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Reflections on Albuquerque, and, a Broadway Discussion

Roberto Alvarez
r.alvarez@ucsd.edu
SFAA President's Column

Albuquerque

In June I had the opportunity to visit Albuquerque, New Mexico the site of our upcoming meeting in 2014. Although I’d visited the city before, on this trip I was there to assist in the planning for the annual conference. I trailed along with Erve Chambers (our Program Chair) and Tom May (SFAA Business Office Executive Director) as we met with UNM faculty, practitioners, the Convention Bureau and visited the National Hispanic Cultural and The Indian Pueblo Cultural Centers. We explored a variety of ambiances: places, people, and ideas that will make up the 74th SfAA annual meetings.

I initially thought that the visit would be simply perfunctory, meeting administrators and arranging possible activities. Yet there was nothing perfunctory about our tasks. At each venue I enjoyed meeting the various actors, and learning of their dedication and interests. I experienced the city in meaningful new ways. I rediscovered Albuquerque, and importantly I learned more about our Society.

From the onset, Tom, Erve and I worked as a team, but also made individual excursions. A particular highlight for me was the National Hispanic Cultural Center (www.nhcnm.org). Here Erve arranged a tour of the facilities and the archival collection that celebrates contemporary Hispano art and expression. Erve also focused on connecting with local grassroots organizations. Tom carefully reviewed a number of hotels and motels that meet our needs and ethical code (such as the relation to labor, and the communal reciprocity of our primary hotel). Our conversations revolved around the 2014 meeting, our membership and Society goals. This was about serving the Society, and connecting to the Albuquerque community.

Erve and Tom arranged a primary meeting with interested University of New Mexico personnel who later enthusiastically agreed to be on the local program committee. In addition to anthropology faculty, the group consisted of practitioners who work and live in the local neighborhoods, and are connected to the Native American, Hispano/Chicano, Euro/diversity for which the city is known. Erve has planned an Albuquerque Day during which SfAA members can connect with many of these community/neighborhood groups in discussions and presentations of local projects and issues. Albuquerque Day is still in the planning stages, but the local enthusiasm and interest in SfAA expertise was encouraging.

By the time I left the city I felt we had accomplished a great deal due primarily to the good work of Erve and Tom. (An important aspect of the visit was reviewing local restaurants. I couldn’t get enough red chile, but I think Erve was ready for greens.) Our visit was not just about having an enjoyable meeting but about engaging the community and giving back as well.

The South Valley

As part of our planning, I had the distinct privilege of visiting EleValle: the South Valley Healthy Communities Collaborative (SVHCC). Bill Wagner, a UNM trained anthropologist and Licensed Clinical Social Worker escorted me through the South Valley (SV) and to a variety of grassroots partner organizations that serve the community.
The South Valley lies just south of Old Town, and across the Rio Grande. Here the river is a boundary (as it is farther east where it separates Mexico and the U.S.).

The Valley is over 75% Hispano/Latino/Chicano and marked by poverty, but also by a deep communal and cultural sensibility. Like many other long-standing Latino communities, the SV suffers from an historical lack of resources. The difference from the “city” just across the bridge is striking. Open lots and small houses cluster under cottonwood and elm trees. Pick-up trucks, and other vehicles park lazily under the shade. The day was hot and the streets were quiet, yet I learned how the South Valley Healthy Communities Collaborative (also known as ELeValle -Elevate the Valle-) has been connected to and is serving this community.

The SVHCC consists of six partners that provide exemplary service and models for community collaboration throughout the country. (For a glimpse of their exemplary work and programs, see the sites I’ve listed below). ELeValle is exemplary in that partners work “together toward a healthier South Valley by strengthening families through community-driven solutions.” At La Plazita Institute, for example, I learned of projects aimed at previously incarcerated youth, traditional healing programs for Native Americans, and a certified organic farm where “culture, spirituality and horticulture come together.” In addition, the La Plazita farm sells produce throughout the city providing income for participants. I related personally to La Plazita’s broad philosophy—“La Cultura Cura.” Each ELeValle partner illustrates a profound collaboration with individuals, families, and community through a network of social-cultural, health and educational services that are defined by the community. At each partner site, I met vibrant, engaged individuals who were eager to share and demonstrate their programs.

Our last stop in the Valley was Centro Savila where my host Bill Wagner is the executive director. This is a treatment program devoted to the recovery and healing of individuals, families and communities suffering from emotional and psychological distress. As other ELeValle partners, the Centro provides services regardless of members’ ability to pay. Here I met staff and clients, and again came away with the sense that these programs offer vital services, but also connect deeply with the community. ELeValle is one such collaborative; neighborhood collaborators dot the city offering similar services.

Albuquerque will offer us programs and people who are engaged, collaborating and that exemplify SfAA. Through these connections our association provides great venues for sharing the knowledge and expertise of applied social science.

From the South Valley to New York City

Just a few days after leaving Albuquerque, I was in New York City, a far cry from the South Valley. I went primarily to visit my colleague and dear friend, George Bond whom I had met at my first postgraduate appointment in 1980. He and I worked together at the Program in Applied Anthropology at Teacher’s College, Columbia University. At that time, I also met other close colleagues including Leith Mulling, the current president of the American Anthropological Association.

On a warm Sunday afternoon, George, Leith and I sat, uptown, in a small café on 105 Ave and Broadway. We reminisced not only about the early days of our careers, but Leith and I discussed our “coincidental” positions in our respective associations. Since becoming president, I had planned to meet with Leith, to share ideas, and connect our organizations. Leith and I compared experiences of being President and the issues faced by our organizations. We also laughed together recalling old times as well as the academic, disciplinary, applied struggles that we, along with others, have engaged. George reminded us that we (fledgling novices back in 1980) would never have dreamed of being in these positions and certainly not during the same period.

Visiting with these friends reminded me of the challenges that brought us together. I was reminded of the work we, and others, have attempted, our commitments, the struggle of representation, the fight for relevant social science and taking a stand for social change. The fact that we, Leith and I are the presidents of AAA and SfAA may be coincidental, but it also says much about how our organizations have changed. (Who would have guessed that a Chicano and a Black Woman would preside con-
terminously over these two organizations?) The challenges we faced have not ended. Seeing these struggles through presidential eyes offers new meaning. The SfAA was always home and a niche in which the applied, practical focus of my work was well received. Yet I ask myself now, what is it that truly makes our organization distinct and what are our future goals? On that Sunday on Broadway, George, Leith and I re-created that special commitment that resides in our efforts to seek justice, practical change and equality. Over the years we were among the many that confronted the lack of representation in anthropology and the academy. We invoked a disciplinary engagement with relevant research and work. Much has changed but the struggles continue to haunt anthropology and the social sciences. Today the AAA is a different institution. The American Anthropological Society is engaged in applied efforts and research illustrated by NAPA and other interest groups.

This AAA evolution is the result of the long-term challenges to anthropology, and its past neglect of applied efforts. This change and the inclusion of applied and relevant anthropology is a good thing. It illustrates the results of critical and practical engagement. And it also raises a question that I continue to ask myself: What makes the SfAA distinct? How do we define ourselves? How are we of service to our members and the world of which we are a part? How has the SfAA met the challenges of diversity and equality not only in our work environments, but also within our own institution?

Our question in the past has been centered on how we serve our membership. This continues to be crucial, but how the organization engages the world is also of great importance. Certainly our renewed international thrust, the enactment of institutional members and our long history of acceptance and strong member relationships are a part of who we are. Our determined focus on relevance and interdisciplinary efforts in advancing applied research and practice continues to be central to our tradition. The questions about the society participating in our world continue to surface. And they are more relevant as we approach the 75th year of our founding.

Sitting on Broadway, I was reminded of the issues that brought the three of us together and the collaborative history of the work we shared. I thought of the South Valley and the other communities in which we work. The contrast of the South Valley, and the insights of the conversation on Broadway have helped me look back and forward, raising the question of our own association’s relevance, our future goals and our organizational connection. These are topics we need to revisit. The upcoming meetings in Albuquerque offer this venue, as does our upcoming 75th.

The following sites provide excellent information on the South Valley Healthy Communities Collaborative.

- www.elevalle.org
- www.centrosavilla.org
- www.laplazitainstitute.org
- www.pbjfamilyservices.org
- www.casadesalud.org
- www.rgcdc.org

From the Treasurer

In Focus: SfAA Journal Subscriptions

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

In the last SfAA News, I described the Society’s Trusts, including the Annual Awards Trust and the Peter and Mary L. New Trust. This month, I turn to a discussion of the Society’s journal subscriptions and how they figure into our annual budget. The Society maintains two subscription-based journals, Human Organization and Practicing Anthropology. Both journals are substantial revenue streams for the Society and contribute to the dissemination of applied social science research.
In 2012, subscriptions to *Human Organization* yielded revenues of $50,446—$24,766 of which was recorded in 2012 and $25,680 of which was recorded in 2011. *Practicing Anthropology* is also recorded over the course of two years, totaling $17,773 in revenues. Totaling $68,219, the subscriptions to *Human Organization* and *Practicing Anthropology* account for nearly 18% of the Society’s 2012 revenues of $382,205.

The circulation for both *Human Organization* and *Practicing Anthropology* is 3,500. A feature of the journals is advertising of job openings, new publications, conferences, and other items that may be useful to the membership. Information pertaining to advertising in the journals is available at the Society’s website.

I welcome member feedback to influence the content of the Treasurer’s News. If there is a financial or budgetary item that you like more information about, please let me know.

---

**Annual Meetings**

Let’s Get Together in Albuquerque in 2014

Erve Chambers
[echamber@umd.edu](mailto:echamber@umd.edu)
2014 Program Chair

As I prepare this column the summer is slipping away and we are getting closer to the deadline for submitting proposals to participate in the Society’s 74th annual meeting, to be held March 18-22 in Albuquerque, New Mexico. As we anticipate a good turnout, it might be advisable to brush off the old keyboard and put a proposal together. Submissions for single presentations are welcome, as are organized sessions on a particular topic. Contributors are encouraged to submit session proposals for standard paper presentations as well as for roundtable discussions and other more innovative formats. Please do not hesitate to get in touch with me if you want to discuss any particular formats or ideas for sessions that you might have.

The theme for the 2014 meetings is *Destinations*. While a more detailed theme statement can be found on the SfAA website, the general idea behind the theme is to recognize the mobilities that shape our lives—those that may threaten stability and uproot lives, as well as those that point the way to fresh adventures and new possibilities. *Presentations and discussions on all topics of interest to applied social scientists are most welcomed.*

Your Program Committee is hard at work encouraging members and others to develop sessions for the meetings. This year the SfAA Board approved a procedure to name several Program Committee members as Co-Program Chairs. The Co-Program Chairs have agreed to call upon their colleagues to help develop a number of sessions related to a common theme or interest. These session clusters will be identified in the program, so that anyone interested in a particular topic (immigration, for example) will be able to readily identify all the sessions related to that topic. For at least some of the session clusters, a wrap-up “state of the art session” will be scheduled, in which participants will have the opportunity to review the topic related issues that have been raised during the meeting and discuss where the field should go next, perhaps even planning new sessions and other activities for the 2015 meetings. I hope that this approach will lend some continuity to our sessions and enable participants to gauge the extent to which our understanding of important human problems improves and gains momentum over time.

Let me give you a few examples. Program Co-Chair Judith Freidenberg is assuming responsibility for helping pull together sessions related to immigration. It looks like we’ll have as many as a dozen sessions related to immigration, ranging from issues related to forced relocation and undocumented workers to the immigration of professionals. Several of the sessions will relate to immigration issues in Albuquerque and the Southwest. In a similar vein, Stan Hyland is busily organizing sessions related to community development and community building. Alaka Wali and Cristina Kreps are pulling
together sessions and other activities associated with recent transformations in museum practices, and Tim Wallace and Melissa Stevens will be responsible for developing a cluster of sessions on tourism. Lois Sanford is helping create sessions and activities related to food and agriculture, Susanna Hoffman will help bring together a number of sessions on disaster research, and Michael Paolisso has agreed to be responsible for developing a series of sessions related to environmental issues. I will have more to say about what these Co-Chairs and other program committee members are up to in a future issue of the newsletter.

Some Program Committee members will represent organizations that are co-sponsors with our meetings or that are working with us in another capacity. Karen Lucas Breda will represent the Council on Nursing and Anthropology, Heather Reisinger is the representative for the Society for Medical Anthropology, Joseph Heyman will review submissions for the Political Economy Society, as will Ben Blount for the Society for Anthropological Sciences. Nicole Taylor is coordinating activities with the School for American Research in Santa Fe.

You will find the names of the Program Committee members on the SfAA webpage, along with the names of a new Local Participation Committee. Members of the Local Participation Committee are critical in helping us develop a meeting that is responsive to the needs and interests of the community in which we are meeting as well as the needs and interests of our membership. The first day of the meetings (March 18) has been designated Albuquerque/New Mexico Day and will be devoted to sessions and other activities that should be of importance to the local population. The public will be invited to attend these sessions free of charge. In this vein, Michael Agar is developing a session that will take a look at issues surrounding local organic farms and acequia irrigation canals and that will include a roundtable discussion of regional food and farming issues. Bill Wagner and Catie Willging are planning on hosting a tour of the EleValle (a pathways behavioral health program) in Albuquerque’s South Valley (see President Robert Alvarez’s report in this issue).

For a program devoted to Destinations, it is good to know that Albuquerque and New Mexico are worthy destinations in their own rights. Our convention hotel is located in the city’s Old Town, a major tourist attraction. We will be walking distance from several museums, lots of Southwestern food, and from a hiking and biking trail system that runs through the Rio Grande’s cottonwood bosque. Albuquerque appears to be a bike friendly town and there are two bike rental facilities within walking distance of the convention hotel. I will have more to share about these opportunities, and about the variety of tours that we expect to offer, in the next issue of this newsletter.

See you in Albuquerque!

Commentaries

Towards a New Water Ethic

David Groenfeldt
dgroenfeldt@waterculture.org
Water-Culture Institute

The environmental literature is replete with cries of concern about the damage we humans are doing to the planet, but this very concern begs another question: Why isn’t our planet in even worse shape? If dysfunctional cultural values are part of the problem, maybe we can approach that problem by considering the values that are operating in the other direction, the “good” values that serve as a brake on runaway environmental destruction.

In the arena of water management, anthropologists and our close disciplinary kin (e.g., geographers, sociologists, political scientists, and even a
few economists) have devoted a lot of energy and taxpayer money to studying why projects don’t work and measuring social inequities and ecosystem destruction from badly conceived development interventions. Without trying to paper over the negatives, I want to provide a sense of “cultural relativity.” The cultural values that are expressed in mega water development projects that displace Indigenous Peoples, wipe out fish populations and entire aquatic species, while lining the pockets of corrupt politicians and contractors, are only one side of a more complex picture. On the other side, there are important counteracting forces, in the form of ethics and best practices, which are helping to mitigate those harmful impacts.

What are the cultural values underlying the US Endangered Species Act or the Clean Water Act? What is the basis for the EU requirement that rivers maintain “good ecological status” or that river basin committees reflect the diversity of stakeholder interests? It is because of cultural values (which I gloss here as “ethic”) that our rivers and lakes and aquifers are not in much worse shape than they are already in!

The point of this article is not merely to express gratitude for the ethics that are already incorporated, often unintentionally, into our water policies, but to suggest that we make a concerted and very intentional effort to incorporate more and stronger ethics into those policies. If a little bit of ethics is good, a lot more ethics could be much better. But for that to happen, we need to know more about the ethics we already have and then give serious thought to the additional ethics we would like to adopt.

Understanding the Ethics We Have

There is already a very clear consensus that we want water management that is sustainable, and that does not continually degrade natural systems, leaving us with lifeless rivers and dried up lakes and aquifers. There is also a consensus, articulated into a UN Resolution in 2010, that everyone on the planet has a right to clean water and sanitation. Further, there is a general commitment to participatory forms of water governance. These “macro ethics” provide a frame within which debates about operational specifics can take place.

The macro ethics which guide water policies are an outgrowth of the concept of Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM), which incorporates a holistic view of water which gives particular recognition to environmental sustainability, social welfare, and governance arrangements. Embedded in the IWRM concept are four important principles with together constitute a surprisingly progressive (if too often ignored) water ethic:

1. **Keeping nature alive.** IWRM assumes that ecosystem services have value, and healthier ecosystems generally have more of those values than unhealthy ones. The overwhelming consensus, whether from businesses, governments, or environmentalists, is that functioning natural ecosystems must be part of the solution. The principle of “functioning natural ecosystems are indispensable” is not quite the same order as “rivers have a right to exist” but the two concepts are logically linked, and an exploration of the former principle can lead, I believe, to eventual support for the latter principle as well.

2. **Human right to water and sanitation.** Providing water and sanitation to everyone has been a key part of IWRM principles at least since the Dublin Statement in 1992. The crowning moment for endorsing the human right to water and sanitation was its adoption as a UN Resolution in 2010. This event solidified the stature of the human right to water as having a basis in international law, even though there is no provision for enforcing the standard.

3. **Responsible Use.** The intuitive concept of using water carefully was given an economic interpretation in the 1992 Dublin Principle\(^1\) that “Water has an economic value in all its competing uses.” According to the Global Water Partnership, “Water must be used with maximum possible efficiency.” While the economic language of IWRM has been criticized for its lack of social compassion, the underlying principle is straightforward: Water has an economic value and should not be wasted.

4. **Participatory Water Governance.** The Dublin Principles also contained some socially progressive language about governance, advocating a participatory approach “at the lowest appropriate

---

\(^1\) Articulated at the 1992 international water conference in Dublin held in preparation for the original Rio Conference on sustainable development.
level.” The importance of stakeholder participation, local community consultations, and especially the inclusion of women in all phases and aspects of water planning (Dublin Principle 3) clearly define an ethic of participatory governance.

These four generally accepted principles constitute an ethical baseline that we can use as a conceptual foundation for envisioning a broader set of water ethics, at a more localized and operational scale. How can we get there?

**Defining the Ethics We Want**

Can we build on these shared principles, pull in some of the not-so-widely-shared ethics from specific cases, and then add some additional principles, and come up with a new, sustainable water ethic for the 21st century and beyond? All the behavioral changes implied by the challenge of sustainable water management depend on getting the ethics right first. Let’s consider what those new ethics are starting to look like, and how they are already being operationalized.

1. **Managing Water Ecosystems.** Managing rivers for ecological health is a promising application of the economic principle of ecosystem services, and it is also an ethical development. This is seen in the EU’s Water Framework Directive, which requires keeping rivers in good ecological status. It is also seen in the movement to remove some of the least useful dams, to re-naturalize rivers, and to make “room for rivers” to flood safely. The term “management” has already replaced “control” in discussions of flood strategies.

2. **Water for Food.** Of all the uses of water, none is as quantitatively important as agriculture, which uses about 3/4 of total supplies. Of course, agriculture is also part of the environment, and has the potential for providing ecosystem services on par with natural ecosystems. When a broad set of ecological, social, and cultural functions, and not only short-term economic returns, are incorporated into the valuation, the greatest returns per drop of water are likely to come from small-scale, agro-ecological farming strategies. That implies a very different ethic from that prevailing in industrialized food production.

3. **Water for People.** The formal UN decision in 2010 to recognize water as a human right, has spawned a huge response from the international community and local governments and NGOs. There is a strong underlay of ethical principles motivating these efforts. The significance of the global movement to ensure safe drinking water is its embrace of an expanded community of ethical concern, and offers hope to extend that ethical concern to environmental and cultural justice as well.

4. **Water for Industry.** Corporate water ethics falls into the relatively new category of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), and the triple bottom-line of economic, social, and environmental “profit.” A promising new development is the concept of “water stewardship” defined by the Alliance for Water Stewardship in the form of standards that individual companies can commit to following.

5. **Water Rights of Indigenous Peoples.** The concept of “free, prior, and informed consent” emerged from the World Commission on Dams and has become an international standard of ethical conduct between outsiders’ proposals and Indigenous Peoples’ interests. This standard is written into the UN’s 2008 Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and has been adopted by some of the major development agencies (e.g., Asian Development Bank).

6. **Water Governance.** Two important trends, which together offer an opening for applying a new set of ethical principles, are (1) legitimizing a governance role for everyone within a water basin and (2) applying a broad ecological frame to water use and management. Both trends were stimulated by the concept of IWRM but go further, fuelled by new ideas from feminist studies and deep ecology, as well as corporate social responsibility. The tangible expression of both trends is the establishment of new governance institutions at the basin level whether legally mandated or optional.

**What Next?**

Taken together, these ethical trends suggest that at least some of the water ethics that we need are already emerging. How can there be any objection to participatory governance, or healthy rivers? This is
where the topic of ethics, and the expertise of anthropologists, take on practical importance.

When maintaining a healthy river is viewed as an ethic, which we choose to honor, for the sake of our grandchildren and for Nature herself, it becomes more difficult to justify lax pollution standards or shoddy environmental assessments. By making the ethics explicit we can compare and debate competing ethical paradigms. Do we want to allow polluters to pay a fee so they can continue polluting? Or would we like those polluters to adopt new technologies and protect river health?

The sustainability paradigm which now guides water policies is presenting an important opportunity to anthropologists. By getting involved in identifying the tacit cultural values underlying acknowledged best practices (for example, environmental flow standards, or “free, prior and informed consent,” in the context of dam-induced resettlement), anthropologists can make a unique contribution. We can draw attention to the inherently moral dilemmas of water management and the need for ethical analysis and debate about alternatives.

The new global water ethic is a dynamic process which will continue to change in response to inputs and reinterpretations. Anthropologists have an opportunity to engage in this contested terrain and contribute both our disciplinary skills and our personal convictions. For more info and to get involved, see the Water Ethics Network website at www.waterethics.org.

How I Organized a War on Drugs Conference, Anthropologically

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

McGruff, the Crime Dog, was puffing as he charged up the stairs. The Philadelphia police officer removed his doggie headdress and took me aside. “I just got back from teaching one of those drug bastards a lesson he’ll never forget,” he said, his tail brushing over the carpet. “We took [an African American] and hung him over a train trestle in West Philly by his thumbs. Three stories up. We threatened to drop him if he didn’t stop selling drugs. You shoulda seen his face.”

I was an applied anthropologist working for the Resource Center for Human Services, a think tank associated with the United Way of Southeastern Pennsylvania. It was 1990. I had been given the job to organize a citywide drug conference. I’d gotten to know Officer McGruff as he performed his DARE (Drug Abuse Resistance Education) classroom visits. He never told the 3rd graders about his other life.

My agency was under financial duress and wanted to gain visibility to increase funding. They settled on the drug issue. As such, they were jumping on the media’s moral panic about crack cocaine in African American neighborhoods. The agency’s Executive Director had contacts in the DEA, FBI, leading corporations (like Bell of PA), broadcast media, the Governor’s office, and the city’s new Drug Czar. All were expected to be approached by me to participate in the conference. I was tacitly expected to follow their lead in the nine months leading up to what was to become a major media event. But I had a lot of leeway in organizing workshops and inviting speakers for the expected two-day gathering.

No one in my agency had problematized the issue by distinguishing various contradictions in the ideological referent “war on drugs” (Freire 1970). This included the difference between licit (tobacco and alcohol) and illicit drugs, law enforcement versus public health approaches, and the historical evolution of the “war.” I proceeded to “study up,” investigating money laundering bankers, decriminalization debates, and widespread racism (such as black versus white sentencing disparities). I explored how the U.S. was a significant drug pusher in its own right, as evidenced by the CIA’s heroin involvement in Vietnam (McCoy and Read 1972) and cocaine in Central America (see Webb 1999, Cockburn and St. Clair 1999) and also, incredibly, as a matter of official national policy.

Such was the view of Alex Cockburn who defined the issue squarely in his Nation column at the time (Cockburn 1989). Cockburn was very influen-
tial to me. I shared his remarks in literature packets that I sent to several progressives whom I hoped to recruit as speakers. He’s worth quoting at length as his reporting served as a foreshadowing of my life in the agency (besides being quite relevant today).

Cockburn wrote that “the major U.S. tobacco companies were petitioning Thailand, which for 20 years had had a successful antismoking campaign and whose Cabinet in 1987 had approved a proposal for a total ban, to accept their tobacco imports under pain of serious sanctions if they refused.” He said among the witnesses to testify was then Surgeon General Dr. C. Everett Koop, who was scheduled to complete his post as Surgeon General the following week.

According to Cockburn, “Koop had not cleared his remarks with the Bush administration and said later that if he’d had, they would have squashed it.... Koop said that ‘our trade policy is to push addicting substances into foreign markets, disregarding the sentiment of the foreign government and the future health of its population.” He called these attempts “egregious ... deplorable [and unconscionable].”

“Years from now,” Koop concluded, “I’m afraid that our nation will look back on this application of free trade policy and find it scandalous, as the rest of the world does now.... At a time when we are pleading with foreign governments to stop the export of cocaine, it is the height of hypocrisy for the United States to export tobacco.” Koop’s commentary provoked Cockburn to conclude, “The fact that the United States, as a matter of conscious national policy, is by far the most consequential drug trafficker in the world remains largely obscured” (Cockburn 1989).

I felt like Koop. I was in an ideological bubble, walking a dangerously thin line between “truth,” self-censorship, or departure. Agency leadership was hardly aware that there was a bubble, or if they were, didn’t care. The culture at large contained a maelstrom of opposing voices about this deadly serious issue but I was in an agency that mostly cared about its own survival. They didn’t want to rock the boat. As an anthropologist I saw that what was warranted was a critical dialogue to widen the scope of the debate.

Like many applied anthropologists, I had my work cut out for me. How could I alter the mainstream discourse of my embedded context to challenge the ethnocentrism of the leading participants? In other words, how could one act as an applied anthropologist to create a conference that was more holistic and inclusive, showing the wide range of alternate views and perspectives on the “war on drugs” issue?

I tried diligently to expand the debate and dialogue. I had some successes and some failures. Here are five steps contributing to an improved dialogue.

1. Use the Heuristic Device of “Conservative, Liberal, and Radical” Perspectives to stretch my thinking. I researched the issues outside of work, because my efforts at work were dedicated to writing grant proposals, making contacts, organizing a “drug conference planning committee” and so on. I consulted The Nation, In These Times, Monthly Review, The New York Guardian, The New York Times, and did a morgue search of The Philadelphia Inquirer, the city’s leading newspaper, on all drug related stories over the previous two years. I delved into the library stacks and conducted background interviews with conservative (e.g., law enforcement), liberal (e.g., public health), and radical informants like Kevin Zeese, formerly head of NORML (National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws), and Eric Sterling with the Criminal Justice Policy Foundation (see CJPF website). Zeese and Sterling, I found, were the most informed observers and dramatically helped me to clarify my views. Eventually I persuaded the organizing committee to invite them as speakers.

2. Highlight the most Progressive thing said by a Conservative in all conference Literature & PR. I found a very serviceable quote in The Philadelphia Inquirer by Robert Armstrong, the city’s new Drug Czar, and I used it frequently. “There are no partial solutions to the substance abuse crisis; comprehensive thinking and planning are urgently needed,” I wrote. “One thing is certain, educational strategies based on scare tactics or on increasing one’s knowledge about the subject have been found to be ineffective. Robert Armstrong, the former First Deputy Police Commissioner and current Drug Czar comments that ‘The criminal justice system is the 10 percent answer. Doing something about medical care, poverty, social and cultural conditions, and education is the 90 percent solution.” I
employed that “90% solution” phrase again and again to stress prevention, education, and treatment approaches. It was the conference mantra.

3. **Form an Alliance with Progressives in the African American and Latino Communities, Public Health, Clergy, and Elsewhere.** I conducted fieldwork, formed relationships, and promoted the conference at police conferences, political gatherings, crime-watch events, as well as medical forums, alcohol and drug prevention groups and progressive organizations. It was crucial to meet people face to face (and by phone if necessary) to establish rapport. Despite resistance in the agency, I succeeded in organizing a panel *Recent Initiatives to Confront Alcohol and Cigarette Advertising*, recruiting a speaker from North Philadelphia’s Uptown Coalition who had stopped the marketing of a high tar cigarette to an African American community. There were the requisite conservative panels on *Working with Law Enforcement*, and *The Corporate Sector: Taking a Role in Drug Abuse Prevention*; however, I was able to recruit speakers for workshops on *Debate on Decriminalizing Drugs and Drug Abuse and AIDS Transmission* among others. I also got Judy Claude, with the American Friends Service Committee, to talk about her research on *Political Economy of Cocaine* (1990).

4. **Be Obstute When Necessary.** I was called into a surprise morning meeting with the Executive Director and two men, one from the DEA and the other the FBI. They were unsure if they could participate in a conference that raised so many radical questions, they said. The FBI agent said that, “Personally I believe in legalization and decriminalization, that’s the way to go. But I wonder if the public is ready for this.” He asked me pointedly, “What exactly is your background? And how do you feel about legalization?” The Director looked at me. I told them I was an anthropologist and that I wasn’t sure about my perspectives on decriminalization and legalization. I said that I was gauging the wide array of perspectives in the community and trying to be inclusive. “There are many good arguments pro and con on these issues and many people in the community, like Philadelphia’s Drug Czar Robert Armstrong, are interested in having a forum to discuss them.” That worked. Bottom Line: they agreed to participate in the conference.

5. **Compromise is Essential.** I had to give up on several panels that I’d proposed in order to get the ones I was able. Gone was a workshop called *Prosecuting Pushers White Collar and Blue* which asked, “What is the current status of white collar prosecution, and how can citizens assist in the drive to prosecute money laundering bankers?” Gone was *Drug Wars a Historical Overview*, which would have detailed events from the Harrison Narcotics Act and the arbitrary demonization of given substances to the US government’s use of heroin and cocaine in its recent wars. Gone as well was *Racism and the Drug Policy*. Still, many of these issues were addressed informally.

In March 1991 the two-day conference was held at the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania. I titled it, *Building a Drug Abuse Prevent Movement: Citizens, Families and Neighborhoods Taking Charge*. There were two plenaries and fifteen workshops with more than seventy speakers. There was even a candlelight vigil in a crime-ridden neighborhood, lunches, and dinners. The broadcast media was out in force with shots of the five Mayoral Candidates attending, including Ed Rendell who would go on to be Governor of PA. The hopeful Mayors focused on “be tough on criminals” rhetoric. Harris Wofford, the PA Secretary of Labor, was there and, unexpectedly, was appointed three weeks later to be PA Senator after Senator John Heinz died tragically in a helicopter accident. Wofford ran for election in 1991 on a universal health care platform, which our agency was actively promoting.

Kevin Zeese (of NORML) and Eric Sterling had a tremendous impact on the conference. Zeese ran for Senator of Maryland in 2006 with the Maryland Green Party and came in third with 1.5% of the vote. Sterling continues doing outstanding work as President of the CJPF and most recently authored a column in *Huffington Post* about the latest Drug Czar (Sterling 2013). Judy Claude was also a dynamic speaker. In her talk, she cited her pamphlet *The Political Economy of Cocaine* (which had inspired me to ask her to speak). In it she wrote, “In proclaiming the war on drugs, the United States has cast itself as a victim. But the victims are coca farmers in Peru, Bolivia, Colombia, peasant workers in Central America and the Caribbean, and people of color in the United States; and the root cause remains an
economic system that has failed to provide all of these people with the means to earn a livable wage and enjoy a life which satisfies their most basic needs” (Claude 1990). A good many people saluted the great diversity and lively debates at the summit. In sum, the conference succeeded in legitimating a number of alternative voices who had the rare chance to publicly debate liberals and conservatives. But the cost was high.

Today, two decades down the road, the “war on drugs” still rages alongside the “war on cancer” and the “war on terror.” All three wars are essentially the same. They are wars that promote blowback (Johnson 2000), misery (Davis 2007), and despair. They are iatrogenic wars on millions of people harmed by hierarchy, capitalism, and the national security state. As such, they are wars on symptoms and reifications, blaming down rather than up, diverting attention from the structural causes beneath a vast sea of human suffering. All three wars are manifestations of a deeper and unspoken reality—a ferocious class war in a neoliberal world.

How do we help create a culture where the default image is one of Officer McGruff, the Crime Dog, holding a banker over a train trestle by his thumbs, not an African American youth?

How do we engage the public as anthropologists and educators? I’ve found that no matter where we work we must never give up being border crossers—transgressing norms, taking risks, and illuminating the real issues in this criminal system called the US of A.
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Applied Anthropology as Community Engagement
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After earning a Ph.D. in Applied Anthropology at the University of South Florida (USF), I was hired as the Associate Director of USF’s Office of Community Engagement and Partnerships. The Office’s mission is to build mutually beneficial and reciprocal university–community partnerships founded on community engaged research, scholarship, teaching, and learning. Its founding director, Susan Greenbaum, was an applied anthropologist, and my faculty advisor. Greenbaum is now Professor Emerita in the Department of Anthropology at USF. As readers of this newsletter can imagine, a university’s office of community engagement is a very fitting place for anthropologists to work and to
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apply anthropology in support of an institutional mission of community engagement.

Part of my job is to promote, celebrate, and publicize outstanding examples of some of the many forms of community engagement being done by USF faculty and students. As a metropolitan Research I university with a global reach, USF has developed strong community partnerships not only in the local region, but also in the farthest reaches of the globe. Community engagement has become institutionalized in many colleges and departments across campus, and not surprisingly, the USF Anthropology Department excels in this regard, with its powerhouse of engaged faculty and graduate students, as well as its M.A. and Ph.D. degree granting applied anthropology programs.

One of the pleasures of my current job is publicizing USF university–community engagement, and my own academic background no doubt biases me when I say here that, felicitously, anthropologists are doing much of that work. Over and over, in newsletters and journals, at conferences and in seminar rooms, I have heard anthropologists reactively bemoan the media’s and general public’s lack of awareness of what anthropology is and what anthropologists do. I believe that we need to be more proactive in telling our own stories and inserting ourselves into the public discussion, and even politics, rather than wait for others to discover us, like the proverbial (and mythical) undiscovered tribe, before we share our tribal secrets, err, expertise and expert opinion with the rest of the world.

It is unacceptable that anthropology is so little understood by the general public in the United States. While living in Brazil, I was pleased to see how visible anthropologists were in society: appearing on the local news to provide expert commentary, discussing their research findings in newspapers and popular journals, being sought out for interviews by students, reporters, and even government officials eager for an anthropologist to elegantly explain pressing social issues of the day or enigmas of the human past. It was a marked contrast to the U.S., where it sometimes seems that the best media coverage we can expect is pseudo-anthropologists such as Jared Diamond gleefully mischaracterizing the esoteric behaviors of “primitive” people to unsuspecting fake news anchor Stephen Colbert.

As an antidote to being distressed by the celebration of ignorance in popular culture, I can at least now make a mark, however small, in my own community by publicizing in my office’s newsletter and website various examples of anthropological community engagement to an on-campus audience and to community stakeholders throughout the surrounding region. For instance, my office’s summer newsletter carried the following story, which contains capsule descriptions of three community engaged research projects conducted by multidisciplinary teams of graduate students that included applied anthropologists.

These three research projects were among others that were selected for funding through the Graduate Student Research Challenge Grant program funded by the USF Graduate School and the Office of Research and Innovation. Challenge Grants are awarded in an effort to build leaders through excellence in collaborative graduate education and research. A team of students submits proposals for one-year projects; at least two of the students must be from two different colleges. The collaborative projects provide students with opportunities to develop research skills that will allow them to excel in their chosen fields. Coincidentally, all three projects below used community engaged research methods to study food, diet, and health.

Steven Williams applying anthropological methods to the smelly business of food waste research

Steven Williams applying anthropological methods to the smelly business of food waste research

Herby Jean checking fittings for an anaerobic biodigester
Towards Sustainability in Food Service: Food Waste Reduction and Recycling for Energy and Fertilizer Use at an Environmental Charter School involved constructing and operating a pilot anaerobic digester to recover the nutrients and energy from the food waste at the cafeteria of Learning Gate Community School in Lutz. The mission of Learning Gate is to promote academic excellence, community service, and environmental responsibility, making it the perfect partner with which to develop an innovative learning platform for sustainable food waste management.

The research team members were: Robert Bair (Team Leader), College of Engineering, Civil & Environmental Engineering; Onur Ozcan, College of Engineering, Civil & Environmental Engineering; Steven Williams, College of Arts & Sciences, Anthropology; Rebecca Loraamm, College of Arts & Sciences, Geography, Environment & Planning; and Herby Jean, College of Engineering, Civil & Environmental Engineering.

The research team also used a geographical information system to project scale-up implications by identifying locations where food waste reduction and recovery programs could be applicable in the City of Tampa. The project received coverage in the local news, including Bright House Networks Bay News 9 and USF News.

Reevaluating the Impact of Urban Agriculture on Food Accessibility through GIS Modeling: An Assets-based Approach to Food Desert Research used GIS methodology and qualitative, community-based research to study land as an asset, whether in use or available for use, in urban agriculture. Working closely with organizations and individuals involved in the Creating a Healthier Sulphur Springs for Kids (CHSSK) coalition, the research team assessed the potential positive effects of urban agriculture on food accessibility in an area labeled by the USDA as a “food desert,” i.e., a food insecure area with few fresh food outlets and numerous fast food outlets. CHSSK is a coalition of service providers that formed after the Tampa Metropolitan Area YMCA was awarded an Embrace a Healthy Florida grant in 2010 from the Florida Blue Foundation to promote healthy living in Sulphur Springs through programming that addresses childhood obesity.

The research team members were: Margeaux Chavez (Team Leader), Colleges of Arts & Sciences and Public Health, Anthropology and Community and Family Health; David Godfrey, College of Arts & Sciences, Anthropology; Susan Tyler, Colleges of Arts & Sciences and Public Health, Anthropology and Community & Family Health; and Lorraine Monteagut, College of Arts & Sciences, Geography, Environment & Planning. As research team leader, Chavez’s poster presentation on the Challenge Grant project was awarded as one of the Best College of Public Health Poster Presentations at the 23rd Annual USF Health Research Day.

Their research examined food access and availability from the point of view of community members, and the findings challenge common assumptions about food buying and eating habits. Chavez elaborates, “Traditional food desert studies have not often captured what it means to actually live in a food desert. In fact, many of the Sulphur Springs resident/activists we spoke with resent having their neighborhood labeled ‘food desert’ because that label does not account for community assets or individual efforts to improve the food environment.”

Furthermore, “the community members we interviewed were excited to share their experiences and take an active role in representing their neighborhood.” Chavez and team are disseminating the results of their research in the form of an “action pack” that provides information about accessible land and the local policies governing access to this
land. They will also publicly present their findings at one of the CHSSK coalition monthly meetings.

Postscript: On July 15th, the Sulphur Springs community was honored by a visit from Kevin Concannon, the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services in the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). Under Secretary Concannon’s office became aware of Creating a Healthier Sulphur Springs for Kids (CHSSK) through information found on the internet and was interested in learning more about CHSSK and efforts to improve food security in Sulphur Springs.

The YMCA hosted a luncheon and roundtable discussion for Concannon and his entourage, CHSSK coalition members, and community stakeholders. Joining Concannon were Don Arnette (Regional Administrator), Peggy Fouts (SNAP Director), and Lanna Kirk (Regional Director, Special Nutrition Programs), all from the Southeast Regional Office of the USDA’s Food and Nutrition Service.

Also present at the roundtable discussion were Margeaux Chavez and Katie Taylor (Master’s student and doctoral student, respectively, in Applied Anthropology). Chavez spoke about her Challenge Grant teams’ research in Sulphur Springs (see above), and Taylor talked with Concannon and his colleagues about her work with Moses House, the YMCA, and the CHSSK to start a farmers’ market in Sulphur Springs. The market will accept SNAP Benefits through EBT. Moses House hired Taylor as Project Coordinator for the farmers’ market after being awarded a Community Engagement Mini-Grant by the CHSSK at the beginning this year. Taylor has been working closely with Lance Arney, Director of Moses House, and various resident stakeholders and community-based nonprofit organizations within Sulphur Springs to get the market open by late summer or early fall.

Evaluating Maternal Nutrition in the North Central Andes of Peru: Opportunity for Assessment and Action used a mixed methods approach to assess prenatal nutrition in rural Peru through diet recalls and participatory action research workshops in order to gather information about prenatal diet and the development of a community assets map to explore local access to resources. Maternal mortality rates are high in rural Peru, and changing prenatal nutrition needs to be documented in order to contribute to prevention efforts aimed at improving prenatal health, as well as to understand the local impacts of globalization, which has transformed economic strategies and local livelihoods, contributing to a nutrition transition in many parts of the world.

The research team members were: Allison Cantor (Team Leader), College of Arts & Sciences, Anthropology; Kristina Baines, College of Arts & Sciences, Anthropology; Isabella Chan, Colleges of Arts & Sciences and Public Health, Anthropology & Global Health; and Curtis DeVetter, College of Public Health, Global Health. Research team member Isabella Chan was given an Edward H. and Rosamond B. Spicer Student Travel Fund Award by the Society for Applied Anthropology to present on the research at the Society’s 2013 annual meeting. Chan also worked with the Center for Social Well Being, located in the rural highlands of Peru. The Center was a community partner on this research project, and provided training in how to conduct participatory action research with local communities.

The team’s analysis of the data they gathered guided the creation of community education materials promoting healthy prenatal nutrition, and pre- and post-tests were conducted to evaluate the impact of these materials. One of the team’s findings was that women were interested in sharing food recipes with other communities. This led to the compilation of recipes from three different communities into a booklet titled ¡Comer bien!: An intercambio de recetas, información y actividades nutricionales para las señoras de Shumay, Marcará y Shilla (Eat Well: An...
Exchange of Recipes, Information, and Nutritional Activities for the Women of Shumay, Marcará, and Shilla).

¡Comer bien! is educational and highlights the healthy aspects of traditional foods, thereby validating indigenous knowledge. The three communities participated in the process of making the booklet, and women in the community designed all the illustrations, which allow them to read the recipes even if they cannot read Spanish (see image below). An earlier version of the booklet was revised after the research team got feedback from additional people in the community. They wanted more pictures and fewer words. As Chan notes, “Participatory action research (PAR) integrates local knowledge, perspectives, and priorities into the research process, guiding the co-construction of products, such as ¡Comer Bien!, that are not only important and relevant to the community, but also usable by its members.”

Throughout the process, families were brought together, as Spanish-speaking children reviewed the contents of the book with their parents, and women from the three different communities were very enthusiastic about contributing to a project that allowed them to exchange information about healthy eating madre a madre (mother to mother), thereby strengthening relations between the communities. “The PAR process is cyclical and iterative,” Chan observes, “and therefore demands more time and patience. Nevertheless, by requiring researchers to build meaningful relationships with the community, it also allows them to establish ties that often endure well beyond the completion of the research. So I think it’s well worth the effort!”

Oral History Project


John van Willigen

Robert E. Rhoades, with Robert Booth, created innovative participatory research methods useful for linking farmers with the development work of the internal agricultural research centers. The foundation of this was done at International Potato Center. Much of this interview focuses on that work. His ideas influenced much of the precedent setting work that was done in this arena. He extended the application of this approach to whole ecosystems in the context of the USAID-funded Sustainable Agricultural and Natural Resource Management (SANREM), which he led at the University of Georgia. Bob Rhoades died in 2010. This interview was done in 2002 and was edited for continuity by John van Willigen.

RHoades: So, in 1979, I accepted a position at the Potato Center...

Van Willigen: Was this one of the first of the...

Rhoades: One of the first. And, I went to CIP, and the reason that CIP was willing to take anthropologists, is because in Peru, anthropology is more powerful than economics. That’s one of the unusual things about the Andes, is because of the native populations and the history of the country. Potatoes, is not a grain, it’s not a commodity, you know, it’s not something that can really be that mechanized, particularly in the Andes, and so they were having a lot of issues in their program with these cultural things. So, they thought it would be a good idea to have an anthropologist. Well, they had already had an anthropologist there about two years before I arrived; his name was Rob Werge. Rob was working on the post-harvest team, and the center was very new, also, that was the other thing, and the
director, a guy named Dick Sawyer was looking to do things different than what the grain centers, the wheat center, the rice center, and so forth, he was going to be different. One of the ways he was going to be different is, “I’m going to have anthropologists.”

**VAN WILLIGEN:** And they were plant breeder dominated, and...

**RHOADES:** Well, actually CIP was too, but there was this other thing, of course potatoes, you know, 80% water, and they have storage problems, they have all kinds of other issues. And, they’re not that important in terms of world trade, and so this director said, you know, “I’m never going to be able to compete with rice and wheat, and no way, corn. I’ve got to do something different.” So he said, “We’re going to talk about marginal people, and women, and underground crops, and so we’ve got to have an anthropologist.” Well Rob Werge went down and worked. He had a choice where he worked, he worked on the post-harvest team, and he did a really good job of translating anthropology into something that technical people could understand.

**VAN WILLIGEN:** Mmhmm.

**RHOADES:** This post-harvest team was a very minor element, and he got hepatitis halfway through his term and then got sick, and never finished, and then went back to the states. But, it paved the way for some really good ideas. Well, he was also a bit of a threat to the economists. Well, economists and anthropologists, almost from the beginning, we didn’t get along. Anthropologists tended to get along with, certainly the technical scientists better than they did the economists.

**VAN WILLIGEN:** Feeding off the same food.

**RHOADES:** Yeah, that’s right. But of course, the economists had the power, they were the ones that [had] control. So, when the head of the economics, social economics program brought me down, he said, “No, you’re going to work here,” all right, he defined very clearly where I was going to work. And it wasn’t going to be in the post-harvest team, and it wasn’t going to be anything I determined, it was going to be something he determined. And, this is where the story starts about “farmer back to farmer.”

**VAN WILLIGEN:** Mmhmm.

**RHOADES:** Okay. I was assigned my first job to evaluate a project called maximizing potato productivity which was a big project funded by IDRC Canada to develop appropriate potato technologies and diffuse them to small farmers in the Montaro valley of Peru. And, they had been working on this project for three years, and it had a very agronomic, agro-economic framework. They did, you know, replications of experiments. They did the cost benefit analysis. They wouldn’t tell the farmers exactly what was in their experiments, because they didn’t want to mess up what the farmer would do in theirs. And so I was brought on, and I was sent up, within weeks, to the Montaro Valley to find out what farmers thought about these technologies, and this project.

**VAN WILLIGEN:** Let me make sure I understand, that [in this] project there was less involvement of farmers in terms of the experimentation?

**RHOADES:** There was a survey, which tried to get at what the farmers’ constraints were. This was the old constraints, where you looked at the yield gap between what they got on experiment station and what farmers were getting, and you explained that gap in terms of these constraints. So the whole mode of thought was we’ve got to close that gap and the yield. And the way to do this is to understand what the farmer’s problems are. Made a lot of sense, actually, and then try to bring their technology up, so that they would get higher yields. It was very much a yield context. So, they sent me up there, okay, I went up there very naïve, and I started talking to farmers. And, I interviewed all 120 farmers, or whatever it was that participated in this project, and I wrote up my results. I came back, and I presented my paper, and the shit hit the fan. Because I said, first, farmers don’t understand exactly what it is that you’re doing, because they know you’re doing experiments, but you’re not telling them exactly what it is you’re doing, because you don’t want them to imitate what you’re doing, the farmers, and therefore they don’t understand. They understand that you talk about a high-cost package, a middle-cost package, and a low-cost package, but they don’t understand what you’re doing. That was number one.

**VAN WILLIGEN:** Right.
**RHoades**: Second thing I said is now, these farmers have a very rational system already. And yield is not the primary thing for them, except in certain, sort of low-lying fields that are oriented toward the market. The higher fields could be grown for family consumption, for ritual purposes, for all kinds of things. And, so I said yield is not necessarily the primary thing here, so you’re defining this whole thing from your point of view. So, I said that in the report, well, there was a huge blow up.

**Van Willigen**: In terms of your thinking and career, the submission of this report is like a pivotal thing, isn’t it?

**Rhoades**: Oh, it was very pivotal. I realized then, that my ideas were not all that appreciated. These ideas today are mainstream, and biological scientists are even more gung-ho about them than maybe some anthropologists, they’re saying, “Whoa, maybe not so quick.”

**Van Willigen**: Right.

**Rhoades**: Yeah, I wrote the report, and I handed it, and I was so naive, and then it was banned, the report was banned inside the center. They stopped the circulation of it.

**Van Willigen**: So this is like an internal working paper that got quashed?

**Rhoades**: Right. That got canned, [they] stopped circulation of this paper, because it was seen as negative, it was seen as an assault on a major funded project, then, of course, they started to attack my methods, “Well, how do you know this?” So, I was just really overwhelmed by this rejection of what I thought were some new insights, and I was trying to explain to them, all of cultural ecology. I was trying to explain to them that, you know, these are mountain farmers, they have small fields, they have very complex systems, and so forth. The end result was I was kicked off the team.

**Van Willigen**: You can always say why it is wrong, but never tell you what to do.

**Rhoades**: I was telling them what was wrong, and everything, but I couldn’t exactly and so it was true, in a way. The problem was I had been defined in that role. I had never been given an opportunity. In fact, at the conclusion of my paper I said, anthropologists should have been at the front of this thing, not at the end of this thing, that was another very sensitive issue. Well, so I got kicked off the team, but I still had some time. Well, same team of crusty old post-harvest storage types, technical people came over to me and said, “you know, we really liked working with Rob Werge, would you like to work with us?” And I said, “Okay, yeah.”

**Van Willigen**: They were looking for resources.

**Rhoades**: They were looking for resources, and they were more sort of systems people themselves, because they dealt with storage units, and they said, “Yeah, we’re working on various kinds of consumer storage.”

**Van Willigen**: Were these agriculture engineers?

**Rhoades**: More engineer types, yeah. Post-harvest processors, and that kind of thing. They designed buildings. So, they had a systems perspective, they were technical people, but they also were in a minority position in the center. They weren’t part of the agro-economic breeder powerhouse.

**Van Willigen**: Right.

**Rhoades**: They were all second-class citizens. So, I said sure. And they said, “well, come on with us, and we’ll show you what Werge has been doing, and maybe you can just pick up where he left off.” And so we drove up to the Montaro Valley and there were all of these huge potato storage buildings there empty. And these storage guys says, “look, the UN, FAO, other organizations, millions of dollars, they built these all over Peru, they built them all over the world, farmers don’t use them. We know that they’re technically perfect. You can store potatoes for eons. Secondly, we know that it’s economical, because we did the economic studies that if the farmers would bring their potatoes there, store them and wait for the market in Lima and just bring them down whenever they’re ready, they’ll make money.” They said, “But farmers aren’t using this stuff.” They said, “Can you help us?” Well, I dug out some of Werge’s materials, but then I started working on my own, and [the] first thing that I explained to them is that a storage system, in the Peruvian Andes, is an integral part of the house. It’s not the image of the separate barn, or the separate storage pit, but it’s something that’s integral inside the house. And that’s for many reasons. One is security, they fear things being stolen. Another is evil eye, they don’t like people looking at their potatoes, and the
potatoes are like a bank account, and they take out a little bit.

**VAN WILLIGEN:** Right.

**RHOADES:** And, I said, what you’ve done here, is you’ve built separate storage units, and you’ve expected these people to trust the people that manage these, that they’re going to do it. I said you’re never going to find it in this kind of a system. And, furthermore, we went to the farmers and the farmers said, “Look,” you know, “we’re perfectly happy with our system of storing our potatoes, because we can control the flow to the market,” and so forth, “from inside our houses,” basically. But [the farmers] said, “the problem we’re having is with the seed potatoes of the new varieties that we like to grow in the lower zones,” and they said, “if you could help us with this, this would be great.” So, there was a problem defined by the farmers. And by the way, the case study came before the model. We were working our way through this thing, okay, so what I told them, I said, “Look, you can work until you’re blue in the face around here on consumption potatoes, you can work forever on traditional varieties, but none of these involves a problem perceived by the farmers.” So these guys, the listened, they said, “Okay, well, we have some technologies we think will work.” I said, “okay, well, what are they?” They said, “Well, one is diffuse light. It’s like refrigeration. You can take potatoes, and you put them in diffused light, and they won’t sprout.”

**VAN WILLIGEN:** Right.

**RHOADES:** And the farmers were complaining about these new varieties of potatoes, all the sprouting and so forth, they weren’t, what we defined as losses, they didn’t define as losses at all. Because, to us, if a potato is shriveled or a little rotten, or something like that, this was a loss, well, in the Andean system, you’ve got to feed the pigs something, they had this _allyu_ belief system in which all creatures need to be taken care of, so you have to have a certain degree of potatoes to feed the chickens, or whatever it is. Therefore, that wasn’t a problem. Shriveled old potatoes that looked like losses to us were actually sweeter in taste.

**VAN WILLIGEN:** Oh.

**RHOADES:** Is another thing. But they said, “These new varieties that we want for the market, because we make money on this, boy we can’t store them.” So, what we had was a situation created by the varieties, and a lack of a storage system, but it was a problem the farmers saw. So then the scientists started working on this diffuse light idea, and at first they did it on an experiment station, again with separate structures, they couldn’t get away from [it]. I kept saying, “No,” they wanted to put plastic on the side, I said, “No, forget about that.” Slowly we found out that it worked, it really did cut back on the sprouting and the loss of water, and we planted them in the fields, diffused light potatoes, they sprouted much quicker as seed potatoes, but it was not being adopted, because we were still clinging to these old ideas. Then we started a whole process of integrating it into the houses, into the compounds, where it was under their control. And all we did was introduce the principle, ultimately, through demonstrations, and then the farmers ran with it. They created their own storage systems, but using the diffuse light principle.

**VAN WILLIGEN:** Right.

**RHOADES:** Now, however, we still were very much, what would you call in a subordinate position.
A low prestige group within the international center. And then there was a review of the social science work, and they invited international guests like Robert Chambers and Vernon Ruttan from Minnesota. All of these guys came down.

VAN WILLIGEN: When was that? About 1981? 82? Somewhere along in there.

RHOADES: Right.

VAN WILLIGEN: This must have been about 1981? Right.

RHOADES: And there was a planning conference in which we had to present, and I was put on the program for five minutes. Right after lunch. The rest of the program, 95% of the program was given to this agro economic [content], the constraints work, where they presented all their scientific work, and you know, their constraints analysis, and their experiments, and all of that, because they were the group that really had the power. Well, a guy named Bob Booth, and I, he was the post-harvest technologist.

VAN WILLIGEN: Now, Booth is the name on the original article that was in Agricultural Administration.

RHOADES: Right, exactly. Bob Booth and I went down to an outdoor bar, for lunch during this conference. We didn’t have anything we were going to say, we didn’t know what we were supposed to say, because we, again, we were really the low status sort of people, and we drank Crystal beer, and I don’t know if you know Peruvian beer, but it is really powerful stuff. You drink one bottle and you’re already half smashed. Well, Booth and I got there, and we started drinking this powerful beer, largely I think we were frustrated, because we didn’t know what we were going to say. And sometime in the course of the conversation, Booth said, “You know, maybe we can model this experience.” He took out what was then were hundred Soles [coins], they were a lot bigger than [a] quarter.

VAN WILLIGEN: Right.

RHOADES: All right, so he laid those Soles down, and so he drew this thing, like this. And so then we started to say, well, obviously we began with the farmer here, right, and then we laid it out in kind of a linear way, you know, in the same old way like that, and then we started looking, and I said, “But that’s not the way we experienced it” right. Because it was really this intuitive process, feedback constantly. And so finally, probably 20 minutes before we [were] to go back to make our presentation, we laid down the Soles, and we put them in this circle like this, and we drew them out. And we said, okay, the way this case unfolded was we began with the farmer’s definition, of the problem. Okay?

VAN WILLIGEN: Okay.

RHOADES: And then we take a biological and an anthropological cut on that, and we argue about it, we call that constructive conflict, right?

VAN WILLIGEN: Right.

RHOADES: With the farmer, so that we define a common definition of the problem, because if we don’t agree on what the problem is, the technologist is going to be off designing stores that don’t work, or seeds that’s not adopted, or, you know, it’s just sort of in la-la land. But after you define the common problem, you’ve got to have a solution.

VAN WILLIGEN: Right.

RHOADES: So, that was where the potential solution came in, and that was the diffused light, in this particular case. Well once you’ve got an idea, like diffused light as a solution, you still have to experiment with it, and you have to adapt it. Okay. And so then, that’s where this adaptation part came in. But the final answer comes back from the farmer. If the farmer doesn’t adopt or use it, it’s not the farmer’s fault. It’s because this process was flawed someway, so you start all over again.

VAN WILLIGEN: Right.

RHOADES: So, this then became known as the farmer-back-to-farmer model.

VAN WILLIGEN: And so, when did that name emerge?

RHOADES: Well, at first we didn’t call it this. We went back, and I presented this with an overhead, I just drew these circles out again, and I explained it, and we had only 5 or 10 minutes, and Vernon Ruttan, the economist, and thank goodness that he’s the one that said it. He stood up and he said, “Well, it appears to me we have two approaches in this department.”

VAN WILLIGEN: [chuckle] Okay.

RHOADES: He said the ... “one approach, begins from the scientists’ definition of the problem, and then merely asks the farmer, through surveys and so forth, what maybe he thinks about it, but it’s
pretty much a linear process in which the scientific process dominates, and then the idea is at the end there’s going to be scientifically superior technologies, which is going to be fired through an arrow to the extension service then that fires them down to the farmer.” And he said, “This other approach, of the post-harvest people is very different.” He said, “In fact, we haven’t seen anything like this in agricultural research yet, which simply says you begin with the farmer, and their definition of the problem, and then you apply your expertise to work toward a solution in an adaptive way, but if it doesn’t work, it’s not the farmer’s fault for being lazy, or irrational, or backward, or anything like that, but it’s because you haven’t understood what the problem was and you haven’t come up with a solution,” so it put the burden on the scientific process. He said, “These are very different things.” Well, then, of course, more, you know, blood on the floor, because this was a direct threat to the power structure, but it was coming from Vernon Ruttan, Mr. Agriculture Economics himself, and so he came up to us afterwards, and he says, “why don’t you publish this thing?”

Further Reading


Call for Papers

Democratic Practice and Community Development
Special Issue of Community Development:
The Official Journal of the Community Development Society

Guest Editors: Paul Lachapelle and Michael Rios

Many community development professionals believe that citizens, acting democratically, play a leading role in the public work of their communities. Community development, as a professional field, promotes democratic practices that build the capacity of citizens and local institutions to make sound decisions about community challenges, recognize their diverse resources, and align their efforts to put community, governmental, and private resources to work. However, there are a number of challenges to the view that community development furthers democracy and vice versa. Too often, for example, community developers may inadvertently undermine citizen engagement by trying to solve problems for citizens rather than with them. Another tension is the use of citizen participation to serve narrow interests or to perpetuate the perception of resident involvement when decisions are made a priori. The multiple ways in which knowledge is constructed and learning unfolds, the changing social and cultural landscapes of communities, and differences between process and outcome measures of citizen involvement are other challenges that draw attention to the limits of community development practice today. One important analytical lens to understand community development and democratic practice is scale and power.

This call for papers is soliciting contributions that focus on identifying and critically analyzing the relationship between community development and democratic practice. The special issue will uncover creative tensions and opportunities among diverse perspectives on the theory and practice of community development, and look for examples of community development practice that does, or does not, strengthen the democratic capacity of citizens in communities.

Submission of ideas for articles is open and topics of special interest include, but are not limited to:
- Shifting theories and paradigms of democracy and power in relation to how community development is defined and practiced.
- Disciplinary perspectives about how democracy informs community development and conceptualizations of community development that advance democratic principles and practices.
- Historical precedents of community development as democratic practice.
- Tensions between passions, interests, and reason in community development processes.
- Reconsideration of community development as democratic practice due to social and cultural shifts as a result of transnational, transregional, and translocal migration.
- “Place-based” and “interest-based” approaches to community development that foster democratic practice.
- How democracy is being (re)defined by the professionalization of the field and privatization of the public realm.
- The role of art and design that aims to link democratic practice with community development.
- The role and impact of formal institutions, including universities, in promoting democratic practices and community development.
- New theories and applied case studies on various ways to measure and analyze the relationship between community development and democratic practices.
- The influence of intangible outcomes of community development practice, such as trust, leadership, reciprocity and networking, on the potential for democratic practice.

This list is not exclusive and does not preclude other topics related to the Special Issue.

Selected papers will be refereed and published in an upcoming special issue of Community Development. If interested in contributing, please send an abstract, not longer than 500 words outlining the topics to be addressed and how the paper will contribute to the topic of the special issue to: Paul Lachapelle paul.lachapelle@montana.edu and Michael Rios mxrios@ucdavis.edu by September 1, 2013. When emailing the abstract, please include DEMOCRATIC PRACTICE in the subject line. Authors will be notified by November 8, 2013 as to whether they will be invited to prepare a full manuscript.

Final submissions of manuscripts will be expected by March 1, 2014 and then will be submitted through a double-blind peer review process used by Community Development. For more details about the journal, please visit: http://www.comm-dev.org/index.php/publications/cds-journal.
be led by the Secretary of the Interior, and the Executive Order is a commitment to:

- Ensuring tribal policy development is coordinated with the White House Domestic Policy Council to improve the effectiveness of federal resources in Native American communities;
- Increasing engagement with tribal nations and Native peoples through the White House Office of Public Engagement and Intergovernmental Affairs;
- Providing effective and efficient meaningful consultation under Executive Order 13175;
- Establishing the White House Tribal Nations Summit as a permanent, annual event; and
- Respecting tribal demands to increase capacity and authority to administer educational programs that better address the needs of our Native students.

The full Executive Order can be found here.

In Canada, two very important reports were recently released. The first report, *Poverty or Prosperity: Indigenous Children in Canada*, looks at child poverty among First Nations, Inuit, and Metis children. Based on data from the 2006 census, this study found that the average child poverty rate for all children in Canada is 17%, while the average child poverty rate for all indigenous children is more than twice that figure, at 40%. In fact, even among children living in poverty in Canada, three distinct tiers exist.

The first tier, with a poverty rate of 12%, excludes Indigenous, racialized and immigrant children. This is three to four times the rate of the best performing OECD countries. The second tier of child poverty includes racialized children who suffer a poverty rate of 22%, immigrant children whose poverty rate is 33%, and Métis, Inuit and non-status First Nations children at 27%. Most shocking, however, is that fully half—50%—of status First Nations children live below the poverty line. This number grows to 62% in Manitoba and 64% in Saskatchewan. The full report can be downloaded here.

The second report to be released on indigenous people in Canada recently is entitled *Equality Rights Data Report on Aboriginal People*. The report is based primarily on data collected by Statistics Canada, and compares Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people across a spectrum of indicators, including education, employment, economic well-being, health, and housing. These comparisons confirm the persistence of barriers to equality of opportunity faced by Aboriginal people.

The report, which can be downloaded here, shows that, compared to non-Aboriginal people, Aboriginal people living in Canada:

- have lower median after-tax income;
- are more likely to collect employment insurance and social assistance;
- are more likely to experience physical, emotional or sexual abuse;
- are more likely to be victims of violent crimes; and
- are more likely to be incarcerated and less likely to be granted parole.

Finally, at the end of June an important conference on salmon was held in California by the Yurok Nation. The conference, entitled *Indigenous Peoples’ International Gathering to Honor, Protect, and Defend the Salmon*, produced an outcome document that provides a powerful statement on indigenous peoples’ continued commitment to salmon, salmon fisheries, river health, and the protection of water. The full outcome document, called *Pel’son’ mehly Ney-puy (“Big Doings with the Salmon”)* can be read 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.
Gender-Based Violence TIG

Anthropology Applied to Sexual Violence in Marriage

M. Gabriela Torres
torres_mgabriela@wheatonma.edu
Associate Professor of Anthropology, Wheaton College, MA

Kersti Yllo
kyllo@wheatonma.edu
Professor of Sociology, Wheaton College, MA

Sxual violence in marriage has not been a focus of anthropological research. Though our discipline seldom shies away from pointing out the ways that power inequities become taken-for-granted-culture, we do resist the study of rape in marriage. Many of our informants across the globe share our resistance. Were we to ask, it is likely that male and female informants across varied cultures would object to the very idea that rape is possible in marriage. What is marriage, after all, but a contract for sexual access that hopes to legitimate society’s reproduction agreements. Engaging as we do in looking beyond ourselves, can we entertain extending the notion of rape as a legally constituted form of sexual violence against an individual beyond its cultural limits? Is this even possible in contexts where marriage itself may not be understood as an act between individuals? What can be gained from thinking about sexual violence in marriage?

This spring, fourteen scholars from across the globe gathered at Wheaton College in Norton, MA to begin to delve into the unease anthropologist seem to have with the study of rape in marriage. With generous funding from the Wenner-Gren Foundation, anthropologists working in cultures around the world were joined by criminologists, sociologists, legal and public health scholars, and human rights activists to explore the grounded study of sexual violence in marriage cross-culturally. In three days of intense interdisciplinary discussion, we distilled areas where anthropological theory and practice can be advanced through the study of sexual violence in marriage. Further, we worked together to explore how anthropological insights can strengthen the work of other disciplines as they investigate and develop policy and interventions to combat marital rape. As it turns out, the study of sexual violence in marriage is in many ways a key to understanding how gender inequities become taken-for-granted-culture.

As our colleagues studying the US and UK demonstrate in their work, rape in marriage was sustained by cultural understandings that made forced sex in the context of marriage a legal impossibility until the last decades of the 20th century. Even today in the US and UK, the legacy of the social supports that made rape in marriage legal are still present in the ways that laws are applied in cases of rape in and out of marriage, in the attitudes of personnel working on criminal investigation, and in the ways that murdered women bodies are marked by those who kill them.

The anthropologists that came to the table were well versed at taking apart the ways that power inequities become embodied into the everyday practices of people. Colleagues in our discipline shared their experience in the analysis of public health and first responder programs that address gender based violence, the study of state-sponsored forms of gender-based violence, and deep knowledge of changing patterns of intimacy across the globe. Although the sites of cultural study differed, the application our discipline’s knowledge to deepen the understanding of sexual violence in marriage offered a set of intriguing opportunities for anthropology’s public engagement in the face of social change. To give but one example, as patterns of intimacy change and the idea of companionate marriage gains currency we might ask what protections are gained and lost for both women and men engaged in new patterns of intimate relationships. As families disengage in the everyday workings of intimate relationships, can
states take over the regulation of intimacy that may have once been the domain of elder generations?

As was evidenced at the Wheaton Workshop, with grounded knowledge of how culture works every day, anthropology is poised to suggest the directions that political and cultural debates on intimacy and rape might take and suggest policy and public health interventions that counter the impact of gender-based inequity with greater success.

New TIG on Business Anthropology at SfAA

Maryann McCabe
mm@cultureconnex.com
SfAA Board Member
University of Rochester

Emilie Hitch
emilie@thinkersandmakers.com
Thinkers and Makers

A new topical interest group on business anthropology is starting at SfAA, and we invite you to join in setting its future direction. Our first TIG meeting will take place at the SfAA Meeting in Albuquerque, March 2014. This will provide opportunity to discuss what you would like from the TIG, specific topics in business anthropology that interest you, and your perspectives on how the TIG can pursue issues of concern to SfAA members. But we don’t have to wait until next March. A dialogue online is beginning at the SfAA website to explore people’s views. Please go to sfaa.net, click Community, then Groups and Business Anthropologists, and add your thoughts to the Comment Wall.

In approving launch of the TIG, the SfAA Board of Directors welcomes business anthropologists and recognizes business anthropology as a growing field of praxis among its members. It’s clear that interest in business anthropology is rising with the number of practitioners and academics in the field increasing, academic programs for business anthropology continuing to develop, and journals and conferences dedicated to business anthropology reaching success. We hope that SfAA will become a place where business anthropologists and those interested in the field come together to learn, collaborate and publish.

Initial plans for the TIG include workshops and panels at SfAA Meetings. For the 2014 Meeting in Albuquerque next March, we intend to organize an all-day workshop for students and professionals interested in the field. The workshop would address practice method and theory in the main areas of business anthropology – organizational change, marketing research and design ethnography. Also planned for the 2014 Meeting is a panel on the challenges of collaboration given by senior business anthropologists. Please let us know your suggestions for workshops and panels and other ways of fostering communication among SfAA members interested in business anthropology. We want to hear your voice on how the TIG can help to expand individual careers and contribute to applied anthropology.

An emergent field like business anthropology can raise a cacophony of voices, and we welcome debate from people who work for business organizations carrying out ethnographic research and from people who teach in departments of anthropology and business schools. From an inside view of workplaces, business anthropologists gain insight into materiality, production, consumption. Let us talk and share what we learn about the texture of global change and consumer culture from practicing anthropology.

Grassroots Development TIG

Emilia González-Clements
emiliagonzalezclements@gmail.com

In approving launch of the TIG, the SfAA Board of Directors welcomes business anthropologists and recognizes business anthropology as a growing field of praxis among its members. It’s clear that interest in business anthropology is rising with the number of practitioners and academics in the field increasing, academic programs for business anthropology continuing to develop, and journals and conferences dedicated to business anthropology reaching success. We hope that SfAA will become a place where business anthropologists and those interested in the field come together to learn, collaborate and publish.

Initial plans for the TIG include workshops and panels at SfAA Meetings. For the 2014 Meeting in Albuquerque next March, we intend to organize an all-day workshop for students and professionals interested in the field. The workshop would address practice method and theory in the main areas of business anthropology – organizational change, marketing research and design ethnography. Also planned for the 2014 Meeting is a panel on the challenges of collaboration given by senior business anthropologists. Please let us know your suggestions for workshops and panels and other ways of fostering communication among SfAA members interested in business anthropology. We want to hear your voice on how the TIG can help to expand individual careers and contribute to applied anthropology.

An emergent field like business anthropology can raise a cacophony of voices, and we welcome debate from people who work for business organizations carrying out ethnographic research and from people who teach in departments of anthropology and business schools. From an inside view of workplaces, business anthropologists gain insight into materiality, production, consumption. Let us talk and share what we learn about the texture of global change and consumer culture from practicing anthropology.

Grassroots Development TIG

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.

During the recent Denver meetings, we identified and began discussing these common themes in our interactions with the small rural producers:

1) “Strategies for acceptance” [of development endeavors], such as
   a) doing demonstrations,
   b) changing mentality,
   c) expanding the opportunities, and
   d) necessity.

A critical criterion is that the work involve locally identified needs.

2) “Multi-disciplinary work”

Other disciplines are “coming to anthropology,” according to one participant. “We work at the community level versus individually sustainable livelihood,” stated another. “I’ve worked with environmental NGOs and as an intern,” said a third. Many had multi-project experience as well as realized the importance of being able to work across disciplines.

3) “Scrounging for resources”

Some participants have created small NGOs, others go from project to project. Almost all have faced the necessity of finding resources just to continue their work. Both Clements talked about literally scrounging for local resources (e.g. tomato sauce cans to form into chimneys, small rum bottles to serve as plumb bobs for teaching the use of A-frames for laying out terraces).

4) “Internships”

Everyone agreed that internships are important, as a way to learn and gain experience, as well as a way to provide or get services on projects.

5) “Globalization”

a) Spread farmer-to-farmer knowledge
   b) Consider the competing forces to cultural integrity
   c) Women’s survival sustainability skills needed

Let’s keep talking!: Grassroots Development TIG on SfAA Community Network

As a method for continuing our discussions, I have worked with SfAA to add the Grassroots Development TIG as a group on the SfAA Community Network.

We are working on the final steps. This is how to access our group:

Log onto www.sfaa.net and click on the SfAA Community Network link. Then click on the Groups tab and scroll down until you find our group. Add your comments.

Activities for SfAA 2014-Albuquerque

We should again use the panel-open forum model for the Albuquerque SfAA, March 18-22 conference in 2014.

The topic is “Destinations.” We are a world on the move. We are increasingly drawn to issues of transience and mobility. The leading question of our time might no longer be who are we but rather where are we going? Where will we live as storms imperil our lives and as sea levels rise, or as fresh water becomes a scarce commodity?

This topic affects us, personally, and probably impacts those marginalized peoples for whom we work even more dramatically.

Action: Let’s plan on having one or more panels. Please put your ideas and comments on our group’s SfAA Community Network.

TIG Brokering Role

The TIG could serve a brokering role. For example, Dave Clements, a chemical engineer skilled in uses of agricultural resources, will provide Andrea with information about the potential utilization of the marenga tree, particularly the possibility of helping to end hunger.
Another idea is to inform the group about any internships you may know about.

Contact me directly at emiliagonzalezclements@gmail.com.

Human Rights and Social Justice Standing Committee

Performing Progress in Haiti, Aloral

Mark Schuller
mschuller@niu.edu
Northern Illinois University

Things appear to be getting better in Haiti, but a closer look reveals the cracks in the otherwise smooth veneer of progress

After I return from a trip to Haiti, I am often asked, “How are things in Haiti now?” Last week I returned to Haiti, and on this trip, it’s particularly difficult to respond.

Particularly when you get off the plane, there are signs of progress. The airport has been renovated. The roads around Port-au-Prince are being repaired.

For those in bright t-shirts on their way to the provinces, travel times have been considerably reduced. Stopping en route in a guarded, air-conditioned restaurant or supermarket offers the appearance of relative affluence with customers stopping to inspect shelves full of packaged imported food. If one has the funds, a private vehicle and the inclination to go to a night club or restaurant in the affluent Pétion-ville, the trip home is safer, since large parts of Route de Delmas—a main thoroughfare—that now has solar lighting.

Many new light posts are adorned with pink posters alternating in French and Creole celebrating Haitian President Michel Martelly’s two years in office. One in particular asks “who has done better in the past 25 years?”

Before his career in politics, Martelly was a performer, known as “Sweet Micky,” (in)famous for his ribald lyrics and stage antics, including dropping his pants.

Now, as head of state, he is performing progress (as noted anthropologist and artist Gina Athena Ulysse puts it), most recently to new Venezuelan president Nicolas Maduro last Tuesday. Port-au-Prince was all decked out: the route from the airport was adorned with Venezuelan flags and signs saying Bienvenidos y muchas gracias. These new signs sit next to ubiquitous banners that begin with pouvwa pèp la (the power of the people) has accomplished this or that thing: increasing the number of children in school, “helping poor for the first time,” repairing the airport, etc. often punctuated with the phrase tèt kale, Martelly’s slogan, a play on words noting his bald head but also meaning no bull.

The performance appears to be working, with positive reviews from official development agencies, NGOs, foreign governments, mission groups, many in the Diaspora, middle class and even some within Haiti’s poor majority, like my neighbor who has a job as a driver for the government.

For those with a certain means and/or on a short visit to the country, things do indeed appear to be getting better. A closer look shows the cracks in the otherwise smooth veneer of progress.

Perhaps the best analysis comes from a fellow performer. By far the song from this year’s Carnival repeated most on the taptap (public transportation)
and people’s lips is by Don Kato/Brothers Posse, *Aloral*. The song’s lyrics deconstruct the Martelly administration’s many public pronouncements as *aloral*, idle talk. People from all walks of life repeat this term to question the many overblown promises, about education, job creation, etc...

When I asked people from all walks of Haitian life who were extolling the progress, no one could identify the source of the public works projects, the company, donors, etc. One reason could be the absence of billboards or large signs typical in this “Republic of NGOs” listing the name, donor, duration, cost, and executing partner of the project, complete with NGO, foreign donor, and Haitian ministry logos.

Another explanation is that the progress began before. A commentator within the Haitian government pointed out that most of these projects began well before this current government took office. “So Martelly gets to claim credit for everything.”

Putting aside the question of who deserves credit for the improved conditions for the relatively well to do, Frisline spoke for many when she said, “hunger is killing people in [camp] Karade.” *Lavi chè* (high cost of living) is a preoccupation for many people. For example, a small bag of rice used to cost 400 gourdes in 2004 (about $10). Today it’s 1250 gourdes. When people took to the streets in 2008 it was 600.

Why aren’t they now? A community leader in Delmas explained that it is because of Martelly’s effective PR machine, unlike the silence of former President Rene Préval. According to this leader, “Five percent of the population is living better, the people anwo [above, in the suburbs of Pétion-Ville, Laboule, Thomassin, or Kenscoff]. They just send rain and the trash down to the city, to the pèp.”

Another indicator was Mother’s Day at the end of May. No one bought flowers in the streets because they couldn’t afford to, so people didn’t even bother to sell them.

For those who don’t know to look for these signs, the streets devoid of both potholes and *timachann* (small merchants) are a good thing. On a trip to Delmas, I saw a truck of nine heavily armed individuals, only three of whom in uniform, destroy *timachann* stands, one plain clothes person even taking expensive merchandise like cell phone chargers and padlocks.

One major indicator of a slow burning crisis is the gradual departure of NGOs and foreign employees. If you walk the streets and take public transport, and can speak the language, you can hear people talking about the lack of jobs as NGOs leave. If you are also a *blan* (foreigner) you’re likely asked for a job with increasing frequency and desperation.

NGO employees earning five to twenty times their Haitian counterparts drove up prices for housing and luxury items. Behind armed guards, supermarkets are still stocking Pringles, which can go for $4 per can. And prices for housing are still, unbelievably, going up, which doesn’t even include the plummeting value of the Haitian gourde against the U.S. dollar, approaching 44 to 1.

Importantly, to claim that the emergency phase is over is to deliberately ignore the many still living under tents. According to the International Organization for Migration, 320,000 internally displaced persons (IDPs) remain scattered in camps that have one thing in common: their invisibility. My neighborhood of Christ-Roi is saddled in between two
very large camps: KID (referring to a political party that had its office there, after it was abandoned by a tonton makout) to the south and one of many named “Acra” (for the wealthy family that owns the land) to the north.

Both camps sit atop a major roadway from downtown to Pétion-Ville. With the progress in the roads, cars can go faster. The lights on Delmas or on the amazing new Catholic school built within months cast shadows on the entrances to the camps, rendering them more invisible. Passersby on foot—not to mention the residents who live there because they have no other choice—can’t help but notice the smell of years of neglect. Pointing to the forty-foot pile of trash meters from his makeshift tarp, Maxon, an artist living in Acra, said “No one has ever come by. They might as well just throw us on top of that heap.”

Of the eight camps in my 2011 study, only two remain. HANCHO I, at the outskirts of privately owned factories where goats roamed the trash and cactus-like vegetation, was finally closed, to make way for a new factory. The perimeter of the private property is already walled in. According to resident leaders, the Red Cross facilitated a relocation plan for most of the residents. However, 16 tents still remain, scattered across the camp.

Residents in Kolonbi, on the other edge of Haiti’s industrial park, are degaje yo, just getting by. But it has been months since a visit from any aid agency. On the positive side, they’re not threatened by forced eviction, unlike 73,000 others according to the U.N., (Amnesty International documented 1,000 families for this year alone), from camps like ACRA I and II and Gaston in Carrefour. There’s no word at all from Kolonbi’s landowner, a former Army officer. Once in a very long while security agents come by to check things out but there’s no pressure to move. However, according to resident leaders, the Red Cross left after their work to reinforce the ravine. OIM’s gone. Oxfam’s gone. The horrible stench of rotting feces remains. And the water tap that was finally providing water after months of advocacy has again been turned off.

Karade, high on the hill overlooking the U.S. Embassy and the Aristide Foundation, seems to be stabilizing. During my visit in May, Karade had many more cars, motorcycles, and small boutiques than my previous visit in December. More houses have been made more permanent with tin roofs. There are more trees, and they sprout higher. It seems on its way to being a permanent settlement, except for one problem.

Deputy Anel Belizaire of Tabarre-Delmas (Veye Yo, a splinter of Aristide’s Fanmi Lavalas) has been on the radio within the last couple of months saying that Toto wants his land back, and that people will have to move. A bunch of graffiti was written all over the front entrance, for the people relocated from St. Louis de Gonzague, where all the electricity and temporary shelters have been invested, saying that the people will not move, that Anel is employing a particular set of vagabonds to commit acts of violence, and that the people are ready to mobilize.

Veye Yo means keep your eye on them. Residents are keeping their eye not only on Belizaire but the two institutions.

According to Reyneld Sanon of FRAKKA (the Reflection and Action Force for the Housing Cause), Aristide declared the area a public utility during his 2001-4 term, possibly to expand upon his university campus. But Belizaire publicly declared that he personally negotiated with Toto about the land to help people after January 12.

While residents in Karade are negotiating with the government for land title, all is not well. In addition to the lavi chè, water remains a dire problem; the only spigots are on the Tabarre side of the border owing to greater collaboration with DINEPA, the water and sanitation agency. But this was before Martelly renamed all but two city governments (in-
cluding Delmas, where Karade sits and whose mayor Wilson Jeudy demonstrated hostility to IDPs).

None of this is to diminish the real progress that is highly visible, especially to foreigners. Indeed, those of us in solidarity need to take account and shift our narrative. However, the progress has its share of victims.

On Saturday, the recently-finished road in my neighborhood was again blocked. Not by trash or potholes this time, but by burning tires and scores of angry timachann. They demanded that the Haitian government have a formal burial for all eight people who died on June 14, as a Public Works truck careened down the hill following a brake failure. Three died on the spot, another three on their way to the hospital and two there.

I knew one of the merchants, Audanie, a single mother in her mid-forties who made anywhere from $1-3 profit a day selling hair care products. According to her friend Renete who sells next to her stand, Audanie’s three children sou kont bondye, are in God’s hands. Audanie’s death—as well as her life—unfortunately does not count. A banner made and hung up by the neighborhood organization honoring the three timachann who died right on the spot was taken down (by the police, say residents).

This dual reality in Haiti puts into question the model for development. Haiti is on its way to becoming Jamaica, or Latin America in the 1990s. Under right-wing dictatorships supported by the U.S., there was progress for the middle class. The few resources flowing through the pinch of structural adjustment were directed upward, but the poor became poorer as the societies became more unequal.

In other words, the situation in Haiti is in many ways like before the earthquake, with extreme poverty, inequality, and exclusion, but this time—like the camps in my neighborhood—hidden in shadows.

As a performer, Sweet Micky—who called himself the “president” of konpa—depended on a willing audience. The gag gets old after a while, forcing him to keep upping his game. Now that he’s president of Haiti, Martelly has several institutions, which for reasons of their own, are willing spectators to the performance.

As Don Kato asks, Pouv’kisa bilan gen gou lanbi nan bouch ou, epi nan bouch pèp la, se fyèl? Tèlman gen grangou? Why do the official reports have the taste of conch in your mouth, but in the people’s mouths it is gall, because truly they’re hungry?

Mark Schuller is assistant professor of Anthropology and NGO Leadership Development at Northern Illinois University and affiliate at the Faculté d’Ethnologie, l’Université d’État d’Haïti. He is the author of Killing with Kindness: Haiti, International Aid, and NGOs and co-editor of three volumes, including Tectonic Shifts: Haiti Since the Earthquake.

Editor’s Note: This Op-Ed was revised to include reflection from Haitian-American anthropologist and performing artist Gina Athena Ulysse.

The views expressed in this Op-Ed are the author’s own and do not necessarily reflect those of Haitian Times.

In addition to Mark’s editorial above, several members of the committee have been busy with projects closely related to human rights and social justice:

- **Linda Rabben**, Human Rights Consultant to the Rainforest Foundation US, is organizing a conference, “Chico Vive: The Legacy of Chico Mendes and the Global Grassroots Environmental Movement.” It is scheduled to take place April 4-6, 2014, at the School of International Service, American University, Washington, D.C. It will bring together grassroots environmentalists, anthropolo-
gists, NGOs, applied scientists, students, journalists and others to discuss past, present, and future strategies, campaigns, projects, and movements. You can contact Linda at lrabben@verizon.net for more information.

- **Kristina Peterson** has just finished a report on the three years of consequences following the BP oil disaster for coastal communities in southeastern Louisiana. The next part of the project will be a participatory timeline map of these consequences and the media’s take on the issues.

- **Betsy Taylor** has been appointed by the Secretary of the US Department of Interior to the coordinating committee of the US Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative. The EITI is a multinational movement to catalyze democratic public debate about extractive industries to achieve goals of sustainable development, poverty reduction, and public accountability. For more, see Taylor’s blog http://www.huffingtonpost.com/betsy-m-taylor/.

- **Peter Van Arsdale** just returned from Tigray Province, Ethiopia, where he assisted with the implementation of a rain water catchment system in the village of MaiMisham. He tracked the latest developments in human rights while there, finding a ‘mixed bag’ in the aftermath of Meles Zenawi’s death.

- **Christine Ho** is working with the legal NGOs, Community Initiatives for Visitation to Immigrants in Confinement (CIVIC) and Americans for Immigrant Justice (AIJ), to help launch immigrant detainee visitation programs in two U.S. immigration detention centers in South Florida.

---

### Student Corner

**Introduction**

Elisha Oliver

elisha.r.oliver-1@ou.edu

University of Oklahoma

Student Committee Chair

This month the student corner explores “experiences” from two diverse perspectives. Our first student author explores the “crack baby myth” and delivers a very timely response to the recent Philadelphia Inquirer article, “Crack Baby Study Ends with Unexpected but Clear Result.” The second student author articulates an argument for integrated and interdisciplinary collaborative studies and research.

Lisa A. Gonzalez, MSW, is the first student author. Lisa is a doctoral student in the Anthropology department at Wayne State University. She also works for the University of Michigan School of Social Work Technical Assistance Center. Lisa has clinical and macro social work experience along with over 10+ years professional experience in the multi-family housing industry in California and the Pacific Northwest. Her clinical training included hospital emergency room psychiatric crisis evaluation, facilitating at risk youth support groups in a local high school and providing therapy to adults and couples in a private practice setting.

Lisa has extensive experience in research. She interned at UCLA in the School of Social Reform where she conducted research on Los Angeles based nonprofits. She received anthropological research training through the National Science Foundation’s Research Experience for Undergraduates. Prior to graduate school, Lisa worked as a corporate manager overseeing the overall management of apartment communities throughout the west coast. This work involved staff training, budget and financial oversight, marketing, and emergency response management.

Lisa has a passion for working with adolescents and young adults around higher education. She is a volunteer mentor with StudentMentor.org, where she works with young people who are unsure about careers or need advice on navigating college.
Our next student author is Ona Harris. Ona is a graduate of the University of North Texas with Bachelors of Arts and Science in History and Bachelors of Public Affairs and Community Service in Anthropology. Her focus of study began with Celtic Identities in American culture and has expanded to include the effect immigration imbeds on America cultural memory. A current developing interest includes the environmental and political issues, as well as cultural practices that influence food procurement and consumption. Equally important in her academic interest is the development of interdisciplinary practice of academia needed to broaden the understanding of cultural identity, community memory, and historical influences.

Currently she is preparing to present a paper titled “Revisionist History, Power, and Cultural Identity” at the 7th International Cultural Symposium in Ankara, Turkey after which she will proceed to Queen’s University, Belfast, Northern Ireland to study for her M.A. in Irish Studies.

The Crack Baby Myth and Experiences from the Field

Lisa A. Gonzalez
lisaviva@umich.edu
Wayne State University

Recently a colleague shared an article with me written by Susan FitzGerald (2013) for the Philadelphia Inquirer with regards to recent findings from a longitudinal study spanning decades examining the “crack baby” myth. After reading this article, I found myself reflecting back on personal experiences I’ve had working on the ground with inner-city youth and foster youth in Los Angeles and Detroit. As an anthropologist, I study the causes of social impacts; as a social worker, I look at positively changing social systems for impoverished communities. This article helped me to recognize connections between the 1980s “crack baby” myth and youth I was working with today. I give a brief but concise overview of the article points I focused on to help show the connections I found with my community work.

According to FitzGerald (2013), there was a crack epidemic going on in the late 1980s in Philadelphia. A study was started by Dr. Hallam Hurt in 1989 through the Albert Einstein Medical Center to evaluate the effects of in-utero cocaine exposure on babies. It was found that nearly one in six newborns at city hospitals had mothers who tested positive for cocaine. In her article, Fitzgerald states that “troubling stories were circulating about the so-called crack babies. They had small heads and were easily agitated and prone to tremors and bad muscle tone, according to reports, many of which were anecdotal. Some social workers predicted a lost generation.”

In May 2013 during a lecture, Dr. Hallam Hurt made a surprising announcement regarding her research study which lasted nearly 25 years. “Poverty is a more powerful influence on the outcome of inner-city children than gestational exposure to cocaine” (FitzGerald 2013). Claire Coles, a psychiatry professor from Emory University who was also interviewed for this article found through her research that cocaine exposure didn’t seem to affect children’s overall cognition and school performance. She was quoted as saying, “As a society we say, cocaine is bad and therefore it must cause damage to babies. When you have a myth, it tends to linger for a long time.”

Academics, access, and preparedness for higher education has been the primary focus of my work with youth in Los Angeles and Detroit. During a conversation about post high school plans with a foster youth I was working with in Los Angeles, the youth expressed that she didn’t do well in high school because she was a “crack baby.” She stated that she was taken away from her mother at birth and put into foster care. She indicated that many foster parents and social workers told her that she was a “crack baby.” Although I had only worked with the girl for a short time, after having reviewed her academic file, I believed she was capable of matriculating to a community college with the support of student services. I found that even with encouragement, this 18-year-old girl didn’t see herself as a potential college student, but instead carried around the label of “crack baby” with her, every day of her life.
More recently during my community work in Detroit, I have had youth share with me that they too are “crack babies.” It was during conversations around future academic plans that these youth shared their stories with me. In these cases, similar to the youth in Los Angeles, it seems that the youth have accepted the label of “crack baby” and believe the stories that have perpetuated around the myth. They believe the stories of having a low IQ or being prone to deviant behavior.

The story by FitzGerald included references to other articles written during the time the study was started. During this time the articles expressed the social attitudes of many professionals towards babies of crack addicted mothers. People wrote and media outlets reported that “crack babies” were “doomed to a life of uncertain suffering, of probable deviance, of permanent inferiority.”

While the research study by Dr. Hurt’s team concluded that the “crack baby” myth was untrue, what now seems to be true is that society’s belief in the “crack baby” myth seems to have conditioned some impoverished youth into believing they are incapable of doing well in school or of being unable to go on to college. Efforts need to be made to provide protective factors for studied populations particularly when theories are developed that can significantly effect a person’s perception of themselves and how others perceive them. Unfortunately, it seems that many of our impoverished youth today see themselves as being “broken” due to the persistence of the “crack baby” myth.

**This Borders on Speculation**

Ona Harris

onaharris@my.unt.edu

Queens University, Belfast

---

As a Study Abroad student writing a paper for an interdisciplinary course, I was expected to consider and integrate academic features of various disciplines. As I wrote, I found myself needing to explain the various perspectives with which each discipline approaches the material. My grader returned my paper with the comment, “This borders on speculation.” I jumped for joy because I found the grader’s comment and perspective rewarding. I had approached the border, stood my argument, and allowed the grader to reckon with the position I took. I did not, however, cross the border.

What tends to be missing from academic approaches is interest in coordinating and integrating knowledge of interdisciplinary academics where the border becomes blurred by and in opposition to specialized approach. The argument I find, with my dual degrees from different colleges, is of one-ups-man-ship. It manifests itself in interdisciplinary arguments over too much history in anthropological discourse and too much mundane behavior of culture in historiography. Yet the best courses I have attended were integrated. They were not, however, dual credited. Each department failed to consider the other’s relevance to their department material.

Popular writers who approach mass audiences, as academics, writing with a wide scope, are criticized by academics over the fine points. The academic specialists heap scorn on general knowledge subjects while they fail to accept the door it opens to curiosity. Thus they fail to imagine this represents the border for the inquisitive reader. It is not to say that speculation should not be resourced and drawn back to stay on the substantiated sided of that border; however, it is the adventurous writer who approaches the border and perhaps dangerously sticks a toe across, thus often motivating academia to respond and prove their argument. The advantage is broader knowledge, better comprehension, especially of the outliers, which influences or even redefines the knowledge base.

Education often creates its own border. In doing so it does not support the experience and knowledge of many of its students. It holds up a standard of book and taught knowledge where experiences are relegated to the neither regions of a border many academics will never cross. The adage “Those who
can, do; those who can’t teach” has haunted many an educator. Those who came to the classroom from doing, to impart experienced skills, find it challenging to stand on the academic platform. Academia fails when it turns away from experiences and speculative examination. Broad knowledge is deterred, in the classroom, for the sake of promoting the academic ego.

Venture to the borders; at least have a look over and consider what other knowledge will strengthen the argument. Gather information, no matter the source, confabulate, analyze, and speculate the questions primary to learning. Why did this happen? How did this come about? What could this mean? Where did it come from? Who or what is the catalyst? Peak over the border, with broad academic consideration, and argue from interdisciplinary perspective.
**Pacific Northwest (PNW) LPO News**
Alaska, British Columbia, Washington, Oregon, Western Montana, Idaho, Northern California

**First Regional Meeting Set**

The Pacific Northwest Local Practitioner Organization (LPO) will host its first public gathering on the campus of Portland State University on September 28, 2013, from 11 am to 4 pm (2nd Floor of the Urban Center, 506 SW Mill Street).

We have had gatherings of Pacific Northwest anthropologists at the recent SfAA meetings in Seattle and Denver which generated a list of interested individuals that now number 66. In the spring of 2013, we sent out a survey using our own contacts, and contacts from NAPA and SfAA, which resulted in about 15 replies.

For most people, an LPO represents an opportunity for a network of practitioners to assist individuals to grow professionally. The practical means of making anthropology work in the “real world” is a central theme. People reported that an exchange of ideas, a venue to mutually grapple with the issues of our field, opportunities to “listen and learn,” and the means to address policy issues in the Pacific Northwest are additional benefits of an LPO.

The professional interests of members include environmental management issues in the Northwest, school reform, public health, cultural resource management, international labor migration, climate change,

Applied anthropologists interested in the Pacific Northwest LPO may contact Kevin Preister (kpreister@jkagroup.com; 541.601.4797) or Emilia Clements (EmiliaGonzalezClements@Gmail.com; 503.860.4808) for more information.

Contact Kevin Preister if you have not received an email with a survey and wish to participate.

**COPAA Visiting Fellows Program**
Susan B. Hyatt
IUPUI
suhyatt@iupui.edu

One of the key resources that COPAA (Consortium of Practicing and Applied Anthropology Programs) provides for our member departments is the Visiting Fellows Program (VFP). As the COPAA Web site explains, “The COPAA Visiting Fellows Program provides the opportunity for applied and practicing anthropologists to share their skills and knowledge in partnership with anthropology departments. The goal of the program is to sponsor visits by either practitioners or applied faculty to COPAA member departments in order to educate students and faculty on topics that build on, enhance, or supplement the department’s existing curriculum. The structure and length of the visit should be determined by the needs of (1) the specific academic program, (2) the expertise of the faculty and
(3) the skills and knowledge of the practitioner/applied visiting fellow.”

The deadline for applications for the VFP has been moved to May 31st in order to give departments an opportunity to assess the benefits of participating in this program and for interested individuals and departments to learn more about the program at the annual Society for Applied Anthropology meetings.

This year, the winner of the VFP competition was the University of Kansas. The Department of Anthropology at the University of Kansas is working to improve its training capacity for graduates who will work outside a university setting. To ensure the success of their applied concentration, and to continue to provide the best possible professional preparation for the department’s graduate students, the department will bring an established and experienced practitioner to campus – Michael Agar, a recognized and accomplished practicing anthropologist with additional experience in an academic department. He will assist with the goals and activities identified below:

- Assessment and recommendations to enhance the department’s training capacity in applied and practicing anthropology;
- Consult with the faculty on development of a short course on professional preparation;
- Organize a one-day workshop for graduate and upper level undergraduate students about preparation for practice;
- Engage in informal discussion with students about practitioner career paths and navigating the private/contract sector;
- Participate in one class on research ethics and one on ethnographic research as these apply to practicing and applied anthropology.

The department applying for the VFP must be a member of COPAA; the visitor, however, need not be from a member institution.

In 2011, with the help of resources from the VFP, the University of Memphis hosted Dr. Jean Schensul of the Institute for Community Research. During her two weeks of residency at the University of Memphis, Dr. Schensul participated in a series of workshops and informal dialogues around methods of community-based collaborative and participatory research during the University of Memphis’ centennial celebration. For the full final report on Dr. Schensul’s visit to the University of Memphis, see http://www.copaa.info/resources_for_programs/2011%20Visiting%20Fellow%20Report.pdf

If you are a member of COPAA, it is not too early to begin thinking about whether your department might benefit from participating in the VFP. Please consult the COPAA web site for more information about the Visiting Fellows Program and other COPAA activities and resources at http://www.copaa.info/.
As I assume the editorship of *SfAA News*, first I would like to thank Tim Wallace for his years of service both to this publication and the organization more broadly. I hope to foster the relationships with contributors that he forged, and my sincere wish is that his own words will continue to grace these pages from time to time. At the same time, this issue marks a transition into what I trust will be a period of growth and positive change for *SfAA News*. The first and most noticeable difference is the updated layout and design. The clean, consistent look provides a polished, professional presentation worthy of our organization’s status. Plus, the new template allows for easy addition of content, reducing production time considerably. While this design may not be final, as the Board continues to consider other options and formats, I believe that this is an excellent first step. I owe a deep debt of gratitude to my friend, colleague, and fellow SfAA member Dr. Lance Arney, who selflessly volunteered his time to create this template and assist in the production of this issue.

Other changes are on the horizon as well. The SfAA website now offers RSS feeds of news content, making it simple to stay on top of stories from your computer, tablet, or phone by subscribing to the feed: [http://sfaanews.sfaa.net/feed/](http://sfaanews.sfaa.net/feed/) (many thanks to Neil Haan for setting this up!). This feature also facilitates sharing of stories across social networks and is an effective way to spread the word about SfAA, its members, and applied anthropology. In addition, content soon will be posted on a rolling basis, and we are working to improve the submission process for news, stories, and other updates from our membership. These changes are concurrent with the ongoing larger SfAA website redesign, so expect to see these and other exciting initiatives over the coming months.

As a final note, I would like to thank all the contributors to this issue. I appreciate the warm welcome I have received and the ready willingness to submit content. Your participation and support have resulted in a far more successful “first issue” than I had feared. As always, though, should you have any suggestions or would like to contribute content, please contact me ([jlsimms@gmail.com](mailto:jlsimms@gmail.com)). I look forward to meeting many of you in person at the upcoming meetings in Chicago and, especially, Albuquerque.