR among colleagues and administrators in the university.”

COPAA is pleased with the success of the VFP program, and would like to encourage our members to apply for the 2013-2014 cycle by May 1st, 2013. Please visit us at http://www.copaa.info/resources_for_programs/index.htm for application instructions and forms as well as for a copy of the University of Memphis complete VFP report. More information will also be available at the SfAA meetings in Denver.

High Plains Society for Applied Anthropology

Spring 2013 Annual Conference March 21-24, 2013
Auraria Campus, Metropolitan State University of Denver

Call for Papers
Theme: The Relationship between Natural Resources and Applied Anthropology with a special emphasis on water resources and conservation
This conference is being hosted in cooperation with the Society for Applied Anthropology’s Annual Conference.
If you or your community, students, agencies, coalitions, organizations, teams, or colleagues have a story to tell, idea to explore, paper to present, poster to exhibit, research to expand our knowledge or experiences to share, please join us! We encourage you to submit your abstracts and panels.
Please follow this link: http://hpsfaa2013.wufoo.com/forms/hpsfaa-2013-conference-abstractpanel-submission/ to fill out the form for a paper, panel, or open forum topic, including an abstract of no more than 250 words.
Please click HERE for downloadable submission form. It can be sent to Jack Shultz (schultzj@msudenver.edu).
All submissions are due no later than March 5, 2013.
*In order to submit a paper topic you must register for the conference. Registration is now open.*

From the Editor

Tim Wallace [tim.wallace@ncsu.edu]
North Carolina State University

As I reported in my last column the SfAA Executive Board is undertaking a significant review of the bylaws for our Society. The President in her column this issue asks you to participate in helping the Executive Board know what your opinions are regarding the proposed changes. I also urge you to come to the Denver Business meeting and make your ideas known.

I am struck by the interesting diversity of our members. My reading of the Loomis interview (a longer version is found in the online format of this issue), indicates to me that the diversity has increased, not diminished since the time of our founders. This is reflected in the very broad array of articles, commentaries, and columns found in this issue. It has been very exciting for me as an editor getting to know and communicating with the many authors that have contributed to this and past issues of the SfAA News. When I talk to members about the SfAA, invariably they say that the SfAA has the best meetings, and that they always feel welcome here.

The founders of the SfAA had a notion of what the SfAA should be, as it was envisioned in a time of war and in an era that had seen many anthropologists working for the government and in an era when they took issue with the way large corporations treated their employees. Here we are in 2013, in another era of war and a period when big corporations have incredible influence over the lives of their employees and over consumers. The SfAA has responded to the changes in our society and in the world by being nimble, flexible and open to the diversity of which I spoke above. The founders insured that we would be receptive of not only academic and applied anthropologists, but also applied scientists from other fields as well. We have maintained an openness
also towards students and encouraged them to be active members. The SfAA has done well in the last 73 years to keep true to the mission of our ancestors while still staying prepared to meet the challenges of this decade and many more to come. And when we became members and Fellows of the SfAA, we committed ourselves to do everything we could to keep our Society vital and relevant as well as to promote the values our ancestors espoused, i.e.: “to promote the integration of anthropological perspectives and methods in solving human problems throughout the world; to advocate for fair and just public policy based upon sound research; to promote public recognition of anthropology as a profession; and to support the continuing professionalization of the field.” The SfAA is counting on you to continue to meet our goals and the needs of society!
The SfAA News is published by the Society for Applied Anthropology and is a benefit of membership in the Society. Non-members may purchase subscriptions at a cost of $10.00 for U.S. residents and $15.00 for non-U.S. residents. Checks or money orders should be made payable to the Society for Applied Anthropology.
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Items to be included in the SfAA News should be sent to: Tim Wallace, Department of Sociology & Anthropology, NC State University, Raleigh, NC 27695-8107. E-mail: tmwallace237@gmail.com. Telephone: 919/515-9025; fax 919/515-2610. The contributor’s telephone number and e-mail address should be included, and the professional affiliations of all persons mentioned in the copy should be given.

Changes of address and subscription requests should be directed to: SfAA Business Office, P.O. Box 2436, Oklahoma City, OK 73101-2436 (405/843-5113); E-mail <info@sfaa.net>. Visit our website at http://www.sfaa.net.