**Anderson, AL**

Response to Editorial Comments

Having revised this article significantly, I believe this version benefits from and addresses directly all of its critiques by reviewers and the editor, and is much improved. In particular, I have added more language to structure the argument, as well as to hone and make explicit the analytic focus.

Specifically,

1. I changed the title, as suggested to emphasize the reflective aspect:

**New Title: A Reflection on Political Research and Social Justice Organizing**

1. I incorporated the references suggested by the editor.
2. In response to Reviewer A:

**The following paragraph on page one, lays out my argument and also introduces the reflective nature of the piece, which later I make more explicit by expanding the ethnographic examples (from Guatemala and San Diego) that show how I deal with critiques of the discipline from a feminist, subjective standpoint, etc. :**

“In what follows, I reflect on how the challenges I experienced as a conscientiously, engaged anthropologist in Guatemala articulate with those I encountered as a social justice organizer in San Diego, specifically employing the methods/processes for mobilizing collective action as I was trained by the PICO Institute. While some readers might contend or fear that this comparative approach aimed at producing constructive dialogue among activists and anthropologists who promote progressive social change dangerously decontextualizes the PICO model, I endeavor to situate carefully two sites of power/knowledge production in relation to both activist trajectories as well as to key counterhegemonic, disciplinary attempts to reconstruct methodologies and analysis as tools for social change. By making practice, power, research, and action the subjects of my analysis, I employ a postcolonial feminist critique, which interrogates the social location of the researcher, resists binary logics of praxis/theory, and locates the structural-material effects of ethnographic research within a broader field of power. “

**Furthermore, I make it clear that I am a feminist and a woman (not a man), and I demonstrate how I am working from an informed rather than naïve perspective of the discipline, especially aligning myself with a decolonizing critique that seeks to undo the relations of hegemonic anthropology and colonialism/imperialism/ etc. In the last section of the paper, I align my analysis of the PICO model with a discussion of respectfully conceived research.**

**And lastly, I change the direct address used in the original oral presentation, entirely.**

------------------------------------------------------

Reviewer B:

**By historicizing more deeply church based organizing, I address and make the link with particular social class projects and class-based struggle in the US.**

**By writing more about the Peace Process I attempt to clarify that it had nothing to do with the Peace Corps, and I write and produce an analysis that addresses my reservations about “projecting the nice face of US imperialism” through the Fulbright program.**

**I also have fully re-written the sections that address comparing the organizing model to methodologies for engaged research by demonstrating how opportunities to engage the people with whom we work can be viewed similarly, and how accountabilities persist long after the initial research is conducted.**

**And again, I have transformed the verbal form of address to a written register.**