NEW PROPOSALS

JOURNAL OF MARXISM AND INTERDISCIPLINARY INQUIRY

Our Mandate

This journal represents an attempt to explore issues, ideas, and problems that lie at the intersection between the academic disciplines of social science and the body of thought and political practice that has constituted Marxism over the last 150 years. New Proposals is a journal of Marxism and Interdisciplinary Inquiry that is dedicated to the radical transformation of the contemporary world order. We see our role as providing a platform for research, commentary, and debate of the highest scholarly quality that contributes to the struggle to create a more just and humane world, in which the systematic and continuous exploitation, oppression, and fratricidal struggles that characterize the contemporary sociopolitical order no longer exist.

Cover: Little Mountain Housing Complex, Vancouver, 2009
Kenneth Campbell photograph.

New Proposals

Journal of Marxism and Interdisciplinary Inquiry

Special Issue
Practice What You Teach

Contents

Introduction

Making the Case for Progressive Engagement

Charles R. Menzies, UBC

As the global economy continues to crumble the need to removing housing from the private market would seem to become more and more a self-evident truth. One would think that housing should be a basic right that all members of society should have access to. Yet, the ideologues of the market continue to shift public resources and public goods into private hands.

At the University of British Columbia, a major public research university in Vancouver, a private company managed by members of the regional development elite is in charge of a massive housing boom. When the market took a dive in the fall of 2008 and sales of private housing stock started to fall, the university's private development company shifted from building private condominiums to building rental units. One astute commentator has noted that development on UBC's lands is the equivalent of a "massive social theft" of public property. Members of the development elite run the university's businesses; they are linked through social and business ties to the companies that 'buy' the development rights who in turn are similarly linked to the real estate firms that market the new housing. While it has the appearance of a 'free market,' what is in fact going on seems more akin to a carefully organized transfer of what should be public capital into private profit.

The university is not alone in this drive toward privatizing public assets. Under successive provincial governments public housing projects have been transformed into private housing developments with an 'allocation of non-market' housing. A local cause célèbre is Little Mountain Housing in the core of the City of Vancouver (see cover photo). Touted as one of Vancouver's oldest social housing projects with a vibrant social community, Little Mountain is slated for redevelopment by a private development company. As part of the deal some 'affordable' housing units will be made available to former Little Mountain residents, but in the meantime the residents have been evicted to clear the way for the privatization of one of the largest pieces of public land left in the City of Vancouver.

In the face of escalating land values in the Vancouver region, publicly held lands represent potential windfall profits for the development elite. Many public institutions, established decades ago, have a legacy of large 'undeveloped' acreage. Under the pretext of raising capital for public institutions the development elite has latched onto a way of profiting from the privatization of public property. They rationalize it within an ideological framework that asserts the primacy and efficiency of market mechanisms—they feel justified in their profiteering and have no qualms about using social networks to gain access to public lands.

The papers in this special issue on Engaged Anthropology show that Anthropologists and other researchers can engage effectively at the local level to counter the dominance of elites such as those in Vancouver. We do not need to let small well-organized elites control our destiny. Good research tied to progressive objectives can make a difference in our world.

Introduction to Practice What You Teach: Activist Anthropology at the Sites of Cross-Talk and Cross-Fire

Anna L. Anderson-Lazo
Guest Editor

Constructed as a consciously transnational and interdisciplinary dialogue among eight anthropologists, the following group of essays compares methods, strategies and outcomes of expressly political research, collaborative networks, participatory projects and activist teaching. While only a few of the essays in their current iterations deal explicitly with teaching, our title draws on our ongoing conversation about engaged anthropology that began when most of the contributors were apprentice teachers in graduate school and has continued as we have taught, researched and, alternately, worked in community-based projects. Here, refracted through the lens of the 2007 Society for Applied Anthropology meetings' theme which focused on "Global Insecurities" and for which we initially produced these essays, we explore how in our various positions distributed across and between several disciplines and nonprofit professions in the US and beyond, we employ the tools of anthropology to imagine, construct and inhabit relationships of thinking and learning collectively, across and outside of mainstream political orthodoxies, disciplinary epistemologies, cultural registers, as well as physical, sexual and civil normativities. As we envisioned what publishing our individual essays as a conversation might contribute, we saw our specific navigations of "global uncertainties" as an opportunity to consider whether our current projects and teaching reflected a common school of praxis—that is, a way of engaging anthropology as a tool for more than merely describing the world, but rather for making a positive difference.

Another primary linkage among the contributors is the mentorship we received from Ann E. Kingsolver, whose activist teaching particularly in Wisconsin, California, South Carolina and Sussex modelled how to take a creative, (re)constructive role in refashioning and honing the tools of social analysis and also how to build and sustain engaged, transnational intellectual community and political networks over time. Our intervention, here in a Marxist journal, points up how activist teaching serves as the bridge between our so-called "field" contexts (where we are simultaneously activists and anthropologists navigating such everyday social realities as our local, national and transnational activist commitments, academic institutional constraints and the aggressively, pro-war foreign policy of the United States) and our texts (representations that circulate in transnational flows of power/knowledge). Thus, as a whole, these essays might be construed as a reflexive, group ethnography, which makes the subjects of its explicitly engaged analysis the role of anthropology in constructing knowledge and power; the role of teaching anthropological perspectives in transforming the unequal relations of power/knowledge; and the responsibility of activist anthropologists to challenge the discipline, and Academe in general, to engage the critiques that we encounter and produce as we push the boundaries of the field (and fieldwork) to include our own political networks and activist trajectories.

A majority of the contributors to the current issue were trained in cultural anthropology at UC

Santa Cruz during the mid to late 1990s, a period when USAmerican anthropologists, both new and established, were reexamining the potential of anthropological research to serve as an agent of social transformation (cf. Harrison 1991) and, perhaps even more urgently, were striving to transform the objectivist modes of ethnographic inquiry that feminist, postcolonial and indigenous critiques of the discipline had laid bare (cf., Zavella 1997; Fabian 1983; Said 1993; Abu-Lughod 1998, 1991; Narayan 1993). As apprentice teachers simultaneously charged with reframing and representing the discipline in our classrooms, we found that instructing undergraduates under the rubric of "Culture and Power" (as our program was called) necessitated a deep historical approach that connected internal reflexive critiques of fieldwork to activist confrontations with USAmerican anthropology's history of complicity in constructing the modes of thought, relations of power, as well as institutions of colonialism, imperialism, capitalism and global structural inequality. Thus we invented courses, co-taught, and often subversively retooled syllabi to create co-learning contexts where the confluence of material and ideological conditions that characterized the disciplinary (inward or) down-turn of the 1990s could be related to the rise of neoliberal global capitalism in a post-colonial, post-socialist world, and not, incidentally, could contravene a general mood of defeat among Leftists as social movements turned away from class struggle, classically defined. As we struggled to teach a useful anthropology, we found that we were also gleaning the discipline, its borders and interstices for workable, transparent methods.

To be clear, in our relationships with students many of us understood in a very practical sense that identifying the epistemological, methodological and political conditions for producing anthropological research either could be paralyzing or could be the first step in actualizing a pedagogy of engaged praxis. For many of us this teaching challenge led to our participation in curriculum development projects that, to name a few examples, forced our home institutions to teach Black anthropologists as part of the canon, to include courses about women of colour in ethnic studies requirements, and to create courses on sexu-

ality and gender that acknowledged the intellectual and political contributions of Queer studies scholars and activists. Furthermore, teaching allowed many of us to use the classroom to collaborate with students to co-produce course-related conferences and activism, service-learning and community-based research projects, and to introduce students to non-academic careers. While some of these efforts increasingly have become mainstream in US institutions of higher learning, they were pioneering attempts that were either actively discouraged or largely ignored in our own training. The projects we relate then, and the moments of convergence, overlap and disjuncture among them, offer a broad and strategically optimistic description of an "engaged anthropology" that draws on historical approaches, situated perspectives, decolonizing critiques, and embodied practices that include everything from empathetic listening to social disruption. Here, I suggest that the key contribution that our essays make to decolonizing and repoliticizing anthropological practice is a sampling of ethnographic work that conscientiously, reflexively if you will, confronts and analyzes the broad substrate of relations of power that are inherent in social science research with human interlocutors today. Our work, often positioned outside the discipline and the academy, re-presents—i.e., "causes to reappear" (in the literal, etymological sense)—that which might be overlooked as the possibilities of and challenges to an activist anthropology.

The Courage to Speak a Powerful Critique: Applying Cultural Anthropology

Reverberating throughout this issue is the chord Sawyer strikes when she describes the transformative possibilities she has discovered teaching at the intersection of cultural anthropology and social work studies, both of which she describes as "contested and political" fields of knowledge production with definite and distinct analyses of structural inequality and power. As she recounts an experience during graduate school in the mid 1990s, Sawyer describes the actual dangers she and her allies faced—that is, some students and faculty were "pushed out" for pointing up the often, uninterrogated hierarchies that positioned theories of individual intellectual engagement

over the social relations and products of collective action occurring along with, or outside Academe. As a professor of social work in Sweden today, Sawyer introduces her students to activist mentors, such as W.E.B. Dubois, Zora Neale Hurston and Paulo Freire, who demonstrate how to identify, resist and transform relations of power from within an unequal society, classroom or discipline. Sawyer's classroom today then might be seen as a site for the collaborative project she refers to as "indigenizing" social work; for she recognizes that her students are also colleagues who live, work, and belong in the very communities "targeted" by development NGOs, social work agencies and, not inconsequently, anthropology.

Similarly and urgently, Kalantary's contribution thickly describes the specific "new sets of fears, anxieties and political hurdles" that anthropologists from and/or studying the Middle East must confront as the US government aligns its aggressive and xenophobic, domestic and foreign policies. As an Iranian political exile, US American citizen and teacher in Middle Eastern studies, Kalantary uses what is an increasingly inauspicious kaleidoscope of transposed identities to focus a simultaneously reflexive, historical and ethnographic lens on the university campus classroom as such. So doing, Kalantary analyzes the cultural work of imagining, creating and empowering the new structures, institutions, legalized discourses, and political roles that secure the geographic boundaries and epistemological sutures of the (so-called) U.S. "homeland."

Paradigms of Participation in Question: Defining Community

Both essays that analyze paradigms of participation help to resituate the emancipatory claims that are often attributed to participatory models for research and governance, and so doing they emphasize the importance of the critical interventions that teachers like Sawyer and Kalantary make in the classroom, where we seek to equip students with the analytical tools and historicizing lenses vital to an engaged citizenry. Additionally, Riley provides a perspective from the United Kingdom, where disciplinary boundaries are drawn slightly differently, especially with regard to the proximity of anthropology to

international development studies. In Riley's hands, anthropology serves as a critical and historicizing filter for new participatory paradigms of international development as they travel across applied and theoretical contexts in several disciplines. In the first part of her essay, a brief literature review, she shows that asking anthropological questions can facilitate a reading of participation as more than a neopopulist metaphor or an oversimplified assumption about relationships between "the State" and its opposing entity, which might be cast as the "poor," the community, the village, or civil society. In fact, posing such questions as what does development do and where do the ideas that comprise development come from, resituates the subjects of analysis as well as the positions from which they can be studied. Thus Riley's anthropological critique suggests the need for ethnographies of how such concepts as participation, state, citizen and representation are experienced and produced at the intersections rather than the divisions of institutions and cultural domains. In the conclusion to her essay, she explores her own suggestion by offering a brief series of ethnographic vignettes connecting the multiple roles of several actors across state/civil society divisions to her argument that more nuanced analyses of participatory mechanisms require a focus on the complexity of everyday, lived experiences of political structures, institutions and relationships.

Hudgins positions her critique of participatory approaches more squarely within an applied anthropology framework, yet her contribution also suggests a necessary resituating of the subjects of analysis. As she seeks to identify the groups who might or should benefit from the health pamphlet she was commissioned to create, Hudgins excavates the meanings of farmworker and migrant across various registers and questions who and what makes a community. Thus, on one level her essay describes how her collaboration with a healthcare focused community-based organization was confounded by her desire to make a useful "participatory" contribution to farmworkers as such. On another level, she systematically broadens the scope of her ethnographic study to understand applications and contexts for the notions of participation, collaboration and community. By turning her focus to the key activities of a participatory project

and considering whether a shared problem or need is enough to define or galvanize a community, her work sheds light on the analysis of a politics of stake-holding among government agencies, CBO's and non-profits in South Carolina.

Activist Linkages and Ruptures: Decolonizing Organizing Frameworks

At a moment when notions of so-called global inse-curities seemingly pervade every realm of cultural production, the first four essays raise such issues as how teachers and researchers can transgress the recurring social norms of complicity with cultural and political oppression by situating anthropology his-toriographically. Drawing on the flushing out of the engaged "problematic" of both studying and inhab-iting culture and power through the overlapping activities of research and teaching, the final essays by Morgensen, Garriga-López, Anderson-Lazo and the commentary by Kingsolver turn to weaving the specific threads of our communal, story-telling tapestry that analyze the lived and embodied expe-rience of activism as ethnographic practice to which earlier essays also allude. In particular, as ethnogra-phers learn from and within networks of activism and organizing, earlier questions such as whether shared problems define communities and whether spatial understandings of cultural production can enhance equity emerge again to suggest that situated analyses critical of power both point to and often require the so-called, engaged researcher to enact uncomfortable, disharmonious, embodied practices such as deviance, disruption and rupture.

In her research regarding the linkages and dis-junctures between Puerto Rican and New York City ACT UP! communities, Garriga-López collects and analyzes histories of Puerto Rican diasporic activism in conversation with long-time HIV/AIDS activ-ists. Her essay also provides a unique examination of ethnographic methods, which is both reflexive and participatory in that she enlists fellow activ-ists. Specifically, she engages her veteran activist interlocutors in assessing the utility of an histori-cal framework for understanding the effectiveness of activist strategies and the long term impact of forms of embodied resistance on the social arena.

In this regard, her interviews reveal that ACT UP! effectively used many forms of embodied deviance (e.g. fake blood, performance, die-ins, kissing, etc.) to congeal and further draw upon a collective under-standing of structural violence that described the course of the HIV/AIDS epidemic on the island as the layering of the "bio-political effects" of US colonial imperialism, including racism, homophobia, gender inequality, clinical treatment, case manage-ment, sex work and poverty. This hard-won view of the HIV/AIDS epidemic in Puerto Rico changed the terrain of health equality, setting the "stage" for new transgressive acts, such as needle exchange events, movement recruitment in bars, and other emerging forms of community activism.

In a related sense, Morgensen examines how Indigenous AIDS activists worldwide are producing theory and movements that challenge the colonial conditions of the pandemic. He calls upon anthro-pologists to learn from their work and to centre decolonization in studies of AIDS and power. More specifically, however, his essay pursues the claim by Indigenous activists that new research must decol-onize knowledge, given that the colonial conditions of social life will not shift until methods of pro-ducing knowledge *about* that world also transform. Indigenous AIDS activists cite broader Indigenous critiques that defy the power of non-Indigenous scholars to define or control knowledge of Indigenous people. Morgensen's essay situates Indigenous activ-ist claims as discrepant bodies of critical knowledge about AIDS and power to which non-Indigenous scholars must respond. He then asks what is at stake for non-Indigenous anthropologists to engage this knowledge dialogically. He traces how Indigenous activist claims are mirrored in historical critiques of coloniality in anthropological theory, which also pro-vide critical insight for the anthropology of AIDS. Arguing that the accountable scholarship demanded by activists will arise from accountable relation-ships, Morgensen ultimately centres "the *process* of configuring anthropological research against colonial legacies" as crucial to anthropologists meeting activ-ists in shared challenge to the colonial conditions of health *and* of knowledge about health.

As the initiator of this written collaboration

and its original editor, with my contribution I propose a slight inversion of the final narrative thread, regarding the roles of values, ideology and power in decolonizing ethnographic practice. Here, like the reverse side of our conversational tapestry, my essay seeks to provoke a collective examination and comparison of social change objectives and commitments within the Academy and in the world of faith-based organizing. By making practice, power, research, and action the subjects of my analysis, I employ a post-colonial 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. Specifically, I reflect on how the challenges I experienced as a conscientiously, engaged anthropologist in Guatemala articulate with those I encountered employing the methods/processes of social justice organizing in San Diego, California. Introducing the "structural-historical organizing method" adopted by the PICO international network for social justice, which cites well-known organizers and claims victories from the civil rights movement, Latin American social revolutions, and traditional trade organizing in the US, the primary question is whether models drawing on faith-based or inter-faith activism inspired by such social change-seeking institutions as the Black Church or liberation theologists are unseemly to many activist anthropologists simply because they leave unchallenged the ideological belief systems of participants or, rather, because they engage them. Describing power as a cumulative product of a process which begins with research that foregrounds engaged listening, and subsequently building relationships, developing common interests, identifying problems to be addressed, and mobilizing collective action to create change, my comparative approach aims to produce constructive dialogue among activists and anthropologists who promote progressive social change by contextualizing the PICO model historically and by showing the overlap between people-based organizing and respectfully-conceived social science research.

If we argue that research relationships alternately can naturalize, transgress, transform and wield power, what might a model or process for progressive social change do to mobilize activist researchers in the service of the communities to which they pertain? What if we were to teach a paradigm of social change that recognizes how people experience power differently, along linkages of commonality?

In closing, I suggest that the essays we have written to advance the conversation about teaching and activist anthropology reflect on, re-present and conscientiously re-situate a deep history of political engagements and social commitments that in contemporary context expand rather than contract our responsibilities to produce ethnographic research that serves communities and that confronts the modes of thought as well as institutions, which reproduce hierarchies of domination, oppression and inequality.

Acknowledgements

References

Abu-Lughod, Lila

    1990 Can There Be a Feminist Ethnography? Women and Performance 5(1):7-27.

    1991 Writing Against Culture. *In* Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present. R. Fox, ed. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Fabian, Johannes

    1983 Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object. New York: Columbia University Press.

Harrison, Faye V.

    1991 Decolonizing Anthropology: Moving Further Toward an Anthropology for Liberation. Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association.

Narayan, Kirin

    1993 How Native is a 'Native' Anthropologist? American Anthropologist 95(3):671-682.

Said, Edward

    1993 Culture and Imperialism. New York: First Vintage Books.

Zavella, Patricia

    1997 Feminist Insider Dilemmas: Constructing ethnic identity with Chicana informants. *In* Situated Lives, Gender and Culture in Everyday Life. L. Lamphere, H. Ragone, & P. Zavella, eds. New York: Routledge.

Transforming Swedish Social Work with Engaged Anthropology

Lena Sawyer
Department of Social Work, Mittuniversitetet (Mid Sweden University)

ABSTRACT: This paper is a reflection on anthropological tools and perspectives used during the past 6 years teaching in an intercultural and international social work program in Northern Sweden. An anthropological critique of power, informed by postcolonial and critical race perspectives, contributes to an engaged analysis of the policy applications of terms such as culture and multiculturalism. The author examines how broadened definitions of social work advance understanding of the history of social work in welfare societies such as Sweden and transform social work practice from normalizing instances to praxis with an eye on social change and justice in global perspective.

Key words: engaged anthropology, experience, social work

Introduction

Writing this article as a contribution to a conversation about activist teaching among colleagues who continue to work as teachers and activists has been an interesting way for me to reflect on my graduate experiences in the anthropology program at the University of California, Santa Cruz and to think about how these years shaped how I now, nearly a decade further along, work as a teacher in a social work program located in Northern Sweden. People travel and with them specific ways of understanding get translated into new contexts. Looking back, I now recognize how much of my learning around issues of power happened in a strange, sometimes painful, and other times invigorating way that provided a link between the theories we were introduced to in graduate school and the ways that personal experiences of class, racial, and sexual politics shaped the university classroom, campus, town, and indeed country during the early to mid 1990s. Questions of the relationship between engagement and theory have been central to critical socio-cultural anthropology debates throughout the last fifty years, yet in the early 1990s these debates resurfaced in many education programs around the country.

Thus this reflexive paper, grounded in the specifics of my own graduate educative experience and teaching practice today, aims to open up, rather than provide definitive answers, to thinking about the relationships among experience, engagement and theory. I want to suggest that experience and our ways of making sense of the world are already framed by "theory," and one of the transformative roles that education can have is to help us and our students critically reflect upon this relationship. Theory is not something "out there" but something we all do as we interpret the world and our practice. Understanding this link makes it easier to address why and how teaching should be a key moment of "practicing what we preach."

Graduate Studies in Culture and Power: "…and some of us were brave"

One of the most useful tools I gained from my training as an anthropologist came from the way anthropology was presented as a contested and political field of knowledge production. From feminist as well as postcolonial perspectives, I learned that "canonical texts" and their authors were contextualized as formed by, as well as negotiating, specific historical debates and understandings about the anthropological project, and we were pushed to acknowledge and engage the relationship between the personal and the political. This is to say that, individual anthropologists' personal interests and projects informed the ways they "did" anthropology and how they positioned themselves in relation to their research. Yet, alongside reading compelling and invigorating texts, much of my learning process also happened outside of the classroom as I and a few other graduate students tried to tie in the theories we were learning with our own lives and experiences of the classroom to the town of Santa Cruz and US politics during the early 1990s. While Foucaultian, Gramcian and other post-stucturalist understandings of power could be debated and argued in the classroom, just how we could use these theories to make sense of, or, better yet, contribute to positive social change, were all too often marginalized or silenced in the classroom.

What stands out in my mind about those years were some of the micro, seemingly insignificant moments of academic bravery I was able to muster and that I saw some others, braver than I, exhibit. What I remember most is the courage some grad students exhibited in challenging the micro-workings of power within the graduate school educational setting and how these moments involved the recognition that these were spaces constructed around specific understandings of learning. Some of us were frustrated by very heady theoretical discussions disconnected from ourselves, our bodies, and our experiences in the world. I remember one student in particular pushing the boundaries of academic learning and in resistance one day presenting her reading of Derrida by mounting the seminar table and performing a tap dance to express how she understood this work. Yet I also remember when some of us, with shaky voices, spoke up about the possible exclusionary aspects of all the postmodern language being used in the classroom to talk about power, and another time how a few of us discussed with frustration how the lectures and discussions that day seemed so disconnected from what was forefront in our minds at the moment: LA was on fire, a black man had been beaten to a pulp by the police, and people all over the country were taking to the streets and we fumed "Who cared about the difference between Bourdieu and Foucault, or De Certeau?" We wanted connection: connection of theory to the way power was being so violently manifested (almost) in front of our eye. We wanted an institutional recognition of these events, realities, and experiences, which that day seemed so central to defining what anthropology was "really" about as a body of knowledge. I remember that after consultation with a few other classmates, we passionately suggested to the teacher and the rest of the class that we needed to connect theory with practice or else "what were we really doing?"

While there is little space to elaborate how and what we actually discussed that day, what sticks out in my mind was my own frustration and sense that learning was often disconnected from my own experience and everyday life that was and continues to be shaped by the facts of inequality and privilege. Even in intellectually exciting graduate programs it seems there still were (and perhaps are) unsaid teaching norms and practices, which unnecessarily shrouded all too many of us, especially and specifically, students from working class and minority communities with a sense of inadequacy, shame, and fear in sharing our/their own truth. And the result is that a few bright (and oftentimes activist) students are "pushed out" (rather than dropped out) from these settings. As such, moments of academic bravery performed by anthropologists with passion, other students and faculty, who took risks to "rock the academic boat" and stretch the norms, modelled how to envision an anthropology that could make a difference in changing power relations.

Thus, it was more than merely the interesting theories as introduced in graduate school that informed my understanding of activist anthropology. Rather, the ways that theories helped us to understand our

own experiences of the world, of institutions (such as academia) and the subtle mechanisms, and possible resistances to structural/institutional power were most profound. Such moments in my own experience, and more often occurrences in which other students' (and faculty's) bravery within that particular institution and specific historical moment, are now vivid snap-shots in my mind, where we with shaky voices took a leap, a risk, stuck out our necks and challenged some of the micro-workings of power visible within academic settings.

Crossing the Pond: From a US Anthropology Program to a Social Work Department in Sweden

My move from US anthropology to Swedish social work happened out of necessity—along with a post-PhD, transnational move, I found it easier to find a job in social work in a country with (comparatively) few anthropology departments. Yet it also spoke to my activist aspirations—to work in new ways with the relationship between theory and practice. If my experience of anthropology under-emphasized practice, social work has focused on practice—and doing. However, if anthropology can be said to have had a major reflexive turn in the 1970s, owing to contributions by feminist and non-white anthropologists, this has yet to happen in (Swedish) social work. While there is a focus on practice and the "doing" of social work, there is often very little linking of students' understandings of their experience and theorization of the world. And this has in part to do with the Swedish social work disciplinary investment in positivism and social engineering.

Among the many disciplinary complexities shaping the social work curriculum in Sweden, what is important to point out is that the origins of Swedish social work are closely linked to the emergence of the Swedish welfare state and grew out of the identification of "social problems" by a growing cadre of middle class (mostly women) social workers in the early 1900s. Their work focused mainly on the urban poor whose marginality emerged from wage labour arrangements in the cities due to rapid industrialisation and rural-urban migration. Historically characterized by some researchers as

growing out of a workers' "struggle for social rights" based on "a morality of wage work and performance," feminist researchers have also pointed out the ways, historically at least, many of the policies were structured around notions of a nuclear family.[1] What is clear, however, is that since the 1990s the Swedish welfare state is, like many other welfare states in Europe, undergoing differentiation and privatisation as neo-liberal economic discourses have begun to challenge earlier discourses of solidarity, universalism, and egalitarianism.

Professional social work educative training programs emerged in the 1920s and were intimately linked to the implementation of Social Democratic ideals of "The People's Home" that took form in the 1930s. Here social workers were key implementers of social engineering policy aimed at ensuring citizen's access to the "the good life" and where those identified as "vulnerable" and/or as "deviating" (from middle class ideals) were provided with social welfare interventions aimed at normalising and bringing them into the fold of the national "family." It is a field that in Swedish social work literature has been portrayed somewhat contradictorily—that is, as an arm of state discipline, normalisation and control, and also as possessing the possibility to assist in positive social change and social justice. Yet there is room for social workers *to manoeuvre* in relation to state social policy in European welfare states: as Walter Lorenz describes, "social workers in turn represent and interpret these systems through their methods of intervention, and the whole time widen or narrow the boundaries of solidarity" (1998:254).

I currently teach in one of three—there are 17 in total—social work educative programs in Sweden that have a special focus on *intercultural and international social work*. The university I work in is situated in the north of Sweden, in a region called Jämtland; a part of the nation often linked with words such as "under-population" and "under-employment" but also "resistance" to both the nation, and more recently, the EU. My students come from a variety of backgrounds; some are from cities that lie in the south,

---

1 See for example, Hernes 1987. On heteronormativity and Swedish state family policy see Dahl 2005.

some are "locals" and come from Jämtland, and still others come from stigmatized and marginalized "immigrant" housing areas that lie in the "peripheries" of cities (that often are) in the south of the country. Many come to social work with an explicit interest in, and often considerable experience, working for social change in a variety of transnational, national and local NGOs, networks, and organisations. This means for me that there are many resources available throughout the course, including perspectives and experiences of power to be accessed and addressed in our collective discussions of what constitutes theory, social work practice, and how this relates to the kind of social workers students hope to become.

Social Work as a Discipline and Practice Formed by, and Negotiating, Global Power

The presentation of anthropological theory as emerging from specific historical periods and contexts, and authors as negotiating specific positions of power and privilege, is a perspective that I use in my own teaching. If many of the social work students I work with come to the classroom wanting to better the world, one of the things I try to do is to get them to think critically and to develop a more complex, historical understanding about some of the key concepts (sometimes unproblematically) used in social work. For example, when I introduce "social problems," "vulnerable groups" and "addicts," I attempt to show students how these categories have emerged at particular historical moments and bear with them specific ways of understanding the world: They can be linked to the will to transform existing power relations but they can also be used to maintain and normalise these relations.

For example, social work students preparing for their six-month student practice period with NGOs (often) located in the global south, sometimes have a very idealistic view of NGOs. I try to push them to interrogate the connections between institutions and global power—how the (sometimes small) NGO office they will be working with during their practice is complexly tied to, and negotiating, national, regional, as well as international discourses. NGO discourses must be understood in relation to global processes of neo-liberalisation, colonialism, and

imperialism; to how particular organisations are placed (unequally) in relationship to each other, and to how actors within these organisations negotiate power relations in sometimes contradictory ways. In particular I use readings which encourage students to think critically about what social work constitutes. Specifically I juxtapose how seemingly "hip" international social work discourses (such as "partnership," "empowerment," "capacity building" and "transparency") have been formed by uneven processes tied to economic globalisation with particularized accounts demonstrating how these discourses are being creatively translated and recontextualized. Critical discussions about the ways that modern ideas of progress and evolution are built into social work theory and ways of practicing when connected to their/our own experiences of education have also been useful for initiating an examination of the relationships among experience, theory and practice.

There exists a growing post-colonial critique of social work which calls for the "indigenization" of social work and is another useful educative tool in that it contextualizes knowledge production.[2] Most often produced by authors situated in the global south, the indigenization literature argues that the expansion of professional social work (i.e. the employment of trained social workers) around the world has been a form of imperialism and is Eurocentric in its theoretical and methodological base (most visibly the method of casework). I hope to provide my students with (often internationally based) readings which situate the development of social work in a history of globalisation as well as provide them with examples and even role models of resistance. Many creative social work methods grow from a deep understanding of the economic challenges and culturally specific forms of care and welfare that stretch Swedish understandings of what social work is, can, and should be. For example, instead of individualistic, psychology-influenced methods of "case work," in some social work training programs in such African countries as Kenya and Uganda, social work students focus on methods of community mobilization, environmental

2 For example, Midgely 1981, Walton and Medhat 1988 and Yip 2005.

advocacy, and learn "practical" skills such as building latrines and wells. I try to present them with useful examples of social workers around the world, people who have been "risk takers" and faced hazards in their commitment to social change. This is where at different historical periods and contexts social workers have worked not as a controlling arm of the state, but in opposition (and sometimes with great risk) to promote social change and social justice in their contexts. Some useful examples that provide role models for an understanding of an engaged social work include Chilean social workers during the Pinochet regime, South African social workers under apartheid, as well as many others who were influenced by liberation theology and the critical pedagogy of Paulo Freire.

Positioning Oneself/ Finding a Professional Position for Oneself

Another relevant perspective I take from my graduate studies among others who were committed to positive social change, is the importance of positioning ourselves in relation to power and privilege in specific contexts and how this can influence the kinds of professional roles we develop. For instance, Franz Boas, Zora Neale Hurston and perhaps most influential in my case, the work of African American anthropologist St. Clair Drake, were all crucial in my own "homing" efforts as an academic and a student of African American and Swedish ancestry. Contact with "role models" I could identify with helped me feel there *could* be a link made between what I often perceived as a distance between theory and practice— and demonstrated how it might be possible to both "keep it real" as well as "become" an academic. These anthropologists often revealed how their work was framed by their own experiences and pursued explicit commitments to producing an analysis of power that recognized race and racialisation (and in the case of Hurston also gender) as they impact especially minorities living in the US. Specifically, I introduce students to Boas's explicit critique against racial ideologies, Hurston's experimentation with anthropological literary conventions, and Drake's studies on black urbanism and expressed commitment to "aid in dissipating stereotypes about black people and in eliminating errors based on confusion between bio-

logical and environmental factors in accounting for observed racial differences."[3]

As a teacher, I attempt to challenge social work students to position themselves and their interests in becoming social workers in relationship to structural power and the (racist) history of paternalism and "development" in particular. This offers students the opportunity to think about themselves as more than merely raced/racialised, but rather, for the majority, this allows them to see themselves as white and thus privileged. This has particular challenges as Sweden in a national context that, after World War II, has cast itself as having an "exceptional" relationship to continental European histories of imperialism, colonialism and racial ideologies and has "officially" adopted a colour-blind strategy in relationship to questions of racialisation (though this has undergone significant critique in the last 5 years). Much of my own research and teaching has been around trying to situate Sweden in a postcolonial context where racial meanings have been a part of the way difference and hierarchical positions have been constructed intersectionally with understandings of gender, class, sexuality, as well as region.[4] I do this by presenting students with a variety of social work knowledge productions, ranging from social policy regarding forced sterilizations of women during the 1940s, state projects aimed at ending so-called "honour killings" to "development" projects working on reproductive health in South Africa. These are all ways to help them use and apply their theoretical skills to "the everyday."

Finally, introducing a post-colonial perspective to Swedish social work also means deconstructing popular Swedish (and also Anglo-Saxon) social work discourses on "cultural competency" by introducing students to more complex and dynamic understandings of culture that are situated firmly within an understanding of global, national, and institutional power and by showing the ways culture in Europe is often used as a metaphor for "race."

---

3 Citation is as he explained in a 1988 interview with George Clement Bond in Bond and Drake, 1988. See also Drake 1978 and Daniels, 2000.

4 See for example my work 2002, 2005. 2006.

"Homing"

So this is my story, one individual's reflections on her own experiences of education in anthropology and her current "homing" efforts in the field of social work in Northern Sweden. I tell this story in this biographical and anecdotal way to remind that anthropology is made up of individuals, their experiences, and their ways of interpreting the world through theory. And to stress that we as teachers need to make our own experiences visible to students, show how they are linked to the theories we use, and the choices we make as teachers, as researchers. Finding a home in academia for me has meant finding a way to make my experiences line up with the theory and practice I use in academia. It also has meant finding a way to make theory connect with my own practice by making my own experience visible in a manner that enables students to reflect and affirm their own experiences of academia. I believe we need to continue to connect anthropology (and social work) to students' experiences and understandings of power in the communities from which they come and to show how theory is not something coming from "out there" in books, but indelibly connected to their and our own everyday lives and communities. As I have argued, role models are incredibly important, not just as historical canonical figures, but also and ultimately, through our own examples as teachers of engaged praxis.

Acknowledgement

References

Bond, George Clement and John Gibbs St. Clair Drake
  1988 A Social Portrait of John Gibbs St. Clair Drake: An American Anthropologist. American Ethnologist, Vol. 15, No. 4: 7-74.

Dahl, Ulrika
  2005 Scener ur ett äktenskap: Om heteronormativitet i svensk Jämställdhetspolitik *In* Queer Sverige. Don Kulick Ed. Stockholm: Natur och Kultur.

Daniels, Timothy P.
  2000 Ruminations of Du Bois, Davis and Drake. Transforming Anthropology 9(1): 30-43.

Drake, John Gibbs St.Clair
  1978 Reflections on Anthropology and the Black Experience. Anthropology & Education 9(2): 85-109

Hernes, Helga Maria
  1987 Welfare State and Woman Power: Essays in state feminism. London: Norwegian University Press.

Lorenz, Walter
  1998 Social Work, Social Policies and Minorities in Europe. *In* Social Work and Minorities: European Perspectives. Charlotte Williams, Haluk Soydan, Mark Johnson, eds. Pp. 247-264. New York: Routledge.

Midgely, James
  1981 Professional Imperialism: Social Work in the Third World. UK: Heinemann.

Sawyer, Lena
  2002 Routings: Race, African Diasporas, and Swedish Belonging. Transforming Anthropology 11(1): 13-35.
  2005 Translating Empowerment: the Swedish State and an Immigrant Women's NGO in Stockholm. *In* Globalization and Culture, Linda Lucas, ed. Kampala: Freedom Press.
  2006 Racialization, Gender, and the Negotiation of Power in Stockholm's African Dance Courses. *In* Globalization and Race: Transformations in the Cultural Production of Blackness. Kamari Clarke and Deborah A. Thomas eds. Durham: Duke University Press.

Walton, Ronald G. and Medhat M. Abo El Nasr
  1988 Indigenization and Authentization in Terms of Social Work in Egypt. International Social Work 31(2):135-144.

Yip, Kam-shing
  2005 A dynamic Asian response to globalization in cross-cultural social work. International Social Work 48(5):593-607.

Politics of Apprehension:
Teaching about the Middle East in Uncertain Times

Afsaneh Kalantary
UC Santa Cruz

ABSTRACT: This paper engages with the complex ways in which current uncertain political conditions brought on by the politics of war and terror have produced new sets of fears, anxieties and obstacles for Middle Eastern anthropologists and scholars teaching about the Middle East in U.S. academia. Elaborating on issues pertaining to the democratic rights of academics, censorship, self-censorship, and the general parameters of academic freedom, the author hopes to raise questions on the current state of academic freedom in U.S. higher education.

Key words: Middle East; Academic Freedom; Practicing Democracy

Introduction

My paper engages with the complex ways in which current uncertain political conditions induced by the politics of war and terror have produced new sets of fears, anxieties and intellectual and political hurdles for Middle Eastern anthropologists and scholars teaching about the Middle East in U.S. academia. Using examples from my own experience of teaching about the Middle East and Iran, as well as pinpointing the current controversies involving other Middle Eastern Studies scholars, I will elaborate on issues pertaining to the democratic rights of academics, censorship, self-censorship, and the general parameters of academic freedom.

By way of introduction and to clarify my personal and intellectual trajectory and connection to the topic of this essay, I should note that I am an Iranian-American political exile. I am also an educator and a cultural anthropologist by training and for my dissertation research I have conducted ethnographic fieldwork with Iranian exiles in Berlin, Germany. Thus my scholarly interests are in a cross-disciplinary dialogue with the field of Middle Eastern Studies.

The purpose of my paper is to raise questions which contribute to a broader conversation on the current state of academic freedom in U.S. higher education. Initially I was emboldened by my project which aimed to highlight the current restrictions faced by Middle Eastern Studies scholars and wanted to seek practical solutions to overcome the current state of apprehension. However, at this point, in

light of new anxieties, brought on by the fear of an impending war against Iran[1] and my research into the history of contemporary purging and intimidation of academics in U.S. academe, I am not really sure if I have any solutions as to how to deal with the existing predicament faced by Middle Eastern Studies scholars other than simply to suggest to resist the stifling effects of the climate of fear and stand in solidarity with those affected.

Attacks on Middle East Studies Scholars

The tragic events of September 11th 2001, which allegedly put in motion the Bush administration's militaristic policies in the Middle East, have led to an exaggerated state of surveillance and silencing of dissent across the college campuses in the United States.[2] The Bush administration's staunch adherence to the cultural superiority of the "West" in order to advance its "civilizing mission" in the form of war and conquest and its appropriation of the discourse of human rights and democracy as a pretext for its permanent military aggression and empire building, jeopardizes the academic integrity, autonomy and even personal welfare of those scholars who do not support these expansionist and neo-colonial policies in the region. President Bush's post 9/11 "you are either with us or against us" stance in his declaration of permanent war against a ubiquitous enemy, that is, TERROR, did not grant any legitimacy for

dissenting views on U.S. policies in the Middle East and helped foster a climate of suspicion implicating those deemed unpatriotic. Therefore, those academics who deal with issues pertaining to U.S. policies and interventions in the Middle East, the history of colonialism or neocolonialism in the region and most significantly the Palestinian-Israeli conflict are forced to be in a constant state of vigilance lest their statements and writings be misconstrued, and read out of context and they be labelled as unpatriotic or suspected of lending support to terrorists or "rogue states," or better yet, their dossier end up in the websites such as Campus Watch catering to the right wing policy of silencing dissenters and censoring Middle Eastern Studies scholars.

In the following section, I will draw attention to some of the events that have had deleterious effects on the academic freedom of those engaged in the process of scholarship and teaching about the Middle East. These events highlight current attacks on the academic right to dissent and as with red-baiting during the 1950s, point to the ways in which those behind these attacks exploit the fear and anxiety the American public feels about faceless enemies abroad and their lack of historical and political knowledge in order to pursue their right wing expansionist agenda of creating a New American Century!

The report released by the National Research Council (NRC) on federal subsidies to programs of Middle East Studies (and other area studies programs) known as Title VI,[3] asking for accountability on the part of these programs, overrules academic independence from Department of Defense or intelligence agencies.[4] This report insists on greater coordination between the Department of Education, the State

---

1   This essay was initially written during George Bush's second term, thus it is permeated with the effects of his rhetoric of War on Terror and the ensuing politics of fear. It is too early to gauge the effect of Obama's rhetoric of hope and change on real practical shifts in the U.S. policy towards the Middle East. Although Obama's foreign policy is articulated in terms of diplomacy rather than war, the continuation of war in Afghanistan and its extension to Pakistan, as well as the current administration's uncritical stance on Israel's recent attack on Gaza do not herald peace and prosperity in the region. With respect to Obama's policy towards Iran, the jury is still out and the forthcoming presidential elections in Iran will probably play a decisive role in shaping Obama's policy towards Iran.

2   The author is cognizant of the fact that along with the state of fear, there have been heroic efforts by many scholars and students to resist stifling of academic freedoms and act in solidarity with those affected.

3   Title VI was initially introduced in 1958 to train experts who could meet the Cold War national defense needs of the United States. Therefore, from its inception it was a form of the U.S. government's intervention in scholarship on international and area studies programs. What is different now is the degree of direct involvement by defense and intelligence agencies and change in the areas of scholarship which align with the current national security needs.

4   See *Anthropology News*, May 2007, p. 39. The NRC report may be accessed here: http://books.nap.edu/html/11841

Department, the Department of Defense and the Office of National Intelligence in allocating subsidies. In light of this report, in 2005 the U.S. House of Representatives passed a higher education reform bill that would establish an independent advisory board to make recommendations that "will reflect diverse perspectives and the full range of views on world regions, foreign language, and international affairs." [5]

The House bill passed on 2005 states that "the events and aftermath of September 11, 2001, have underscored the need for the Nation to strengthen and enhance American knowledge of international relations, world regions, and foreign languages. Homeland security and effective United States engagement abroad depend upon an increased number of Americans who have received such training and are willing to serve their Nation." Therefore, this bill makes it obvious that it is the homeland security needs of the United States which directs the process of knowledge production about international relations.

According to this bill the education secretary can monitor how Middle East Studies departments use Federal funding and if they are producing suitable graduates for the U.S. diplomatic, intelligence and defense corps. That is, this bill requires the education secretary to allocate funds according to "the degree to which activities of centers, programs, and fellowships at institutions of higher education address national interests, generate and disseminate information, and foster debate on international issues from diverse perspectives." However, detractors of the bill, especially Middle East studies scholars, argue that this bill is not meant to foster diversity of scholarship and produce more well-rounded diplomats but merely to stifle dissent among the ranks of academics in Middle East and other area studies programs. While this bill directly affects scholars in Middle East and area studies programs, ultimately it has dire consequences for the academic freedom of anthropologists who research and teach about the Middle East.

Another example of a concerted effort to suppress independent research and dissenting views

in US academe is the report by Senator Joseph Lieberman and Lynne Cheney's American Council of Trustees and Alumni, made public on November 2001, "Defending Civilization: How Our Universities Are Failing America and What Can Be Done About It."[6] While this document claims to promote academic freedom and dissent, it argues for suppressing the views of academics who do not support US foreign policy. The Council of Trustees and Alumni went further to lay the foundation for the conservative Middle East Forum's McCarthyite blacklisting project, Campus Watch, a website that lists the names of "unpatriotic" professors—that is, those scholars who criticize US foreign policy and Israeli occupation. The website, the brainchild of Daniel Pipes, a right-wing medieval historian, encourages students to inform on their professors and calls the victims of its smear campaign "apologists for suicide bombings and militant Islam." Although opposition to Campus Watch and similar efforts to blacklist scholars and silence dissenting views in the academy is growing, some argue that it is more than merely the academic career of individuals that is at stake here, for blacklisting projects such as Campus Watch render their blacklisted targets susceptible to being charged with crimes punishable under the USA Patriot Act.

Nicholas De Genova, who was an assistant professor of Cultural Anthropology at Columbia University, provides a telling example. He received death threats and almost lost his job after he made statements in opposition against the impending Iraq war during a faculty teach-in in March 2003. Similarly, the 2008 tenure battle by Margo Ramlal-Nankoe and 2007 controversies revolving around the politicization of a teaching job offer for Wadie Said and tenure decisions on Nadja Abu El-Haj,

---

5   To read the complete text of H.R. 509: International Studies in Higher Education Act of 2005 refer to http://www.govtrack.us/congress/billtext.xpd?bill=h109-509

6   The American Council of Trustees and Alumnae (ACTA) was founded by Lynne Chaney, Joseph Lieberman and others in 1995. This organization was mainly launched in order to establish a conservative agenda in college campuses under the guise of supporting open-minded liberal arts education which mainly meant to counteract the post-60s relatively progressive political climate in many liberal arts college campuses in the aftermath of the pervasive student anti-Vietnam War movement and the support for the Civil Rights movement which had resulted in a demand for a multicultural education.

Joseph Massad, and Norman Finkelstein, scholars known for their critical stance on Israel's policies or the U.S./Israeli relations point to the many difficulties faced by the scholars whose personal views or scholarly work on the Middle East and Israeli/Palestinian issues deviate from the dominant orthodoxy.[7] The most recent example of this phenomenon is the right wing smear campaign on then presidential candidate Obama due to his acquaintance with Rashid Khalidi, a distinguished Palestinian scholar of Middle East and Palestinian history and of American foreign policy in the region. That is, the McCain campaign and right wing media insinuated that since Obama "knew" Khalidi, he was "anti-Israeli," and had "terrorist" connections, which by implication incriminated Khalidi, for his critical stance on Israel and U.S. Middle East policies.

The Fight Against the Myths and Stereotypes of the Middle East

While the threat of a U.S. war with Iran looms on the horizon, and the United States is burdened by the disastrous and deadly consequences of the Bush administration's invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq, the dominant discourse on the Middle East in general and Iran in particular is mired in a long history of Orientalist misconstrual, racist bigotry, and stereotypical mis-representations. For instance, the 2006 released movie *300,* depicting 300 Spartan soldiers' ostensibly "courageous" fight for "freedom" and "democracy" in the war of Thermopylæ against the "barbarian" Persian army in 480 B.C. is a grotesque example of popularized history lessons the American public is subjected to. Taken from a graphic novel by Frank Miller, this historical epic, with dubious factual basis, feeds into already sedimented popular apprehensions about the Middle East, Iran and Iranians and quite ingeniously lends support to the Bush administration's current Middle Eastern policies.

In light of the pervasive climate of surveillance, censorship and apprehension limiting the academic freedom of Middle Eastern Studies scholars, such lopsided portrayals point to other battles in which these very scholars are engaged. I use the previous movie example to highlight what I consider to be one of the major difficulties faced by scholars of Middle Eastern Studies in this country, namely the absolute dearth of unbiased and scholarly popular knowledge about the Middle East and the wide spread popular ignorance about all that has to do with the diverse communities of Muslims and/or assortment of Middle Eastern societies and peoples. Movies such as *300* or *Not Without My Daughter* and fictional narratives and memoirs posited as first-hand, "native informant" knowledge seem to be the staple of popular lore about the Middle East. One might wonder what all of this has to do with a community of diligent students who attempt to take courses about the Middle East and hopefully shed their stereotypical views. Based on my own limited teaching experience, my prognosis is not very positive.

On one hand, there is the task of dispelling the age-old stereotypical imaginary of a trans-historical Middle East in which a large geographical entity with heterogeneous national, ethno-cultural, religious, and linguistic histories is lumped together under the overarching category of "the Middle East" which at times also includes North African nations as well as Turkey and Central Asian nation-states. Many a time, the term Middle Eastern is conflated with being an Arab or a Muslim, disregarding the fact that not all those residing in the geographical region(s) delineated by the term "the Middle East" are Arabs, or even Muslims. That is, there are Christian and Jewish Arabs and also millions of Turkish, Persian, Azerbaijani, Baluchi, Turkoman and Kurdish non-Arabs inhabiting that region. Moreover, at times one has to emphasize that contrary to popular depictions and Hollywood stereotypes, not all Middle Easterners are devoutly or fanatically religious, rural or tribal; that they are not oil sheiks, do not all ride camels, dwell in tents, own harems, and most exasperating,

---

7   Wadie Said, the son of the late Edward Said, the world renowned Palestinian literary critic, was a candidate for a job as a professor of law at Wayne State University. Norman Finkelstein, who taught political science at DePaul University, lost his tenure case due to outside political pressure. Nadja Abu El-Haj, an anthropologist at Barnard College was granted tenure despite the controversy and the case of tenure for Joseph Massad, a professor of Middle Eastern Studies at Columbia, is pending. An assistant professor of Sociology at Ithaca College, Margo Ramlal-Nankoe's tenure was denied.

that not all Middle Eastern women are veiled or passive weaklings waiting for their Western saviours.

What makes the current attacks on the Middle Eastern Studies scholars most pernicious is that, as noted above, the field itself is already faced with a minefield of hegemonic cultural misunderstandings and downright prejudice against everything Middle Eastern. On one hand, in light of overall US American illiteracy on international politics and history in general and Middle Eastern history and politics in particular, the task of imparting knowledge and dispelling myths about the Middle East is a difficult one. On the other hand, in the current political climate, while the academic freedom of many long-established Middle Eastern Studies scholars has already been imperiled, non-tenured, adjunct and independent scholars are put in an ethical quandary. That is, they are left in a constant state of uncertainty as to whether to soften some of their positions or engage in self-censorship lest their already tenuous position be put at risk, or rather take their chances and state what is unpopular and pay the price for their outspokenness with their job and keep their integrity untarnished. For instance, in 2005 Douglas Giles, an adjunct professor of philosophy and religion at Roosevelt University of Chicago, IL was fired for allowing students in his class to ask questions about Judaism, Islam and Zionism. The chair of the department ordered the adjunct professor to censor his curriculum, restrict his students' questions, and forbade him to respond to controversial questions or comments from students pertaining to Judaism, Islam, the "Palestinian issue," and Zionism.

While my sketchy teaching experience might not suffice to build a case for the dominance of a climate of apprehension and surveillance, as noted above, there are plenty of other examples to make that very point. Granted, my personal teaching and scholarship experience is limited to my work at UC Santa Cruz, a liberal institution of higher education. However, even my task has not been uncomplicated. I can easily recall some of my own hesitations and anxiety-filled moments when I was vexed by the possibility of misapprehension of some of my statements in my classes by my not-so-supportive and at times antagonistic students. Furthermore, I still have a clear image of some of my fellow graduate students who in uncharacteristically hushed voices advised me to "be careful!" about publicly announcing my anti-war stance regarding the U.S. war against Afghanistan when the initial post 9/11 climate of fear seemed to be all-pervasive. I also recall a student's e-mail demanding clarification of some outrageous remarks made by the Iranian president Ahmadinejad, the president of the country from which I was exiled, implying that as an Iranian I was somehow responsible for these remarks!

While I was teaching a course on Iranian peoples and cultures a couple of years ago, and after I displayed some recent online photos from Iran, I was stunned by how most of my students were shocked to find Tehran a modern city with a sprawling cityscape. Moreover, not one of my students knew that in 2003, Shirin Ebadi, an Iranian woman, who was a lawyer and human rights activist became the first Iranian and Muslim woman to be awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for her pioneering work for democracy and human rights in Iran, particularly women and children's rights. Also, I was surprised how easily most of my students expressed compassion and understanding towards Iranian people after reading a journalistic account that discussed middle and upper-middle-class Iranian women's concern with plastic surgery and fashion, and some young men's and women's lax attitudes about sex; as if the only means by which my students could find a common ground with Iranian citizenry was through their shared U.S. American taste and sensibilities! Furthermore, despite my students' general stereotypical perceptions about what "dictatorship" and "lack of democracy" in Iran meant, the extent of the Islamic State's daily terror and its disciplinary power in creating new citizenry was unfamiliar to many of them. I am not sure if my many attempts to contextualize this political state of affairs in the long history of semi-colonial and neo-colonial power relations in the region were useful in assisting them to attain a nuanced view of the history and politics of modern state formation in Iran. Although I highlighted the fact that the democratically elected government of Dr. Mosaddeq, an Iranian nationalist, and the architect of the nationalization of the Iranian oil industry was overthrown in a 1953 coup d'état

orchestrated by the CIA and supported and funded by the U.S. and British governments, I am not convinced if some of my students were able to make any connections with US support for a monarchical tyranny and the revolution of 1979, notwithstanding my efforts to highlight that very connection.

Moreover, most of my students were not aware of the extent of daily resistance and the fight for justice and democratic rights mounted by Iranian students, and they were particularly unaware of the existence of a home-grown, indigenous women's rights movement in Iran. Most of my students were surprised to find out that Iranian women have been active participants in the major historical processes in the contemporary Iranian political landscape. They were astonished to hear that despite all the cultural and political setbacks, Iranian women have been fighting for women's equal rights and the abolition of misogynistic laws and that some of those active in women's rights movement have embarked on a project of reinterpreting Islamic teachings in order to improve Muslim women's lot. This information belied my students' stereotypical perceptions regarding the passivity of Muslim or veiled women. While in hindsight, I could take a breath of relief in realizing that attendance in my course might have helped dispel some of my students' misapprehensions, I am not convinced that taking one course or even a compilation of courses can overcome a long historical process of misconstrual and cultural racism. Notwithstanding the necessity of structural changes and shifts in racial politics and practices locally in U.S. American society and globally in terms of fair trade and global racial and social justice and economic and political power sharing, the process of dispelling the stereotypes and myths surrounding the Middle Eastern peoples and cultures is a slow and steady process. This process requires utmost personal fortitude and intel-

lectual perseverance in the face of provocation and at times simple luck—that is, having students with discerning eyes, curious enough to do some homework on their own. Or better yet, one might hope that a major transformation in U.S. foreign policy towards the Middle East would in turn necessitate a shift in dominant cultural representations of "everything Muslim, Middle Eastern or Iranian." In this paper, however, I do not intend to explore the conditions of possibility for such a drastic change.

As I had warned earlier, this paper merely draws attention to the myriad constraints faced by scholars whose academic research, teaching and writing touched on issues related to the current affairs in the Middle East in General and Israeli/Palestinian issues in particular. Thus the paper does not highlight strategies of resistance and counteraction on the part of scholars who do not support the imperial expansionist policies of the United States government in the Middle East and also stand up to the power of orthodoxy and the climate of fear. The jury on the suppression of dissenting views in the academy, however, is still out and I hope the recent surge in popular dissent will render more improbable the success of such efforts.

Acknowledgements

Participation and the State: Towards an Anthropological View of the 'New Participatory Paradigms'

Kathy Riley
University of Sussex

ABSTRACT: This paper reveals how certain academics approaching terms such as participation, or the state and civil society/community/masses/population, have re/conceptualized both the concepts themselves as well as the positions from which they can be studied. The paper traces the rise of critiques concerning participation in development—examining the particular issues of concern to anthropologists—before turning to the current debates taking place on the borderlines between anthropology and development. In this context, the work being produced as part of the Development Research Centre at the Institute of Development Studies in the UK is a central focus. Raising here the types of questions currently being asked about participation, the analysis addresses increasing concerns with governance, democracy as well as citizenship, and finally, anthropological views of the State, for there appears to be an emergence within participatory development of a rejection of the anti-statist development approach.

Keywords: anthropology, development, participation, state.

Introduction

It is widely accepted that 'Participation' as a development methodology has firmly entered the mainstream of development orthodoxy (see Reference, Bastian and Bastian 1996 to Cornwall 2002). In the UK some of the main proponents of this methodology have been working out of an organisation called the Institute of Development Studies (IDS). I refer to these development theorists as the 'neo-populists' (following Brown 1998:133-134). The work of the neo-populists (and other proponents of participatory development) has been strongly critiqued by anthropologists over the past three decades. The argument of this paper is that the dominant reaction of the neo-populists to the anthropological critique of participatory development has been to 'bring the state back in.' Whilst recent work by the neo-populists shows an awareness of the anthropological critique, their 'quick fix' (return of the state) rests on a particular conception of 'state' (and by association non-state) which anthropology can also show to be problematic.

The first section of this paper reviews the critiques of participatory development which have been formulated by anthropologists. The second section shows how a recognition of these critiques by the neo-populists has led to the emergence of a new neo-populist paradigm in which they argue for the (re)inclusion of the state. The third section demonstrates the problematic nature of the view of the state held by the neo-populists, through attention to

anthropological approaches to the state. Finally this paper concludes by looking at an ethnographic example of the pervasive ambiguity of enacting the state (see Herzfeld 1992).

The neo-populist work examined in this paper comes from the Participation, Power and Social Change team at IDS. Most British writers on participation take the 'original proponent' of participation to be Robert Chambers (a long term IDS researcher, currently on the Participation, Power and Social Change team). However, his work is heavily reliant on the earlier notions of participation from Paulo Friere and the liberation theologists.

Anthropological Critiques Of Participatory Development

The first section of this paper outlines the critiques of participatory development which have been made by anthropologists. The critiques focus on six aspects of participatory development: the use of change agents, the idea of 'partnership,' the hidden nature of 'the gift,' the idea of 'community,' the role of 'experts,' and the use of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) as the purveyors of participatory development.

The use of 'change agents' in participatory development (which claims to be 'bottom up') has been pointed out to be paradoxical. Midgley saw that whilst proponents of community participation attack the 'top-down' approach they "do not seem to realise that their own approach is riddled with paternalism" (1986:35); this he related particularly to the use of "change agents." Midgley criticises the moral element of the heroic community worker and points out that the very act of introducing a community worker "is an external imposition" (35-36). Green sees the claimed need for a change agent as amounting to "a denial of the poor's capacity for agency to bring about social change by themselves on their own terms" (2000:70). Stirrat points specifically to the role of mobilisers and facilitators in reinventing the "sense of community which it is believed was once there" (1996:74; see Mosse 1997 on the recreation of imagined past idyllic systems).

This paradox lies at the heart of a Freirian approach to development. Paulo Freire's work retains the Marxist quandary of false consciousness, to which he introduces the 'dialectic educator' who possesses "the secret formula of a power to which they [the oppressed] must be initiated" (Rahnema 1992:123). The participatory development promoted by the neo-populists in the UK (see Brown 1998) is heavily reliant on the earlier work and ideas of Freire, and thus faces the same criticism (see Stirrat 1996).

Notions of 'partnership' and 'equality' in development interventions have also been questioned. Crewe and Harrison point out that the "rhetoric of partnership often disguises considerable inequalities in the power and choices of supposed institutional 'partners'" (1998:181).

In "Development as Gift," Stirrat and Henkel (1997) use Mauss's work on gift-giving to reveal that the giving and receiving of gifts reaffirms social hierarchies. Development institutions transform the donor gift (of money) into a gift of advice for the recipient, which is heavily conditional making partnerships problematic. Thus the idea of 'partnership' obfuscates inequalities. Development practitioners rarely see themselves as involved in a gift relationship, preferring 'contractual' metaphors (Eyben 2006:88-9).

A nostalgia for 'community' has long been part of populist development ideology (Robertson 1984: 142). Participatory development models have tended to treat 'community' as a homogenous, and harmonious collective (Gardner and Lewis 1996, Gujit and Shah 1998). In so doing, differences in gender, age, class/caste, or ethnicity have been obscured. In reality, as Stirrat notes, "the notion of 'the village' or 'the community' as a significant social unit is difficult to sustain" (1996:72). This 'myth of community' is based on a solidarity model of community in which it is seen as a natural social entity which can be represented (Cleaver 2001).

Rather than viewing 'participatory' interventions as emancipatory, participation has been shown to reinforce social hierarchies. Pottier has observed, in his work in participatory workshops in Magindu, Tanzania, that the language used in the workshops defined 'us' and 'them', and also legitimised "particular sets of codes, rules and roles" (1997:220). He asks whether participatory workshops bring people together (as they claim in the concept of community building), or if in fact they recreate social distance.

When participatory projects are implemented project staff takes on the role of 'experts.' In Mosse's ethnography he observed that "project workers became problem solvers, suppliers of products [...], influential people with connections [...], experts or advocates" (2005:81). This was felt more strongly by Burghart when he took part in a participatory project in Nepal. He found that he was transformed into a 'lord' in villager understandings, and his attempts to reject this position received angry responses from village participants (Burghart 1993).

There has been an assumption that NGOs are the natural purveyors of participatory methodologies. Stirrat and Henkel make the point that it is NGOs that transform the gift of the donor into a "heavily conditional gift" (1997:66). On a more practical level the Edwards and Hulme volume *Beyond the Magic Bullet* questions the assumptions made about NGOs as cost effective, sustainable, and fostering popular participation (1996). They point out that little or no evidence is provided to support these claims. In terms of 'NGO accountability' they amply demonstrate a severe lack of 'downward' accountability in NGOs, and only a moderate 'upward' accountability.

This critique of NGOs has led to a call in recent years to 'bring back the state' (Akbar 1999; Fung and Wright 2001). It is my argument that the image of the 'State' in this neo-populist proposal is discordant with recent anthropological explorations of The State.

The Neo-populists and the Return of 'The State'

To a limited extent the anthropological critiques of participatory development (outlined above) have been heard by the proponents of participatory development methodologies. In particular anthropologists working within IDS have called for research to address some of these issues:

> Strikingly few accounts of participatory mechanisms in practice give us any idea about who actually participates; we get little sense of who exactly is speaking for or about whom, and how they themselves would regard their own entitlements and identities as participants. [Cornwall 2002:29]

The desire of development theorists is to place greater emphasis on practice, and what the 'lived experience' of participation (and citizenship) 'tells us.'[1] However, the most notable change to the neo-populist approach has been a re-engagement with the idea of state involvement in participatory development.

During the 1980s and 1990s, versions of participation encountered in the work of the 'neo-populists' had in common "a feeling of unease and scepticism about the value of state-centred approaches to rural development"[2] (Stirrat 1996:68). In contrast the 'new' language of the participatory rhetoric (by no coincidence coming from within the same institution as the 'old' language) is very much concerned with the involvement of the state, understood in terms of 'governance,' 'citizenship' and 'rights.'

The reappearance of the state in development thinking has predominantly come in the form of 'empowered participatory governance,' as presented by Archon Fung and Erik Olin Wright (2001). The goal of this approach is that "ordinary people can effectively participate in and influence policies that directly affect their lives" (2001:7). I wish to concentrate on how these notions are located within discussions of participatory development.

The state has emerged in discussions of participation alongside the idea of participation as a change-agent for citizens. Andrea Cornwall and John Gaventa call for a "more active and engaged citizenry... *and* a more responsive and effective state" (2001:32).[3] Andrea Cornwall's working paper on participation in development (2002) draws together many of the anthropological views of participation, with the move towards the inclusion of the state. Cornwall's approach to including the state in participatory development relies heavily on the 'creation of

---

1   The latter concern comes from John Gaventa, seminar 02/04/04.

2   Although Stirrat refers specifically to rural development he admits that this suspicion of the state is shared by the macro-economic orthodoxies that he avoids by using the term "rural" (87 n. 2).

3   Simultaneously, these authors display an emerging notion of scales of participation—from "phoney" to "real."

space.' Following Lefebvre's notion of social space as produced space Cornwall examines how participation is *situated* within different spaces. She explores how new participatory mechanisms may create "new kinds of spaces between, within and beyond the domains of 'state' and 'civil society,' reconfiguring their boundaries and intersections" (Cornwall 2001:4). Cornwall explains that the primary concern of these mechanisms is to "enhancing equity." This gives rise, she claims, to a concern for more democratic institutions. With these new mechanisms in place "in some contexts, citizens become part of 'the state'" (2001:4). Cornwall relies here on a strict division between 'citizen' and 'state' to which we will return towards the end of this paper.

This work on 'spaces' and 'participatory mechanisms' shows a continued tendency for idealised stereotypes of who fills the 'spaces' of participatory mechanisms,[4] alongside a continued blinkeredness towards other structures and processes which contribute to everyday experiences of 'poverty' (see Stirrat 1996). But beyond this, it relies on a very simplified idea of 'the state.' The final section of this paper explores anthropological approaches to 'the state' which point to a more complex and situated set of experiences than those conceptualised by the authors at IDS.

An Insufficient Version of 'The State'

The entry of the state into ethnographic analysis was based on two changes in the way 'the state' was perceived. Firstly, a re-conceptualisation of the existence of the state through the work of Foucault (1977) alongside the work of Anderson (1983), Mitchell (1991) and Taussig (1992, 1997). Secondly, through explorations in perceiving the state though ethnography (see Gupta 1995; Coronil 1997; Geschiere 1997; Taussig 1997; Hansen and Stepputat 2001). A forerunner of this particular view of the state is found in the writing of A.R. Radcliffe-Brown (as Taussig points out revealingly nicknamed 'Anarchy' Brown in his student years) who referred to the state as a 'fiction of the philosophers,' as not existing in a phenomenological sense as an entity "over and above the

human individuals who make up a society" (quoted in Taussig 1992:112). As such 'the state' can now be perceived as alike to myth—or as Taussig eloquently puts it: "God, the economy, and the State, abstract entities we credit with being" (1997:3, citing Philip Abrams for the concept of substituting the word God for State). A more restrained version of this concept is put forward by Mitchell, who refers to the state as 'structural effect' which should be studied "not as an actual structure, but as a powerful, metaphysical effect of practices that make such structures appear to exist" (1991:94). None of these approaches should be confused with questioning the power of states themselves. Neither author takes the state as being less powerful for being so imagined or constructed: "For what the notion of State fetishism directs us to is precisely the existence and reality of the *political power* of this *fiction*, its powerful insubstantiality" (Taussig 1992:113). As Ferguson and Gupta argue, taking states as imagined (citing Anderson), constructed entities "conceptualised and made socially effective through particular imaginative and symbolic devices" (2002:981) opens these devices to study.

So how do these anthropological approaches to the state relate to the current discussion of the state and participation? The images created of the state by the neo-populists are images of real, existing structures. They lack ethnographic evidence about what 'the state' means, instead drawing on bounded notions of 'state' and 'society' which in reality are not only unclear, but "fluid and negotiable according to social context and position" (Fuller and Harriss 2001:15). It is not only that the state as it exists is not a "discrete, unitary actor" (2001:22), but the very concept of state is a "composite reality and mythecized abstraction" (Foucault 1991:103). The ideal of the state held by Fung and Wright (and followed by others) rests on a version of 'governmentality' formulated in the sixteenth century between state centralisation and religious dissidence (see Foucault 1991:88). It also heavily rests on the eighteenth century formulation of 'population' as the "ultimate end of government" (1991:100). What is presented as a secular, culturally neutral conception is deeply rooted in particular ways of perceiving the world, indeed "ways of knowing" (see Hobart 1993).

---

4   As in Cornwall's discussion on the transformation of spaces by the "powerless" (2002:9).

Making Complex the Division Between 'Citizen' and 'State'

Guillermo Torres is a local government delegate. In this role he takes responsibility for translating government policy to make it understandable to his electorate. He also takes the problems of his electorate to the municipality's civil servants. At least, that is what he does Monday to Friday. On Saturday he runs a neighbourhood baseball group, encouraging the neighbourhood's young men to play in the city's league. On Sundays he attends his local church, where he is well known and respected. Monday evenings he teaches local history to school children. Tuesday evenings he attends an evening class for local retirees.

Miguel Antonio is a civil servant. He lives in the same block as Guillermo. Most evenings he plays dominoes with neighbours and friends. He used to play baseball in Guillermo's team, but the lure of good food and the current soap opera won out in recent years. Miguel also sells bottles of imported whiskey on the black market, an income which pays for his cleaner and an occasional item of furniture for the front room. His black market enterprise is reliant on the motorbike he has been provided with for his work as a civil servant.

Both Guillermo and Miguel have elderly mothers. Both of their mothers rely on the same state run cafeteria for their daily lunches. The state cafeteria is an important social space for them. Regular users of the cafeteria hold poetry readings, and mark national celebrations with parties held in the cafeteria. Both of their mothers have a network of friends from the cafeteria who step in to provide support if they are ill.

The Neighbourhood Council, where Guillermo works, is responsible, among other things, for collecting fines from citizens who have broken regulations. A queue regularly forms outside the Council building of disgruntled individuals preparing to argue their case against their notification letters. Guillermo sits at his desk and addresses their cases one by one.

These brief ethnographic vignettes highlight the complex daily interactions of individuals with 'the state.' The lives of Guillermo, Miguel and their mothers are all interwoven with state structures and state services. There are no fixed boundaries between their lives as 'citizen' and their lives as 'state agents/recipients.' In the IDS literature the state is imagined as a real, existing structure. Ethnographic evidence about the state contradicts this image. Bounded notions of 'state' and 'society' are shown not to reflect ethnographic reality.

This paper has examined current debates within one area of development theory, that of the neo-populists, and has shown them rejecting earlier anti-statist viewpoints and moving towards discussions of governance, citizenship and the state. Juxtaposing this work with particular views of the state coming from within anthropology indicates emerging problems with the 'new' terminology, and thereby conception. The conclusion is that simplistic notions of 'state' versus 'civil society' need to be closely examined, and attention must be paid to the importance of historical and contextual daily *experiences* of political structures.

References

Akbar Zaidi, S.
1999   NGO Failure and the Need to Bring Back the State. Journal of International Development 11(2):256-71.

Anderson, Benedict
1983 Imagined Communities. London: Verso.

Bastian, Sunil and Nicola Bastian, eds
1996   Assessing Participation: a Debate from South Asia. Delhi: Konark Publishers.

Brown, David
1998   Professionalism, Participation and the Public Good: Issues of Arbitration in Development Management and the Critique of the Neo-populist Approach. *In* Beyond the New Public Management: Changing Ideas and Practices in Governance. Martin Minogue, Charles Polidano and David Hulme, eds. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Burghart, Richard
1993   His Lordship at the Cobblers' Well. *In* An Anthropological Critique of Development: The Growth of Ignorance. Mark Hobart, ed. London: Routledge.

Cleaver, Frances
2001   Institutions, Agency and the Limitations of Participatory Approaches to Development. *In* Participation: The New Tyranny? Bill Cooke and Uma Kothari, eds. London: Zed Books.

Cornwall, Andera and John Gaventa
2001   Bridging the Gap: Citizenship, Participation and Accountability. PLA Notes 40, IIED.

Cornwall, Andrea
2002   Making Spaces, Changing Places: Situating Participation in Development. IDS Working Paper 170. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.

Coronil, Fernando
1997   The Magical State: Nature, Money and Modernity in Venezuela. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Crewe, Emma and Elizabeth Harrison
1998   Whose Development? An Ethnography of Aid. London: Zed Books.

Edwards, Michael and David Hulme (eds.)
1996   Beyond the Magic Bullet: NGO Performance and Accountability in the Post-Cold War World. Connecticut: Kumarian Press.

Eyben, Rosalind.
2006   The Power of the Gift and the New Aid Modalities. IDS Bulletin 37(6):88-98.

Ferguson, James and Akhil Gupta
2002   Spatializing States: Toward an Ethnography of Neoliberal Governmentality. American Ethnologist 29(4):981-1002.

Foucault, Michel
1977   Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. London: Penguin Books.
1991   Governmentality. *In* The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality. Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller, eds. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Fuller, C.J. and John Harriss
2001   For an Anthropology of the Modern Indian State. *In* The Everyday State and Society in Modern India. C.J. Fuller and Véronique Bénéï, eds. London: Hurst and Company.

Fung, A. and E.O. Wright
2001   Deepening Democracy: Innovations in Empowered Local Governance. Politics and Society 29(1):5-41.

Gardener, Katy and David Lewis
1996   Anthropology, Development and the Post-Modern Challenge. London: Pluto Press.

Geschiere, Peter
1997   The Modernity of Witchcraft: Politics and the Occult in Postcolonial Africa. Virginia: University of Virginia Press.

Green, Maia
2000   Participatory Development and the Appropriation of Agency in Southern Tanzania. Critique of Anthropology 20(1):67-89.

Gujit, Irene and Meera Kaul Shah
1998   The Myth of Community: Gender Issues in Participatory Development. London: Intermediate Technology Publications.

Gupta, Akhil
  1995 Blurred Boundaries: The Discourse of
        Corruption, the Culture of Politics, and
        the Imagined State. American Ethnologist
        22(2):375-402.
Hansen, Thomas Blom and Finn Stepputat
  2001 States of the Imagination: Ethnographic
        Explorations of the Postcolonial State. Durham
        and London: Duke University Press.
Herzfeld, M.
  1992 The Social Production of Indifference:
        Exploring the Symbolic Roots of Western
        Democracy. Chicago: University of Chicago
        Press.
Hobart, Mark, ed
  1993 An Anthropological Critique of Development:
        The Growth of Ignorance. London: Routledge.
Midgley, James
  1986 Community Participation, Social
        Development and the State. London and New
        York: Methuen.
Mitchell, Timothy
  1991 The Limits of the State: Beyond Statist
        Approaches and Their Critics. The American
        Political Science Review 85(1):77-96.
  1999 Society, Economy and the State Effect.
        In State/Culture: State Formation After the
        Cultural Turn. George Steinmetz, ed. Ithica, NY:
        Cornell University Press.
Mosse, David
  1997 The Ideology and Politics of Community
        Participation: Tank Irrigation Development in
        Colonial and Contemporary Tamil Nadu. In
        Discourses of Development: Anthropological
        Perspectives. R.D. Grillo and R.L. Stirrat, eds.
        Oxford: Berg.
  2005 Cultivating Development: An Ethnography of
        Aid Policy and Practice. London: Pluto Press.

Pottier, Johan
  1997 Towards an Ethnography of Participatory
        Appraisal and Research. In Discourses of
        Development: Anthropological Perspectives.
        R.D. Grillo and R.L. Stirrat, eds. Oxford: Berg.
Rahnema, Majid.
  1992 Participation. In The Development
        Dictionary: a Guide to Knowledge as Power.
        Wolfgang Sachs, ed. London: Zed Books.
Robertson, A.E.
  1984 People and the State: an Anthropology of
        Planned Development. Cambridge: Cambridge
        University Press.
Stirrat, R.L.
  1996 The New Orthodoxy and Old Truths:
        Participation, Empowerment and Other Buzz
        Words. In Assessing Participation: a Debate from
        South Asia. Sunil Bastian and Nicola Bastian,
        eds. Delhi: Konark Publishers.
Stirrat, R.L and Heiko Henkel
  1997 The Development Gift: the Problem of
        Reciprocity in the NGO World. The Annals of
        the American Academy of Political and Social
        Science 554:66-80.
Taussig, Michael
  1992 Maleficum: State Fetishism. In The Nervous
        System. London: Routledge.
  1997 The Magic of the State. New York and
        London: Routledge.

"Communities," Anthropology and the Politics of Stakeholding: The Challenges of an Inorganic Activist Anthropology

Kristen E.G. Hudgins
University of South Carolina, Columbia

ABSTRACT This paper draws on my experiences creating and implementing the South Carolina Migrant Farmworker Resource Project, an activist endeavour with an anthropological approach. My discussion of the project focuses on the difficulties of managing stakeholder interests while working among various community organizations and simultaneously accessing the input of the community to be served. I use community in quotes to problematize assumptions and to question what makes a community, if not self-defined. Challenges in definition, collaboration, planning, implementation, and sustainability are examined through a critique of inorganic, participatory research and the difficulties of trying to engage in applied anthropology.

Keywords: participatory research, community, collaboration, implementation, sustainability

This article is an endeavour to pull apart and discuss one of my experiences attempting collaborative and participatory research within the context of engaging in activist and applied anthropology. In many ways, this paper is more about me and the questions I faced in trying to design and execute a project than it is about the project itself. Therefore this paper is a telling of the pitfalls of trying to use a participatory approach to research, which even after all of this I still think is a goal that I will always strive toward. It is a reflection and a re-evaluation of what I attempted to do and what I actually managed to accomplish in a way that I hope may help others who find themselves in similar positions.

For the past four years now, I have lived and gone to school in South Carolina. In that time I have worked in various aspects with the growing Latino/a community there, largely within research based contexts and often revolving around health issues. It was in this time that I became interested not only in collaborative and participatory approaches and how they might enhance and improve research design, but also in how to bridge gaps between community stakeholders.

Let me begin at the beginning. I received a year-long fellowship from North Carolina-based Student Action with Farmworkers (SAF) which is a non-profit organization "whose mission is to bring students and farmworkers together to learn about each other's lives, share resources and skills, improve conditions for farmworkers, and build diverse coalitions working for social change" (SAF 2009). As a

SAF fellow I was tasked with developing a project related in some way to farmworkers, and we were to do so with a community-based organization of our choosing within our state. It should be noted here that I never found a community-based organization in South Carolina that was made up of farmworkers.

I knew that I wanted to do an applied project and from experience working with different, although largely Latino/a communities in South Carolina, I knew that healthcare access was an important issue in the state. For this reason, I chose the South Carolina Hispanic/Latino Health Coalition (SCHLHC) as my community partner in large part because I was already familiar with some of their work. Additionally, I felt they would serve well as an umbrella organization of sorts and that they would be able to facilitate my entrée to work with smaller community-based organizations. The SCHLHC lead me to the South Carolina Primary Health Care Association's (SCPHCA) Migrant Health Program, and it was with this community-based organization that I worked most closely with. The majority of the fieldwork and research that I did for this project was facilitated by the SCPHCA through their clinics for farmworkers and the summer interns placed with them by SAF. All of these influences led me to create—under the auspices and influences of many interested parties—the South Carolina Migrant Farmworker Health Resource Project.

Throughout 2006 I worked with several different community organizations on the project in order to develop a booklet, which was designed to help farmworkers more easily access low-cost healthcare resources throughout the state of South Carolina. The booklet is written in both Spanish and English, is organized by county, and gives basic information for all hospitals, urgent care centers, health departments, and community-based migrant health clinics. It is this applied research that I focus on. Additionally, this paper is concerned with whether or not this particular project merits the classification of having used a participatory approach, and asks the question: how does one do collaborative research when it is difficult to determine who constitutes the "community" you are working with?

Participatory research has been characterized in many ways, and here I provide only a small slice of the scholarship on the subject. Budd Hall (1993) describes it broadly, writing, "Participatory research fundamentally is about the right to speak" (xvii). Here Hall is referring to the collaborative course of action that a participatory approach necessitates in its goals to engage in "a process which combines three activities: research, education, and action" (xiv). Peter Park (1993) further states that: "participatory research begins with a problem…the sense of the problem arises from the people who are affected by it and whose interest demands that it be solved. And the problem is social in nature and calls for a collective solution" (8). I take heart in Patricia Maguire's (1993) approach that: "even the modest successes of *attempting* this alternative research approach may help others find the courage to learn by doing rather than being immobilized and intimidated by ideal standards" (1993:158). It is within her work that I draw a lot of inspiration for this paper to critically examine my role within the Health Resource Project.

In identifying an interest and commitment to doing participatory and collaborative research, I needed to decide whom I was collaborating with. I saw myself as working for the interests of farmworkers and I felt that this was the group that I was working for as I saw the health resource booklet as being for their use and benefit. However, as will become clear further on in the paper, farmworkers are a highly diverse and often mobile group and thus in many ways hard to define as a "community." It was for this reason that the majority of my sustained interactions and participatory feedback throughout the project were with the representatives of community-based groups, service providers, and volunteers more so than with farmworkers themselves. In order to understand the process of how the project came about and was conducted, it is important to define the project stakeholders, whom I see as the farmworkers, the community-based organizations with whom I was working, service providers, and myself.

I had originally conceived of this project as participatory, collaborative, and constructed in large part along the lines that farmworkers saw as most pressing for them; however, in choosing to work with

healthcare-based community organizations, I had already predetermined my starting point for the project. This is a large part of why I see this project to be inorganic and not participatory, because *I* determined the parameters of the project, and not the farmworkers. What I have come to realize is that my project was not so much about farmworkers' needs as defined by farmworkers as much as those needs were defined by the community-based organizations that in some ways spoke for the farmworkers. It is here that I feel I failed utterly in the Freirian model of a liberation and participatory model (Freire 1974).

Throughout the project I easily involved the community-based organizations, but struggled to establish contact with farmworkers. In this way I was trying to follow what Rylko-Bauer and van Willigen (1993) state as the key to collaborative research, which involves "decision makers and other potential stakeholders (e.g. community members) in the research process so as to identify their information needs, develop relevant research design and methods that have face validity, identify ways in which clients can use the research and increase their interest and commitment to doing so" (1993:140). As I floundered through the project trying to figure out political relationships between groups—which could be complicated by funding issues for example—I found myself not only engaging in an activist, applied anthropology, but also engaging in an ethnography of community-based organizations in an attempt to understand their constituencies and agendas and where I fit in to the matrix of these relationships.

So whom exactly was I working for? I still struggle with this question. There were many cooks in the kitchen and I think that is the nature of collaborative work. The lack of bounded notions of who farmworkers were led me to rely more heavily upon community-based organizations than on any particular farmworking "community." The community-based organizations were my gatekeepers and my primary stakeholders as well, which in some ways complicated matters and yet made us mutually dependent upon one another to get the project done and the booklet produced. But it wasn't until recently that I realized that they were my primary stakeholders in this project, not farmworkers per se. In this work I

have often seen myself as a pinball bouncing off of different interests and groups while trying desperately not to fall down the chute.

The original goal for this project was to make it participatory in nature so that it would most accurately represent the needs of the "community" that I saw myself working with—being farmworkers. My first problem became obvious when I realized that I didn't know what constituted a community within this context (see Chavez 1994 for a discussion of Latin American immigrants and notions of community). Farmworkers in South Carolina, as in other states, are a diverse and highly mobile group from different national, social, and sometimes linguistic backgrounds—so are they a community on the sole basis of their shared occupation? Even this can be considered highly differential as farmworkers face different working conditions based on time of year, crop worked, and documented status. So what might constitute a farmworker community?

Statistics on farmworkers in South Carolina can be difficult to come across and their accuracy is questionable with regard to issues of census undercounts, and the invisibility of the farmworking labour force in the United States (Kingsolver 2007). The U.S. Department of Labor considers there to be "two distinct classes of farmworkers: migrant agricultural workers and seasonal agricultural workers" (Rosenbaum and Shin 2005:6). A migrant farmworker is someone whose primary employment is in seasonal agriculture, travels for work and lives in temporary housing. A seasonal farmworker may work in seasonal agriculture, but has a permanent residence in the community.

It has been reported that migrant farmworkers tend to be foreign-born whereas most seasonal farmworkers are U.S.-born (SAF 2007). The Department of Labor estimates that three quarters of the hired farm work force in the United States were born in Mexico. And more than 40 percent of crop workers were migrants, meaning they had travelled at least 75 miles in the previous year to get a farm job.

The main crops produced with the work of farmworkers in South Carolina are peaches, watermelons, tobacco, apples, strawberries, various vegetables (such as cucumbers, soybeans, and peanuts), forestry and

nursery work. "Seventeen percent of the state's economic product and 1 in 5 jobs are linked to the food, fiber and forestry industry" (South Carolina Agriculture and Forestry). Generally speaking, hired farmworkers are largely recent immigrants from Latin America—although other groups such as African Americans, Haitians, and immigrants from the West Indies have also historically worked as hired farm labour in the state. According to Lacy (2006), most farmworkers who work in South Carolina live beneath the poverty level, are mainly Spanish speaking with a limited proficiency in English, lack transportation, health insurance, and access to other social service resources. The statistics for SC are that 1,400 farmworkers or so arrive on H2A visas specifically to do farmwork for a maximum of a 10 month expected stay (depending on the crop they are working) and are supposed to receive a minimum of $8.00 an hour (Lacy 2006).

As per the SCPHCA's Migrant Health Program staff, the majority (being about 95%) of farmworkers they work with are Latino/a—these same statistics were echoed by the representatives of five different health centres serving migrant and seasonal farmworkers around the state. My personal contact with farmworkers indicates that many people take advantage of different labour opportunities throughout the year moving back and forth between farmwork and other forms of low-wage labour—such as working in restaurants or in construction. It is posited by many who work with farmworkers that workers classified as migrants tend generally to be young men working their way from crop to crop for the short term, whereas seasonal farmworkers are more likely to include men, women, and children. The distinction between seasonal and migrant farmworkers can be an important one with regard to funding and access to certain benefits.

Armed with this knowledge, I set out to engage these different types of farmworkers, but caught myself wondering if differences and similarities in occupation across such varied national and linguistic lines could constitute a sense of community. Social scientists have conceptualized communities in several different ways throughout time as based on place, interest, and attachment around notions of inclusion

and exclusion (Wilmott 1986). Marx (1967[1867]) saw community as linked to labour, which was certainly my first assumption choosing a group with a similar labour background. However I did not know if that is how farmworkers chose to see themselves, particularly if they are engaged in other labour activities outside of farmwork. Anderson (1983) pointed us to think of communities as imagined and Chavez (1994) reminds us that immigrant communities in particular maintain many transnational ties linking them back to their home communities. I would contend that notions of identity and community are fluid and relative to the situation, context, and perhaps even the mood of the person whom you are asking.

Communities of place revolve around geography, whereas communities of interest may be seen as occupational groupings or organized around hobbies, and communities of attachment are a bit more nebulous and are often arranged upon notions of ethnicity, political leanings, and lifestyle, for example. But can one not belong to several different communities without necessarily privileging any one over any other? Watts (2000) notes that a community is: "an extraordinarily dense social object and yet one that is rarely subject to critical scrutiny" and "is often invoked as a unity, as an undifferentiated thing with intrinsic powers, that speaks with a single voice" (2000: 37). At this point, it is beginning to appear that "communities" to some extent are always somewhat externally defined. But to what degree did I feel comfortable defining farmworkers for the purposes of my project? I felt that I needed some sort of bounded group in order to be able to engage them in the participatory process: if you are going to use community collaboration, you need a community, right?

Needless to say, I grappled with this question over and over again. In an ideal world I wanted to work with farmworkers and have their feedback and their ideas about what they needed and wanted from the project. I quickly came back to this central question….who are farmworkers? Are they communities of interest as they share a general occupation? But aren't the divisions within that occupation sometimes more important? Or the crops they work on? What about where they are from—does that count as a community of geography or of attachment?

Wouldn't it depend on how the farmworkers defined themselves, and wouldn't those definitions change based upon any number of variables? Considering the highly diversified farmworking community, who exactly was I trying to target? Was I talking about migrant farmworkers, family farm owners, immigrant farmworkers, native-born farmworkers, or seasonal farmworkers?

Given the mobility and high degree of variation among farmworkers in the state, I decided that I would take a two-pronged approach to looking at issues faced by South Carolina's farmworkers. I chose to engage in outreach and clinic programs run through the SCPHCA Migrant Health Program, in order to have direct communication with farmworkers, as well as working with the community-based healthcare providers themselves. By moving back and forth between these two groups and within the webs that connected them—firmly at times and tenuously at others—I was able to start constructing a picture of how the stakeholders were placed and how this shaped their perceptions of farmworker needs, as well as how these perceptions intersected or varied.

The community organizations I was working with had a keen interest in the obstacles that farmworkers faced in trying to get their health needs met. Through time spent with farmworkers, primarily in healthcare settings, it is my impression that it is those involved in seasonal work who most often take advantage of the healthcare opportunities targeted specifically toward farmworkers. It is difficult for me to say how representative this group is as they were all people who are already seeking healthcare. Moreover, as seasonal farmworkers they are more likely to be acquainted with the healthcare resources in their area than migrant workers might be. To this extent, the people I was interacting with were the people less likely to need the aid the booklet was designed to provide, indicating to me that I was missing the input of those who the project was developed to serve. This became a point of frustration for me, because even though I continued working on the project with the resources I had available to me in the frame of participatory collaborators, it was difficult for me to let go of the specific participants that I had visualized myself working with through the process of developing the booklet.

In order to compile the health resource book, I used the blueprint of other resource booklets—for the state and nationwide—that had been produced in the past and modified them to be what I hope is more user-friendly in language and layout. Throughout this whole process I would continually take my work back to the service providers, community organizations, and to SAF, as well as discuss the project with farmworkers I met in migrant camps and clinics in order to get their input. What I most felt through this whole process was that I was being pulled in different directions and being given varied instructions by different stakeholders (in this case primarily being SAF, the health coalition, and the Migrant Health Program and their affiliates throughout the state)—particularly with regard to the layout and design of the booklet.

Everyone was interested in having a final product, but all had different levels of investment in the project. The SCPHCA Migrant Health Program and service providers regularly got back to me about the content of the book as well as the formatting, the SCHLHC was interested in costs of printing the book, and SAF wanted to be able to say that I'd finished what I had set out to do. The onus fell upon me to determine the direction of the project and to decide what it would and would not include based on the support being provided (or not being provided) and the "manpower" being used to produce the booklet. Does this negate the participatory aspect of the project?

Elden and Levin (1991) argue that collaborative or participatory research is not empowering unless there is full participation at every stage of the research project. Does that then disqualify my work as participatory? Probably so, especially when considering the lack of farmworker input. I go back to Maguire (1993) and her endorsement of a participatory approach regardless of how neatly it may or may not fit within the parameters of "truly participatory work" to wonder how useful this project was.

What makes participatory research? Does it necessitate the formal process of working with a community group? Can it be truly participatory if the researcher defines the problem to be solved? Must the impetus for the research come from the

unbidden community? Other projects I have done have stemmed from questions emerging from community members themselves, but this collaboration with service organizations was different. I made use of certain aspects of a participatory approach, involving some stakeholders more than others. My purpose in writing about this project, with all of its pitfalls and snags, is to be honest about the messy truths of doing research with communities. This article is an attempt to be open about what I tried to accomplish, what I actually managed to do, and where I missed the mark.

In the end, regardless of my intentions to make this project representative and reflective of farmworker needs, I came to realize that this project is more representative of interests of the community-based organizations and service providers. Additionally, the booklet speaks to a much wider audience (I think) than just migrant and seasonal farmworkers and can be of help to anyone seeking access to low-cost healthcare resources in the state of South Carolina. Although farmworkers are the primary target audience, all information is presented in both Spanish and English so that a wider audience may use it.

So what did I actually manage to do? This is a source of great frustration for me. I finished the guide and presented it to the community organizations I was working most closely with as they had expressed a desire to print it so that we could distribute it at migrant health clinics and health fairs around the state, as well as in other venues. I was asked to format and design the guide as well as research printing costs, and write formal letters requesting funding from different agencies, all of which I did. To my knowledge, however, the guide has still not been printed.

In terms of the next steps for the project, I think that printing the booklet and getting it out to the farmworking population would be the natural place to start. If this happens, I hope that it will continue and that future generations of Student Action with Farmworkers interns or fellows, or anyone interested in adding to the booklet or modifying it, perhaps to include legal and social services, will be able to work directly with farmworkers, however defined, and evaluate the work of service organizations acting on their behalf.

In conclusion, while this article has been filled with far more questions than answers, I have tried to unearth and to air my own assumptions about research, what makes a "community," and about participatory research so that others interested in taking on similar endeavours might be able to benefit from the hurdles have encountered. I have often been frustrated by the gloss that often covers the pitfalls and missteps of trying to do research, and this is my attempt to give a glimpse into the messy truths that often accompany a participatory approach. I hope that the issues that I've raised here might be for others what Maguire's (1993) work has been for me: a reiteration that research is not just about results, but a reflexive learning process as well.

References

Anderson, Benedict
1983   Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. London: Verso.

Chavez, Leo R.
1994   The Power of the Imagined Community: The Settlement of Undocumented Mexicans and Central Americans in the United States. American Anthropologist 96(1):52-73.

Elden, M., & M. Levin
1991   A Framework for Conducting Utilization-focused Policy Research in Anthropology. *In* Speaking the Language of Power: Communication, Collaboration and Advocacy. David Fetterman, ed. Pp. 137-154. Washington, DC: The Falmer Press.

Freire, Paolo
1974   Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: The Seabury Press.

Hall, Budd
1993   Introduction. *In* Voices of Change: Participatory Research in the United States and Canada. P. Park, M. Brydon-Miller, B. Hall, and T. Jackson, eds. Pp. xiii-xxii. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Kingsolver, Ann E.
2007   Farmers and Farmworkers: Two Centuries of Strategic Alterity in Kentucky's Tobacco Fields. Critique of Anthropology 27(1):87-102.

Lacy, Elaine
2006   South Carolina Farmworkers. Presented January 13, 2006 at Student Action with Farmworkers Workshop. Columbia, South Carolina.

Maguire, Patricia
1993   Challenges, Contradictions, and Celebrations: Attempting Participatory Research as a Doctoral Student. *In* Voices of Change: Participatory Research in the United States and Canada. P. Park, M. Brydon-Miller, B. Hall, and T. Jackson, eds. Pp. 157-176. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Marx, Karl
1967[1867] Capital. New York: International Publishers.

Park, Peter
1993   What is Participatory Research? A Theoretical and Methodological Perspective. *In* Voices of Change: Participatory Research in the United States and Canada. P. Park, M. Brydon-Miller, B. Hall, and T. Jackson, eds. Pp. 1-19. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Rosenbaum, Sara, and Peter Shin
2005   Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers: Health Insurance Coverage and Access to Care. Washington: Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation.

Rylko-Bauer, Barbara, and John van Willigan
1993   A Framework for Developing Utilization-Focused Policy Research in Anthropology. *In* Speaking the Language of Power: Communication, Collaboration, and Advocacy (Translating Ethnography into Action). David Fetterman, ed. pp 137-155. Washington, DC: Falmer Press

South Carolina Agriculture and Forestry
2006   South Carolina Agriculture and Forestry. Electronic document, http://agriculture.sc.gov/, accessed on February 22, 2007.

Student Action with Farmworkers
2007   United States Farmworker Fact Sheet. Electronic document http://saf-unite.org/learn/factsheet.htm, accessed April 2009
2009   Student Action with Farmworkers Mission. Electronic document http://saf-unite.org/about/mission.htm, accessed April, 2009

Watts, Michael J.
2000   Contested Communities, Malignant Markets, and Gilded Governance: Justice, Resource Extraction, and Conservation in the Tropics. *In* People, Plants, and Justice: The Politics of Nature Conservation. Charles Zerner, ed. Pp. 21-51. New York: Columbia University Press.

Wilmott, Paul
1986   Social Networks, Informal Care, and Public Policy. London: Policy Studies Institute.

Boricuas ACTing UP in New York and San Juan: Diasporic AIDS Activism, Colonialism, and Anthropology

Adriana Garriga López
Department of Anthropology
Columbia University in New York

ABSTRACT: Following from the analysis of unstructured interviews conducted with members of the first AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power's (ACT UP!) New York contingent to visit Puerto Rico with expressly activist aims, this essay traces some linkages and disconnects between HIV/AIDS activism in New York City and San Juan, Puerto Rico. Reflecting on the use of ethnographic methods in dissertation research, this essay produces one account of some of the links between different communities struggling with the appearance and entrenchment of HIV/AIDS and some of the ways in which anthropology can engage with the untold or unaccounted for histories that inform this activism and the political frame of HIV/AIDS in San Juan today. This paper analyzes and engages with the configurations of power and responsibility that brought ACT UP! New York to San Juan and explores how ethnography may bring an historical focus to the communal and individual experience of activism in order to better see its effects and different manifestations in the present.

KEYWORDS: Puerto Rico; HIV/AIDS; ACT UP

Introduction

This essay draws together observations and reflections gathered from ethnographic research carried out among social justice activists during the years 2005-2007 in San Juan, Puerto Rico. It constitutes a preliminary analysis of fieldwork carried out among social justice organizations and community initiatives in the San Juan metropolitan area. This research included my participation in organizational meetings with different groups of people affected by HIV/AIDS, and individual interviews with people living with HIV/AIDS who participated in such organizational meetings and community-based organization initiatives. These interviews aimed at drawing an oral history of such activism, and of

the experiences and political commitments that led patients and their supporters to engage in public acts of social protest, demonstration, or reclamation. Data gathered from such participation and observation indicates that politically-active individuals depend heavily on activist networks and on their affective and social ties to other activists. The organizational labour and advocacy work of such networks has led to important social and governmental responses, including the availability of drug therapies and clinical trials for people infected with HIV and living on the island, and the adoption of the HIV/AIDS patient's Bill of Rights. Not all of the activists I interviewed and worked with were members of the AIDS Coalition

to Unleash Power (ACT UP!). Some were part of the Puerto Rico chapter established in the summer of 1990. A handful participated in the planning of the delegation as members of the Hispanic Caucus of the New York chapter of ACT UP!, mostly those who remained on the island after other members of the brigade returned to New York City. This paper discusses the role of that brigade in the evolution of HIV/AIDS activism on the island. It does not, however, follow a straightforwardly historical frame for telling a story about the rise and fall of the ACT UP! Puerto Rico chapter. Instead, I reflect thematically on some of the intersections between the theoretical, methodological, and ethnographic questions that this research engaged and emphasized.[1]

In a wider context, this work is concerned with the ways in which Puerto Ricans are socio-politically reproduced as colonial subjects of the United States through representational, legal, and extra-legal strategies mobilized as part of the management of such contagious and pathologized bodies. This text is a part of my doctoral dissertation, where I analyze the current structure of governance and state organization in Puerto Rico as an unincorporated territory of the United States in terms of how this political relationship has influenced the ways that HIV and AIDS have spread and become entrenched among Puerto Ricans. I also analyze some of the ways that Puerto Ricans live with and respond to HIV and AIDS, not only as epidemics or bodily circumstances, but as socio-and bio-political issues. That is, I investigate HIV/AIDS in Puerto Rico as a composite site

where the elaboration of dominating and regulatory discourses over bodies and subjects certainly takes place, but also one where everyday people forge and traffic in critical and resistant knowledge production, and modes of social empowerment.

Following from reflections on unstructured interviews with Puerto Rican AIDS activists and with members of the ACT UP! New York contingent that visited Puerto Rico in the summer of 1990, this essay traces linkages and points out cleavages between HIV/AIDS activism in New York City and San Juan, Puerto Rico. It produces one account of some of the links evidenced by this 'visit' between Puerto Ricans living in the United States and those on the island, as both communities struggled with the appearance and entrenchment of HIV/AIDS. This paper also explores some of the ways in which anthropology can engage with the untold or unaccounted-for histories that inform activism around HIV/AIDS in San Juan and the Caribbean more broadly today. This paper analyses and engages with the configurations of power that brought the ACT UP! New York contingent to San Juan, reflects on the strategies used by the group to raise awareness of the growing AIDS crisis on the island, and examines the reported experiences of Puerto Rican AIDS activists struggling against negligent state and federal agencies for access to information and treatment. My analysis relies on my informants' own analyses of the difficulties implicated by such activism, and of the political meanings of HIV/AIDS in their lives. Finally, this essay provides some exploratory questions about how ethnography may serve to bring a historical focus to the communal and individual experiences of HIV/AIDS activists in the Puerto Rican diaspora and in the diasporized island, in order to better see the effects of those negotiations and confrontations with normative and state power, as well as their social and institutional manifestations in the present.

Historical Background

People infected with HIV living in Puerto Rico did not have access to pharmaceutical treatment or clinical protocols until the early 1990s. Many of those infected with HIV on the island during the early years of the pandemic were without recourse to

medical treatment and suffered from extensive discrimination and stigmatization. All of the people I interviewed for this project who were in Puerto Rico during the mid to late 1980s and early 1990s reported that people infected with HIV faced profound isolation from their families and social networks, as panic over the contagion spread. Some doctors in local clinics and hospitals refused to examine or treat patients who presented with paradigmatic Auto Immune Deficiency Syndrome symptoms, such as 'wasting' and Kaposi's sarcoma, and common opportunistic infections such as tuberculosis, candidiasis, and pneumocystis carinii pneumonia. The response from governmental institutions to this public health crisis was inadequate and very slow in coming. It was in no small part through the activities of ACT UP! New York's summer 1990 Puerto Rico brigade, and especially through the subsequent consolidation of social justice organizations agitating for the rights of people living with HIV/AIDS, that the living conditions of HIV positive Puerto Ricans and those living with AIDS began to change.

This new AIDS-directed activism dovetailed with and had a profound influence over the fledgling gay and lesbian liberation movement that emerged contemporaneously with the deepening hold of the epidemic on Puerto Rican society. Although by the summer of 1990 island-based feminist and gender rights groups had already been working for years to address the crises brought about and exacerbated by the epidemic, the aggressive style of activism and public protest that ACT UP! New York's brigade brought to Puerto Rico raised the stakes, and it provided visibility to the difficulties faced by HIV positive people. The resulting confrontations with state and institutional authorities empowered local activists (HIV negative and positive alike) and encouraged them to demand vociferously the adoption of measures for the protection of the civil and human rights of people living with HIV/AIDS, including their right to health care and access to treatment for HIV infection. These activists also stressed the general need for public programs aimed at the prevention of HIV transmission among high-risk groups. They also demanded that these prevention activities account systemically for the effects of social marginaliza-

tion and stigmatization. While this latter demand continues to this day mostly unmet, the activism of HIV positive people, along with their friends and loved ones, was crucial to the development of social service programs for people living with HIV/AIDS in Puerto Rico.

Through a cross-sectional analysis of the research conducted for this study, I have also tried to elucidate some of the different bases for activist engagements with HIV/AIDS in the Puerto Rican context. I draw from this analysis to argue that queer and feminist organizations in Puerto Rico were able to communicate to people in the US queer and Latino diasporas that the conditions of life for people with HIV on the island had become untenable, and that these trans-local communities organized on the basis of inter-sectional identities or responded to that call for assistance out of a sense of solidarity and shared struggle. These trans-local coalitions did not take place without a deep critical and collective consideration of their political and/or ideological implications. The activist strategies of ACT UP! members have had a profound impact on the strategies employed by AIDS activists. Social justice interventions such as the demand for compliance with legal safeguards that mandate patient representation within social service and state institutions, the public denunciation of corrupt government officials and of criminal administrators of state-funded social service organizations who stole millions of dollars intended for the provision of services to people with HIV/AIDS in San Juan, and the demand for access to current and new drug therapies, each engage many different bases for their particular forms of activist claims. These demands are not necessarily made on the bases of the gay liberation and empowerment framework that ACT UP! espoused, yet they demonstrate the ongoing legacy of ACT UP!'s protest ethics and aesthetics in Puerto Rico and in the Puerto Rican queer diaspora. This text also seeks to account for some of the disjunctures between these two related contexts, and the implications of such differences for inter-communal support and solidarity.

The impetus for this paper comes from a desire to situate the actions of ACT UP! New York's Puerto Rico delegation and of the subsequent island chapter

within a set of political questions that were incumbent upon these activists to consider and negotiate. The significance of the different social contexts surrounding the New York and Puerto Rico epidemics was not lost on these ACT UP members, nor on those with whom they collaborated on the island before, during, and after the summer of 1990. In fact, all interviewees reported that the group questioned and debated extensively the appropriateness of the ACT UP! NY model for Puerto Rico, with the concern that social realities and conditions were so different that they would necessarily imply difficulties for the successful transferral of activist strategies espoused by the organization.

While these interventions and demonstrations had been largely successful in the United States as a way of making the epidemic visible and in terms of generating community empowerment, some ACT UP! New York members worried that their protest strategies would not translate effectively or usefully to activist groups on the island, because they relied on a radical performance of homosexuality and bodily entitlement. An awareness of the critical urgency of the situation for people living with HIV/AIDS on the island led these New York-based activists, many of whom had been born or raised on the island, or had lived there for part of their lives and were familiar with the political climate of political organizing there, to risk being perceived as culturally insensitive. They travelled to Puerto Rico knowing that they faced the possibility of community antagonism to their presence and their methods, and they did indeed encounter some local hostility, expressed mostly through the accusation that the group's activities were too extreme, or too loud, or too uncouth as to be socially respected or effective. Nevertheless, the brigade had a lasting effect not only on the AIDS policies adopted by the Puerto Rican government, but also on the social arena. A number of the activists who were part of that brigade relocated to Puerto Rico and decided to remain on the island and continue to be active as community representatives. Beyond these material effects, the development of such translocal activist networks had a profound effect on the terms of public discourse about HIV/AIDS, and on other social activist networks, especially in terms of

the modes of expression and performative protest that the group engaged.

Methods

Five people directly involved in the creation of the ACT UP! Puerto Rico organization were interviewed for this essay, four men and one woman. All interviews were conducted in San Juan, Puerto Rico and were carried out in Spanish and some English. Through an initial interview with an HIV positive gay man, I connected with the four other interviewees, some of whom were people that I already knew through my personal and social networks. Each of these people who participated in ACT UP! protest and community organization activities provided a unique perspective on the events of 1990 and the ACT UP! NY brigade, and on the debates that it instantiated and re-capitulated. I conducted unstructured interviews with these activists, allowing our conversations about the history of the ACT UP! NY Puerto Rico delegation to travel the distance between their recollection of particular events, discussions, and persons, and their analyses of the group's composition, context, coordination, and strategies. These interviews illuminated the political concerns that pervaded activist strategies and networks across diasporic contexts. Those interviewed provided their views and opinions on the effectiveness of different activist strategies developed and adopted by various activist groupings, and shared their sense of what was accomplished, the limitations faced, and the ongoing effects of these groups and initiatives. Their analyses provide an anchor for thinking about the bio-political effects of U.S. political dominance in Puerto Rico and about HIV/AIDS as an epidemic whose social dimensions bring embodied subjections into sharp relief.

The events I refer to in this text are matters of public record, substantiated in newspapers of record and other media, where the names of activists are clearly stated and in many cases their photographs printed alongside. All five of the interviewees have been public figures, open about their HIV status or about their participation in AIDS activism, appearing often (to varying degrees) in the media as spokespeople for advocacy groups, health care initiatives, and social change organizations.

I have also drawn from and made use of the archives of the ACT UP! Oral History Project, an initiative of the New York Public Library System that collects video and audio recordings of statements given by people who were involved in the organization, transcribing and archiving them for public use. One of the informants I interviewed in Puerto Rico for this paper was interviewed for the ACT UP! Oral History Project, wherein he described his participation in ACT UP!, including his participation in the New York Latino Caucus and the Puerto Rico delegation.

The Latino Caucus and the Puerto Rico Delegation

Three of the five people interviewed for this study were living in New York City in 1990, where they participated in meetings of the ACT UP! New York chapter and were central to the creation of a Latino Caucus within the larger organism. These three are all Puerto Rican gay men who maintained strong social links to Puerto Rico despite having migrated to New York. In the case of at least one of these men, their residence in New York was the direct result of an HIV diagnosis, in the context of the dearth of case management, clinical treatment, or even appropriate symptom management for AIDS patients in Puerto Rico. All three were fundamental to ACT UP! New York's resolution to send a delegation of activists to San Juan, Puerto Rico during the summer of 1990, after working hard to convince the group's membership at large of the urgency of such an endeavour.

In ACT UP! New York meetings, especially within the Latino Caucus, activists discussed what they knew and what they had heard about the health situation of HIV positive people and people living with AIDS in Puerto Rico and demanded that the organization as a whole take decisive action. In the words of one Latino Caucus member, Moisés Agosto:

> We started planning around those events that were going to happen during that whole summer. One of them was the secretary [of health Sullivan] going. The other was the National Commission hearings in Puerto Rico. The other was this gay pride time,

even though there was not a parade at that point. And there were other activities I can't remember. So we went. We organized ourselves, and we had to go there and organize people, because we could not fly all of ACT UP! to Puerto Rico. So what we decided was that the committee was going to go— some of us—and we were going to work to mobilize people. There were a lot of touchy issues related to me coming from there, knowing that having the Americans, or what is perceived as coming from the Americans, coming with some sort of political movement—even though it was related to health, it was political. To impose a point of view to those that were already doing some grassroots work—we had to be careful with that. I always think that is very important that, no matter how liberal you are, you cannot lose sight of that. And also, come on, growing up in a colony where you hate all these things that you have been imposed to have. So we went to Puerto Rico. It was quite a trip. [ACT UP! Oral History Project, New York Public Library System, NY]

Agosto's recollection of the debates around the appropriateness of the Puerto Rico delegation as a project that the ACT UP! members should sponsor and support, clearly demonstrates an anxiety about the colonial relationship between the US and Puerto Rico, and a desire to carry out careful activism that really took into serious consideration the politics of activism and the approrpiateness of activist models to particular situations.

The Latino Caucus presented a proposal to the Organizing Committee for a delegation of about 40 people who would carry out a variety of prevention and education activities once in PR, including needle exchange, community meetings, protests, and demonstrations. After heated debates about whether this proposed activity was appropriate to the goals of ACT UP! NY and to the needs and desires of Puerto Rican community activists, the proposal was approved and plans set in motion for the trip. The delegation to Puerto Rico was funded solely by ACT UP! NY with private monies donated by wealthy members of the organization, as was the case with most ACT UP! initiatives. Joey Pons, who was one of the Latino Caucus members that travelled to the island remained in Puerto Rico after the other mem-

bers of the ACT UP! NY delegation had returned to NYC because he thought it irresponsible to open up the field of civil disobedience and aggressive AIDS activism in Puerto Rico without providing sustained support to the community members and activists who would then have to confront and contend with the effects of the demonstrations. The other two informants interviewed for this study, Fernando Sosa and Mayra Santos Febres, were living in San Juan, Puerto Rico at the time of the delegation's arrival there in July of 1990. They participated in the events that took place while the NY delegation was in town and they continued to work with the organization once ACT UP! Puerto Rico was established. Fernando Sosa, especially, was highly involved in the organization subsequently, organizing and participating in ACT UP! Puerto Rico events until the organization's dissolution in the mid to late 1990's.

Blood of What Nation?

ACT UP! employed innovative and often risky protest strategies, such as engaging in direct action and civil disobedience to interrupt the business-as-usual laissez faire attitude held towards sick and dying people infected with HIV, the carrying out of sex positive sex education among both out and closeted gay men, exchanging used hypodermic needles for new ones, in-your-face activism (such as the use of stage blood, die-ins, kiss-ins, and stage makeup worn on faces to make them look like skulls), and especially exploiting public fears through the rendering of the dangerous, contagious, and terrifying body of the infected (or presumed to be infected) person as a performative protest object. As David Gere (2004) has argued,

> the generally accepted notion was that if high-risk blood were to pass through a break in your skin, it would kill you, slowly. The genius of this particular ACT UP! action, then, [the use of stage blood] was in transforming the prevalent signification of AIDS. By smearing this supposedly tainted blood all over themselves, the protesters were able to transmute it into a sign not of gay contagion but of government guilt. [65]

In every case where ACT UP! used stage blood, the effect was to confound and frighten the police operatives present at their demonstrations. While in the US this actually resulted in massive arrests during predominantly peaceful protests (such as the one that took place in front of the FDA offices in Rockville, Maryland in 1988) because it was perceived that the activists were endangering public welfare, in Puerto Rico these strategies had the opposite effect. Police operatives present at the demonstrations were reportedly afraid to touch the stage-blood-smeared protesters and in large part for this reason did not arrest them, even when they interrupted mass at the upscale San Juan Cathedral, nor when they lay their bodies down as a group in front of the Governor's Mansion in Old San Juan.

These direct action strategies had not been seen in Puerto Rico before AIDS activists engaged them, with the exception of civil disobedience carried out in Vieques against the US Navy. They therefore had a large impact on social movements and social justice activists who observed the response of the media, the police, and the state to the group's demands. I argue here that ACT UP! NY/PR's legacy in Puerto Rico is vibrant and alive in the present, not only in the current activism of AIDS patients and advocates, but also evidenced in the performativity of protest bodies in other political arenas. No other group, however, has quite the same capacity as those living with HIV/AIDS to enact their bodies as sites of social terror, where the fear and ignorance of policy makers and people in powerful positions is made manifest in situ. The effect of this power is to demonstrate the link between fear and ignorance about HIV/AIDS and governmental inaction, neglect, and inadequate response to the epidemic. It is in this sense that ACT UP! depended on the performance of contagious embodiment to achieve social justice aims.

Successful as this strategy was in placing living bodies right at the site of prejudice and fear in order to both humanize and exploit them for political gain, it was not without consequences for those who engaged in it. Activist burn-out, discrimination due to public identification as an HIV positive person (even when this was not actually the case), and the social ostracizing of activists who had been publicly identified in this way were common. Interviewees also reported that many Puerto Ricans were uncomfortable with the strategies employed by ACT UP!

members and responded with a sense of embarrassment or regulatory anxiety about the public exposure that this protest movement represented.

Nevertheless, the gains achieved by AIDS activism in Puerto Rico are invaluable. Clinical trials, access to pharmaceutical therapy, complementary health services, case management, housing provisions, patient representation on policy boards and institutions, public education campaigns, and hospital and other social services for HIV/AIDS patients in Puerto Rico are all the direct result of AIDS activism. The social and political context in which these gains in visibility, access, and representation must be enacted and mobilized, however, has always and continuously undermined their effectiveness. And this is because it is a colonial context in which economic and social resources are severely limited by the unequal application of the US constitution to this island territory where governmental corruption abounds, and where the criminal negligence of patients and the mis-use of HIV/AIDS resources continue to be a serious impediment to the successful management of HIV/AIDS as a social problem.

By Way of Conclusion

In an extended interview with an activist with more than twenty years of protest and advocacy experience whom I will here call Manuel, he noted that an increase in recognition and awards for HIV activists often seems to coincide with their approaching death, and thus, he confided, he often becomes preoccupied with his own mortality when he receives awards, recognitions, honours, or requests for interviews, such as the one I conducted with him. Nevertheless, I conclude that employing ethnographic interviews with noted activists, whose lauded literary, activist, or social products now circulate transnationally, opens up yet another layer of historical inquiry regarding the structures of power that the Puerto Rican ACT UP! organization sought to transfigure. What these 'war' stories convey, when they are told again in conversations among activists committed to an ongoing process of reflection and change, is that such embodied and critical moments as the ACT UP! New York's needle exchange committee's field trip to the barrio known as La Perla, where they carried out the first

needle exchange to take place on the island, permanently transformed ways of knowing and acting on behalf of social justice aims for people living with HIV/AIDS, as well as ways of inhabiting diasporic activist terrains.

Recent activism in Puerto Rico continues to draw on the strategies of ACT UP! As mentioned by one activist during an interview, organizers knew that the importation of a US activist model to Puerto Rico wouldn't last, but also that the point was to spark local activism through the delegation's ground-setting work, and a community activism infrastructure, which put HIV/AIDS in the public eye and a face to the AIDS epidemic in Puerto Rico. The performance, as well as ongoing performativity, of these events, protests, and demonstrations pervades other areas of life. These new strategies of embodied deviance included recruitment in bars using pick-up techniques, as well as the events, protests, and demonstrations carried out by the delegation. The effects of these strategies run deep: the body of panic, its performativity of contagion; the visibility of the terrifying fluid. Hence, this essay is only the beginning of a reflection on how the retelling of the stories that explain the contexts in which these strategies emerged, raises for consideration various and multi-directional effects of the relationship between the ACT UP! organization of New York and that of Puerto Rico, including the production of new forms of protest and diasporic activism as such.

References

Agosto, Moisés
    Nd   ACT UP! Oral History Project. New York
            Public Library System, NY.
Gere, David
    2004 How to Make Dances in an Epidemic:
            Tracking Choreography in the Age of Aids.
            Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Indigenous AIDS Organizing and the Anthropology of Activist Knowledge

Scott L. Morgensen
Women's and Gender Studies, Macalester College

ABSTRACT: Indigenous AIDS activists join AIDS activists worldwide today in theorizing the AIDS pandemic as a construct of social relations of power. Their anti-colonial and transnational activism holds scholars accountable to studying how power structures the production of knowledge about AIDS. This essay first examines how Indigenous AIDS activists theorize the colonial and transnational conditions of AIDS, and challenge states and international agencies to respect the sovereignty of Indigenous communities and knowledges. The essay then cites Indigenous activist knowledge as inspiration for revisiting critiques of coloniality in anthropology, and their implications for the anthropology of AIDS. Anthropologists studying AIDS can respond to AIDS activists by addressing how colonial legacies shape the processes and products of research and writing. By working within intersubjective and reflexive relationships with people and communities affected by AIDS, anthropologists can enter accountable dialogue with AIDS activists and on that basis produce anti-colonial and transnational knowledge about AIDS.

KEYWORDS: AIDS; Indigenous; anti-colonialism; transnational activism; critique of anthropology

Introduction

AIDS activists have taken leadership in theorizing how power conditions the lives of people affected by AIDS. Activists today increasingly identify colonization as a key condition of health and organize transnationally to challenge colonial legacies in global health. AIDS activists historically targeted the politics of knowledge, by shifting stories about immorality or self-harm to claim that AIDS was produced by inequalities and requires social justice responses. But if in the 1980s ACT UP arose in the US to demand treatment by challenging homophobia and the profit motive, the Treatment Action Campaign (TAC) today addresses these issues in South Africa by centering colonial histories, global capitalism, and their structuring of race,

gender, migration, and health.[1] Activist theories like TAC's are leading scholars, governments, and NGOs to study AIDS through a multi-issue analysis of colo-

1 For accounts of TAC, see the work of Mandisa Mbali (Mbali 2004a, Mbali 2004b). In this paper, "anti-colonial and transnational AIDS activism" is a gloss for projects whose diversity is contentious. One movement's anti-colonialism—say, South African denialists with whom Thabo Mbeki aligned to argue that racism and poverty cause AIDS—may counter another's, as when TAC locates colonial legacies in the poor health care that facilitates HIV and blocks treatment access. Knowing that what "anti-colonial and transnational AIDS activism" means must be judged on a case-by-case basis, I offer Native AIDS activists as a model for the particular critiques of colonial knowledge production that this essay invites.

nial and global power relations. Although this is one desired effect of current AIDS organizing, activists launched their critiques not to build up the authority of arbiters of official knowledge, but precisely to disrupt their authority and force their accountability to the renewed self-determination of historically subjugated peoples now affected by AIDS. Thus, a key effect of anti-colonial and transnational AIDS activism has been to decolonize the conditions producing AIDS, which include knowledges about AIDS and about people affected by AIDS. This decolonizing work means to alter both the *terms* on which AIDS and people affected by AIDS are known, and the *methods* producing such claims, so that people challenging AIDS and colonial and global power will be recognized as key theorists of the pandemic.

I argue that the efforts of AIDS activists to decolonize knowledge should focus the anthropology of AIDS. AIDS activist claims must be affirmed as distinct arenas of knowledge that call anthropologists to destabilize normative knowledge production. As a main case my paper examines critical theories created by Indigenous AIDS organizers in North America and in transnational Indigenous alliances.[2] I cite Indigenous AIDS activist literatures as leading bodies of anti-colonial and transnational knowledge about AIDS, which hold scholars accountable to conversation with Indigenous people when theorizing AIDS and indigeneity. I then ask how reckoning with these or related forms of AIDS activist knowledge repositions the anthropology of AIDS. The stakes of AIDS activists evoke historical critiques of coloniality and globalism in anthropological theory. I trace how such stakes and critiques inform anthropological research on AIDS, and I call scholars to

engage AIDS activists as key interlocutors in producing theory. Anthropologists must change if a wish to decolonize disciplinary authority is to make anthropology accountable to activist knowledges. Such knowledges will restrict anthropologists' prerogative to tell the truth about AIDS, and will require collaboration as a basis for new research and knowledge production

I make my argument in a moment of reflection on my positioning as a non-Native and white scholar of Indigenous sexual politics and AIDS organizing. I recently finished my first project, which is a critical insider ethnography of non-Native queer appropriations of Indigenous cultures, which I examine comparatively to the histories of Native GLBTQ and Two-Spirit activism, including within Native AIDS activism (Morgensen forthcoming). My ethnographic critique of non-Native sexual politics was inspired by studying the anti-colonial work of Native Two-Spirit and AIDS activisms, which decenter the authority of non-Native claims—including mine— by holding them accountable to conversation with self-determined Indigenous knowledges. Reflecting the values Cherokee scholar Jace Weaver has called "communitism," which link Indigenous activism to community survival, the theories and practices of Native Two-Spirit and AIDS activism are renewing the integrity of Indigenous knowledges and challenging non-Native authority to determine their truth (Weaver 1997). In my book and this essay, I engage the knowledges of Indigenous AIDS organizers in order to hold my writing accountable to activist conversations that neither I nor any anthropologist controls. In the moment when I write this essay, I am considering the stakes in inviting Indigenous AIDS organizers, or being invited by them to create collaborative ethnographic research on their work. The archival nature of my prior research relationships with Indigenous activists means that we only now are considering the terms of collaborative ethnography. This essay thus reviews the major stakes raised by my asking how such research might transpire. Without further referencing the details of my work (which are published elsewhere) I write this essay to reflect a particular moment in the process of configuring anthropological research against colonial

---

2   I use "Native" and "Indigenous" interchangeably in this text, with certain qualifications. "Native" here primarily refers to the pan-tribal identity claimed by persons in Canada and the US, and its use as a descriptive term in scholarship and politics from these states. I use "Indigenous" more broadly as an analytical term that also, at times, appears as a pan-tribal identity, notably in global activism. "Native AIDS activism" thus refers primarily to projects within the US and Canada, and "Indigenous AIDS activism" to projects linking people in these states to broader organizing.

legacies, as I discuss in conclusion.[3] This essay cites the integrity of Indigenous knowledges of colonization and AIDS as modelling theories and methods that can lead the anthropology of AIDS in anti-colonial and transnational directions.

Producing Indigenous Knowledge in AIDS Activism

Native AIDS organizers in the US and Canada have theorized AIDS as conditioned by a colonial governmentality in sexual cultures and public health.[4] Such theories arose first in HIV prevention and health care texts that called Indigenous people to claim a decolonized response to AIDS. They also shaped activist demands that non-Native and Native agencies decolonize health interventions in Indigenous communities and support the leadership of Native AIDS organizers. This creation of theory from activism has been examined by Native scholars of AIDS such as Karina Walters and Irene Vernon, whose work has returned to and served further activism. In *Killing Us Quietly: Native Americans and HIV/AIDS*, Vernon joins writers for NNAAPC (National Native American AIDS Prevention Center) and NASTAD (National Association of State and Territorial AIDS Directors) in marking how the material effects of colonization on Indigenous health contextualize the spread of AIDS. They trace how historical techniques of conquest marginalized Indigenous people from the conditions of good health, as removal, containment, allotment, and assimilation disrupted the very conditions of life while making disease a weapon of war (National Alliance of State and Territorial AIDS Directors 2004; National Native American AIDS Prevention Center and the Rural Center for AIDS/STD Prevention 2004; Vernon 2001). Health

researchers further examine the psychological effects of colonization on health, as when Karina Walters engages the work of Bonnie and Eduardo Duran to trace how "historical trauma" informs the marginality, low self-esteem, or violence in Native people's lives that enhances vulnerability to HIV/AIDS (Duran 2004; Walters 2002). Native AIDS activists have marked institutional health care to be lacking, noting that the federal founding of the Indian Health Service remains under-funded in relation to need, while its rural and reservation locations and requirement of federally-recognized tribal enrollment overlook indigenous people living under the conditions of termination, urban relocation, or forced assimilation (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 2003). In these contexts, activists created services to answer institutional neglect with decolonizing approaches to health that address trauma and empower Indigenous people in community. In 1989 NNAAPC formed the first national, federally-funded Native AIDS service, the Ahalaya Project, which offered "medical, mental health, spiritual, social, emergency, and educational services" within a profile "built on cultural, spiritual, and traditional healing dimensions" that fostered indigenist identity and traditional healing (Barney et al. 2004; Bouey 2000). Ahalaya also formed a site of longitudinal health research that was initiated and managed by Native AIDS activists. The Indigenous People's Task Force, founded in 1987 as the Minnesota American Indian AIDS Task Force, integrated traditional healing methods into its health services, and grounded health education in indigenist storytelling, such as in the peer education troupe The Ogitchidag Gikinooamaagad Players that performed original sketches for Native audiences (Minnesota American Indian AIDS Task Force; Rush 1989). Such cases show Native AIDS organizers answering federal neglect—itself a legacy of colonial violence and control—by adapting federal resources to form services that revitalize identity and community for Indigenous people as a response to their vulnerability to AIDS.

Among the forms of marginality targeted by Native AIDS activists, homophobia stood out as a key condition of the impact of AIDS for Native people, and as itself a colonial legacy. Native GLBT

---

3   Multiple articles and my forthcoming book offer further reflection on my positioning in my ethnographic and historical research (Morgensen 2008, Morgensen 2009, Morgensen forthcoming).

4   I invoke here the normalizing modes of governance in colonial and metropolitan societies and institutions, in particular as they rely on the regulatory production and management of social classes and the education of racial and sexual subjectivity (Prakash 1999, Scott 1995, Stoler 1995). On governmentality, see Inda 2005.

communities formed in the 1970s in the US and Canada amid migration to cities that supported urban Indian and sexual minority movements. The appearance of AIDS particularly affected urban Native GLBT people, who also contributed key founders and leaders to early Native AIDS organizing (Burns 1988; Medicine 1997). Native GLBT people already were recovering knowledge of historical recognition of gender and sexual diversity in many Indigenous societies, and using this knowledge to challenge homophobia in Indigenous communities and in US society as effects of colonization. While not all Indigenous societies attested to accepting gender and sexual diversity, all had been targets of colonial education that enforced colonial homophobia in law, schools, and new religions (Hurtado 1999; Midnight Sun 1988; Thomas 1999). In 1990, at a third international gathering of American Indian and First Nations lesbians and gays, participants adopted a new identity, Two-Spirit, which in loan translation from Northern Algonquin meant the "presence of both a masculine and a feminine spirit in one person" (Anguksuar 1997). In English Two-Spirit identity served as a bridge between "*winkte*, *nádleeh*, and other appropriate tribal terms" for historical social roles and the GLBT identities that Native people claim today (Thomas 1999). While Native AIDS organizing always served as a site for cultivating knowledge of historical roles, such work rapidly expanded in the 1990s with the spread of Two-Spirit identity. Native health workers found that teaching about Two-Spirit histories or promoting adoption of Two-Spirit identity helped Native GLBT people respond to rejection by family or community by believing in their worth in Native societies and choosing health and survival (Kairaiuak 2002).

Such efforts to form health services by decolonizing both the institutions and knowledges conditioning AIDS led Native people to organize on the terms Maori scholar Linda Tuhiwai Smith has called "indigenous methodologies" (Smith 1999). Native AIDS organizations countered the hostility, neglect, or control of colonial institutions by adapting their resources to support Native-centred responses to AIDS. They further supported the reinvention of tradition as a health practice, as when former NNAAPC

executive director Yvonne Davis countered colonial heterosexism in non-Native and Native programs by promoting Two-Spirit identity as a decolonizing indigenous methodology for personal and collective healing (Davis 2006). Such tactics caused the material conditions and cultural logics of health, gender, and sexuality to be determined by Native AIDS activists. In doing so, they displaced a colonial governmentality in the institutions and discourses that still defined subjectivity and social life for Native people affected by AIDS. By critically identifying and then altering modes of colonial governance, Native AIDS activists practiced decolonizing methodologies that, in Robert Warrior's terms, announced an "intellectual sovereignty" over Indigenous peoples' relationship to AIDS and social change (Warrior 1994; Warrior 2006).

Pursuing decolonization also involved Native AIDS organizers in transnational activism, which articulated colonial histories while linking Indigenous people in border-crossing alliances. While scholars tend to use the term *transnational* to refer to global economics, politics, or cultures and the subjects traversing them, the situated anti-colonialisms of Indigenous people have been specifically transnational, and no less so in response to AIDS. In the US, colonial governance already correlates diverse Native Nations as American Indian or Alaska Native, and incorporates Kanaka Maoli as Native Hawaiians. In turn, amid radical activism and sovereignty struggles, Native became a pan-tribal identity that bridges national differences while marking shared experiences of or responses to colonization (Garroutte 2003; Smith and Warrior 1997). This mix of colonial imposition and anti-colonial claim on transnationalism frames Native AIDS organizing in the US, which has adapted federal funding (and its mandate to serve "American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians") as context for new Indigenous alliances. For instance, NNAAPC conferences linked AIDS activists from the lower 48 states, Alaska and Hawaii during the period when Two-Spirit became a key term describing Native men who have sex with men (MSM) in AIDS services. The pan-tribal gestures of Two-Spirit met their specificity when Kanaka Maoli AIDS activists encountered the term amid their

own work to reclaim the traditional Hawaiian term *mahu* as a marker of gender and sexuality diversity. NNAAPC programs fostered dialogue about Two-Spirit and *mahu* that marked their distinctions and potential alignment, a quality extended when Kanaka Maoli activists allied with Indigenous Pacific AIDS activists who were reclaiming traditional terms for Samoans (*fa'afafine*) and Maori (*takatapui*) GLBT people. Transnationalism thus shaped AIDS activism if Indigenous people adapted the authority of settler states to form alliances that challenged colonial sexual cultures and reclaimed Indigenous traditions while connecting them in new solidarities.

Indigenous AIDS organizers also marked the global dimensions of both AIDS and colonization by forming increasingly transnational movements. They already bridged differences by networking across settler states, when ties formed across the Anglophone US, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia, or by participating in global Indigenous activisms such as the preparation of the UN Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. But the growth of AIDS as a pandemic and the increase in global health responses also drew Indigenous people to address AIDS in global terms, by fighting invisibility in global public health, challenging how health policies affected them as subject peoples in settler states, and forming a global voice to back local claims. Global activism arose notably in Indigenous participation in the International AIDS Conference (IAC), as unexpected meetings across great distances inspired new solidarities (Cameron 1993; Junga-Williams 2006). During the 1990s, conversations among IAC delegates led to the first Indigenous activist pre-conference in Vancouver in 1996, the International Indigenous People's Summit, which continued in later years to gather Indigenous conference delegates. Such work portrayed qualities of transnational activism, as it made conferences of international governmental and non-governmental agencies into key sites for lobbying agendas while forming new identities or movements (della Porta 2005; Keck 1998). Transnational feminist and queer theorists have critiqued the normativity of such systems of global governance and their NGOization of transnational social movements (Grewal 2005; Puar

2007). Yet they also note that the very adaptability of global power is what some local actors adapt to spaces of marginality, which can force global systems to confront the troubling effects of discrepant stakes. One such space is the recalcitrance of Indigenous sovereignty in the face of the flexibility of globalization, as argued by Indigenous delegates to the IAC. Their goals include pressuring settler states to recognize the sovereignty of Indigenous peoples in their borders. Their claims thus traverse what Kevin Bruyneel theorized in Native Studies as "the third space of sovereignty," where Indigenous demands for recognition or resources in the settler state or international law act on and trouble the boundaries of their historically colonial rule, by delimiting sovereign relationships within ongoing colonial situations (Bruyneel 2007). In such contexts, Indigenous AIDS activists invent transnational knowledges and activisms in order to answer the border-crossing power relations in settler states and global systems. Such work is not identical to the local knowledges or activisms Indigenous people must create to address local situations, whose distinctions can appear glossed by the pan-indigeneity of transnational organizing. Yet that organizing intends to create space for local stakes to be negotiated anew, if state or global governance can be displaced or redrawn in response to transnational demands for Indigenous sovereignty. In this sense, the transnationalism of Indigenous AIDS activists is specifically anti-colonial, as it crosses borders to hold states and global health agencies accountable to demands for sovereignty over health. This reminds that, for Indigenous people, transnationalism is not "new." International law and global capitalism reflect and extend past and ongoing colonization, while border-crossing activism today reflects longstanding efforts to join Indigenous peoples in work for decolonization.

Anti-colonial and transnational activism is the context in which Indigenous AIDS organizers produce decolonizing knowledge of AIDS and indigeneity. I offer a remarkable example of such activist knowledge: a policy statement issued by the International Indigenous People's Summit at the 2006 International AIDS Conference, entitled "The Toronto Charter: Indigenous People's Action Plan on

HIV/AIDS 2006." I examine the Charter by inspiration of Robert Warrior's interpretation in *The People and the Word* of the 1881 Osage Constitution, which he reads as a creative adaptation of constitutional law to establish terms on which colonial authority will be accountable to Indigenous sovereignty. The Charter writers similarly wrote in the narrative form of public policy to hold settler states and international agencies accountable to an Indigenous authority to define and manage health systems on Indigenous terms. In the two years prior to the 2006 IAC, organizers of the International Indigenous People's Summit travelled to prepare the text "at a session of the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues and in numerous cities in Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the United States," and then submitted drafts to Indigenous AIDS organizations worldwide to request feedback (National Native American AIDS Prevention Center 2006:6). The final text was printed as a high-quality poster and announced at the Toronto conference. While elsewhere I interpret the Charter announcement as a mode of media activism, here I address its content as an intervention in normative knowledge production about Indigenous people and AIDS.[5]

The Charter opens as "a call to action" to the states, international bodies, and non-governmental agencies that manage "the provision of HIV/AIDS services for Indigenous Peoples around the world… to develop programmes that will make a real difference to Indigenous Peoples and the communities from which they come" (International Indigenous People's Satellite 2006). The Charter first affirms that Indigenous people share the "devastating effect" of AIDS, as their related marginalization by settler states produces a "range of socio-cultural factors that place Indigenous Peoples at increased risk of HIV/AIDS," so "in some countries, Indigenous Peoples have disproportionately higher rates of HIV infection than non-Indigenous people." The Charter resituates this experience in a demand for affirming Indigenous peoples' "inherent rights… to control

all aspects of their lives, including their health" and "to determine their own health priorities." This statement asserts a sovereign relation to settler societies, reminding that health is conditioned by myriad structural factors that, to benefit Indigenous people, require self-determination. By demanding that settler states fulfill treaty, trust, and other constitutional obligations to the Indigenous peoples whose lands they occupy, the Charter clarifies sovereignty as neither assimilation within nor separation from settler society but, as Bruyneel has argued, a self-determining basis for ongoing relationship. In this mode, the Charter argues that "governments are responsible for ensuring equitable access to health services and equitable health outcomes for all" that will grant Indigenous people "a state of health that is at least equal to that of other people." The text then sets the terms of such work in "culturally appropriate service delivery," which will give Indigenous people "access to their own languages," address the "physical, social, mental, emotional and spiritual dimensions" of health, and "communicate information about the prevention and treatment of HIV/AIDS that is relative to the reality in which Indigenous Peoples live." The Charter insists that these changes will not exercise the prerogative of settler states. Rather, they would respond accountably to an authority retained by Indigenous people to define and manage their own lives amidst ongoing colonial occupation. This will include Indigenous control over the production of knowledge. It asserts that "governments must be committed to consulting with Indigenous Peoples in order to ensure that health programmes meet the needs of Indigenous Peoples," and that "it is essential that HIV/AIDS data on indigenous peoples be collected in a manner that is respectful of the needs of Indigenous Peoples as identified by Indigenous Peoples themselves." Governments then will "ensure the central participation of Indigenous Peoples in all programmes related to the prevention of HIV and programmes for the care and support of Indigenous Peoples living with HIV/AIDS" and will grant "resources to Indigenous Peoples to design, develop and implement HIV/AIDS programmes…so that Indigenous communities can respond in a timely and effective way to the demands placed on com-

---

5   I discuss The Toronto Charter as activist media in my forthcoming book, while I also discuss other uses of Native AIDS activist media in other writing (Morgensen 2008, Morgensen forthcoming)

munities by the AIDS epidemic." All these calls to transform the practices of settler states are framed by a demand that international agencies "monitor and take action against any States whose persistent policies and activities fail to acknowledge and support the integration of this Charter into State policies relating to HIV/AIDS" while ensuring that the "participation of Indigenous Peoples in United Nations forums is strengthened so their views are fairly represented." Hence, even as the Charter models a transnational activist tactic of calling international agencies to exert pressure on states, it marks Indigenous people's tenuous international representation, and so holds both national and international law accountable to answering the effects of colonization.

This Indigenous activist text theorizes colonial governmentality by marking and challenging the institutional knowledges and power relations defining Indigenous people. The Toronto Charter marks Indigenous people as sovereign precisely while still subject to colonial rule, which does not erase their right to assert social difference and seek the fulfillment of state obligations. The text singles out for criticism an epistemological authority of colonial agents to determine truth, and demands conditions for Indigenous people to do so for themselves while holding colonial agents to their terms. Such claims are intensified when the text addresses AIDS. The Charter states not only that colonial rule disrupts the material conditions of health for Indigenous people, but also that fostering health requires reimagining subjectivity and community in accord with Indigenous theories and methodologies. Thus, the Charter marks the material conditions of knowledge production as a key terrain of struggle for Indigenous people in AIDS activism. In light of the Charter's analysis, we see that how we live in a colonial situation will be determined by what we know, how we know it, and how a social order arises in relation to such knowledge and its methods of production. In particular, the text holds government agents and knowledge producers accountable to meeting Indigenous people as interlocutors by following Indigenous plans for comprehending and addressing health. The Charter thus frames ongoing translations of critical theory of culture, power, and AIDS from the everyday strug-

gles of Indigenous people into a distinctive body of activist knowledge, which means to alter the political and epistemological terms of colonial rule.

Questioning Anthropological Authority, Negotiating Ethnographic Relationships

What does it mean to anthropologists that Indigenous AIDS activists critique how AIDS is conditioned by colonial governmentality, and foreground their anti-colonial and transnational conversations as contexts in which any knowledge about them should arise? I understand Indigenous and other AIDS activist knowledges to demand that anthropologists critique colonial legacies in theory and method as a condition of studying AIDS. Specifically, I see activists arguing that a critique of colonial or global power in the lives of people affected by AIDS also must critique how that power structures scholarly knowledge. As Indigenous AIDS activists argued, colonial legacies in scholarship—and notably in anthropology—will sustain unless Indigenous people can set the terms of accounts of their lives as interlocutors in any conversation about them. (Mihesuah 1998; Mihesuah 2005; Smith 1999) If anthropologists of AIDS want to critique colonial and global power, then it will be not just what they say about power, but when, how, and to whom they say it that will determine whether they realize their goal. I now link these considerations to the anthropology of AIDS by asking how they can revitalize critiques of coloniality in anthropological theory and method. Rather than assuming that the discipline has "moved on" from such discussions, I ask how older critiques address anthropologists of AIDS to be mindful of coloniality not only in normative knowledge production but also in how they work to craft anti-colonial responses.

Current anthropology still can learn from the upheavals at the turn of the 1970s in US and British anthropology, when their complicities in colonial and imperial projects were marked for debate. My citing of this moment somewhat displaces the reflexive historiography of US anthropology in the 1980s (Clifford and Marcus 1986; Stocking 1983) in order to remind that it followed prior work to target a directly colonial formation of anthropology. Kathleen Gough's call to make new empirical research relevant

to understanding her era's revolutionary changes also called for critiquing colonial qualities in anthropological theory and method (Gough 1968). After all, radical scholars cannot counter a form of oppression with new research if that oppression has been naturalized and reproduced in their research methods or theories. While my intellectual ancestry in anthropology traces to the feminist, Marxist, and Third World scholars who marked coloniality, nationalism, or masculinism for critique, I choose here to revisit scholars who presented a less marginal location while diagnosing anthropological thought. I do so to remind scholars like myself that our locations in the discipline—reflecting commitments to racial, economic, national, gendered, sexual, and health justice—may appear to grant us a distance from disciplinary norms that in fact is not guaranteed. In particular, I ask anthropologists of AIDS to revisit our responses to three insights from early critiques of anthropology: (1) the historically colonial contexts of anthropological research; (2) the establishment of distance as a methodological condition of anthropological research and theory; (3) and the embedded narration within stories about distance of the anthropologist's own normative audience or sense of self.

Talal Asad framed the collection *Anthropology and The Colonial Encounter* (1973) by arguing that anthropology can be practiced only by accounting for colonization as "the basic reality" enabling its historical practice, which then made it "miscomprehend" its subjects by failing to address them as products of an "unequal world" (Asad 1973:17-18). In 1991 Asad reiterated that it "is not merely that anthropological fieldwork was facilitated by European colonial power…; it is that the fact of European power, as discourse and practice, was always part of the reality anthropologists sought to understand, and of the way they sought to understand it" (Asad 1991:315). Asad offers an institutional and discursive critique of coloniality in the social worlds that anthropologists meet *and* in the knowledges they bring to those spaces. By the 1990s anthropologists modelled study of the colonial histories and discourses through which they met their subjects (Lavie 1990; Tsing 1993; Williams 1991). But Asad's critique reminds that despite the disciplinary appearance of such texts today, they and others like them remain interventions in a historical coloniality that will never be erased or overcome in its entirety but must be marked and countered continually.

Johannes Fabian's studies of coloniality in anthropological discourse appeared in 1971 and deepened in *Time and the Other*, which traced how "anthropology contributed above all to the intellectual justification of the colonial enterprise" in its *denial of coevalness* among its own and its subjects' worlds (Fabian 1971; Fabian 1983:17). Fabian critiqued how "Time is used to create distance" when anthropologists apply the "epistemological dimension" of colonialism to make it so "not only past cultures, but all living societies [are] irrevocably placed on a temporal slope;" and he critiques the claim that scientific knowledge requires crossing spatial or cultural distance when in fact this projects temporal distance as a condition of objectivity (Fabian 1983:28; 17; 30). But he recognized that the communicative ethos of ethnography also creates an "intersubjective time" that "the anthropologist *qua* ethnographer is not free to 'grant' or 'deny.'" Centring ethnographic intersubjectivity in research can interrupt anthropology's own historically colonial logics: rather than pursuing objective research by seeking out and bridging distance (but, in fact, inventing and enforcing it), scholars can create intersubjective research by entering and engaging past and present relationships (32). In this latter mode, anthropology will release its claim on exceptional knowledge and accept its positioning along a host of other knowledges that arise within relationship. In such work, "the Knower cannot claim ascendancy over the Known (nor, for that matter, one Knower over another)" because anthropologists and subjects will "only 'know' when they meet each other in one and the same cotemporality" (164). Fabian's call to create knowledge in dialogue rejects distancing by asking if anthropological work is coeval: Is the work not just amenable to addressing intersubjectivity, but *premised* on it? Is there not just a potential for accountable dialogue, but is work initiated *only* from within it? In this way, Fabian displaces a classic prerogative of anthropologists to determine who and what they will study, or when or how research will occur, prior to the relationships that research will examine having

been formed. Indeed, the very desire to do research, not to mention its start or end, now will be responsible to the terms of relationships that precede and exceed ethnographic study. Such qualities have come to frame collaborative ethnography, in which scholars cross differences at the behest of subjects who make ethnography useful to shared goals (Lassiter et al 2004; Naples and Desai 2002). They also inform how "insider/outsider" and "native" anthropologists, while retaining a prerogative over their work, negotiate it from within longstanding ties that compel decisions based on interdependence (Bunzl 2002; Weston 1997).

Roy Wagner's *The Invention of Culture* proposed in 1975 that anthropologists who recognize culture as an inventive practice also mark how their own narratives invent culture as their object (Wagner 1981 (1975)). In particular, Wagner noted that grounding anthropology in bridging distance does not just project difference on its object; it also produces the terms of the writer's normative audience and sense of self. This claim is based on a reminder that a classic conceit—that anthropological comprehension of culture hinges on the distance of being outsiders—also suggests that anthropologists first recognize the terms of their own culture when ethnography marks its uniqueness. This is the basis of his provocative statement: "In the act of inventing another culture, the anthropologist invents his [*sic*] own, and in fact…reinvents the notion of culture itself" (4). Here, by reflecting on the normative terms of research, Wagner recognizes that anthropological writing invents, at once, a distant and unfamiliar object, and a proximate and familiar sense of self and social norms. This insight calls scholars to ask how their writing is informed by desires for *self*-discovery, or how it projects cultural norms through which normative audiences then will meet difference unreflexively. Anthropologists have engaged such insight by addressing their investments in research, which Visweswaran argued for destabilizing all narration of differences by framing it as a narration of the self and of the self's relationship to difference (Manalansan 2003; Tsing 2005; Visweswaran 1994).

Revisiting Asad, Fabian, Wagner, and their echoes in recent work reminds that the colonial con-

texts of research, reliance on establishing distance, and embedded narration of the scholar's audience or self bear longstanding critique in anthropology. Their legacies call scholars to address colonial conditions, intersubjectivity, and reflexivity in the design and practice of their research and writing. Such stakes mesh with the demands of Indigenous and other AIDS activists that knowledge of AIDS should be produced from critically reflexive positions within the power relations of a colonial and globalizing world. I argue that for anthropologists, accounting for coloniality, intersubjectivity, and reflexivity is a precondition of being responsive to the critical theories and research directives of AIDS activists.

Anthropologists of AIDS have a long record of joining AIDS activists in marking and disrupting the power relations structuring culture and knowledge, in particular when anthropologists arose within AIDS-affected communities, or engaged them in order to make research accountable to social justice struggles.[6] A major initial and sustained theme was study of the cultural life of marginalized people, including sexual life in particular, in order to address official knowledges in medical research or health services, and alter how they miscomprehended or restigmatized people affected by AIDS (Adam et al. 2000; Bolton 1992; Bolton 1994). Some anthropologists specifically applied their cultural and political knowledge of AIDS to evaluating the institutional mediation of AIDS, knowledge, and power in order to offer policy recommendations (Farmer 1999; Parker 1994; Parker 2000). Anthropologists who bore such applied interests also produced ethnographic studies of communities affected by AIDS, in order to characterize their social lives, their experiences of marginalization and social disruption amid AIDS, and how research can inform AIDS activism (Balin 1999; Carrillo 2002; Rubin 1997). Such studies also bridged into

---

6   The most complete citation list in the anthropology of AIDS is the bibliography of the AIDS and Anthropology Research Group of the American Anthropological Association, available on-line at http://groups.creighton.edu/aarg/research/index.html. I limit my citations in the following paragraph to a tiny set of sources representing key topics I wish to highlight. The global locations of my research and of the AARG are evident in these citations overwhelmingly representing US-based research.

ethnographic research specifically on the historical roots or political formation and mediation of communities mobilized in AIDS activism (Adam 1997; Booth 2003; Brown 1997; Epstein 1996). Each of these methods presented scholarly interventions in the politics of health and knowledge that engaged AIDS and knowledge about AIDS as structured by power relations.

Yet these critical agendas by anthropologists of AIDS varied in their application to the epistemologies of research or writing, as became visible in particular in their relation to disciplinary authority. For instance, many radical implications for anthropology and knowledge about AIDS followed Paul Farmer's inspiring and highly-regarded ethnography *AIDS and Accusation: Haiti and the Geography of Blame*. Farmer argued that disease and health are conditioned by inequality and that medical anthropology must respond pragmatically. He linked this analysis to a scathing critique of the colonial legacies shaping Haiti and careful reporting of how rural Haitians narrated AIDS and inequalities, all within an account of a long-term medical venture managing a local health clinic for people living with HIV/AIDS. Farmer reflects on his positionality by noting the harm caused in Third World countries by the development interventions of First World states and their citizens, and he holds himself to not repeating them. His claims are grounded in promoting anthropology as a basis for creating unique scientific knowledge—itself a reflection of how anthropologists of AIDS in the 1980s challenged disciplinary marginality by arguing the extreme need for their work. But this turn to discipline-building stabilizes anthropology's authority as an arbiter of global knowledge about people in poverty or people affected by AIDS. By implicitly addressing this claim to US academic, medical, and policy professionals, Farmer's book does not account for why this is his audience; nor does the book examine at length how he did, or could have communicated his project in equal detail to Haitian officials, teachers, activists, or anyone other than the non-Haitian professional circles to which the book is written. Thus, the book's radical claims appear in a form that ultimately privileges knowledge produced by and for globally powerful readers. Its very critiques

of colonial history and its promotions of coeval and reflexive ethnography thus reinforce anthropology's authority to determine and manage truth for its subjects. I do not mean to single out Farmer's text for critique, but to recognize in his popular work qualities that are much more widespread. Admittedly, this early text publishes his dissertation, a form that forces young scholars to demonstrate disciplinary knowledge to a privileged academic audience. But more importantly, defending the distinctiveness of anthropological knowledge is common to anthropologists who commit their research to social justice and then cite the authority of science to ground and justify that work. But based on my work as a non-Native scholar engaging Indigenous AIDS activism, Native Studies, and the critique of anthropology, I argue that reasserting an authority in anthropological knowledge blocks anti-colonial, coeval, and reflexive relations from arising among anthropologists and people who work with them, who have a chance to create knowledge by mutually and critically engaging the conditions of a colonial and transnational world.

Models of research that displace authority while arising within such relationships also appear in the anthropology of AIDS and other interdisciplinary work by scholars and activists. Writing as members and observers of AIDS-affected communities, Michael Brown, Nancy Stoller, and David Román use ethnography and related methods in sociology and performance studies to examine radical cultural and political responses that set new terms for knowledge production. Steven Epstein and Cathy Cohen turned similar analyses to explain the power relations that historically constrained or enabled community responses as a basis for theorizing AIDS, power, and knowledge (Brown 1997; Cohen 1999; Epstein 1996; Román 1998; Stoller 1997). By locating their interested readings in a range of accounts by AIDS activists, these researchers intersected scholarship by activists who documented the politics, theories, and modes of healing communities produced while holding readers accountable to their stakes (Bérubé 1996; Dangerous Bedfellows 1996; Rubin 1997). All such qualities align when scholars address the colonial and global conditions of AIDS and knowledge production. Cindy Patton has positioned her crit-

ical theories as reflecting AIDS activist histories, when she accounts for how her comrades' locations within US queer activism let them enact the colonial and globalist discourses on AIDS she critiques. From this reflexive position, Patton theorizes the colonial relations that produce AIDS, communities, and knowledge while opening the authority of her claims to question. All this work pushes her and her readers past the comfort zones of habitual thought to foster new communication across differences (Patton 1990; Patton 2002). In turn, Irene Vernon's *Killing Us Quietly: Native Americans and HIV/AIDS* argues that colonization conditions how Native people experience AIDS and mobilize activism, notably by framing the lives and work of Native Two-Spirit people, women, and youth as inspirations for decolonizing the conditions of health. In contrast to Patton's complex prose, Vernon writes in a manner that will be accessible to non-academic Native audiences, even while she creates sophisticated theory from and for Native people by citing knowledge produced in Indigenous AIDS organizing as an Indigenous intellectual history of colonial governmentality and AIDS (Vernon 2001).

Together, these works suggest that scholarship on AIDS will benefit once scholars study and write from accountable relationships with—or as—AIDS activists who mutually produce knowledge about AIDS. I know research on AIDS activism itself cannot be the sole topic or method that anthropologists of AIDS will pursue. But its relative marginality in anthropology vis-à-vis interdisciplinary fields suggests that anthropologists are not being encouraged to conduct work whose key effect, if not intent, is to displace the authority of scholars and their claims. I remind here that displacement is not a synonym for dismissal: one's research is taken *more* seriously if its subjects or interlocutors block it from becoming preeminent over all other knowledge, and instead engage it in critical conversation. Displacement in research is a situating practice that also constitutes a key step towards dialogue. The anthropology of activist knowledge guarantees that opportunities for displacement will arise. Among other reasons, this is why I argue that AIDS activism needs to be made central to the anthropology of AIDS, in order to align research with the methodological critiques that appear both in anthropology and in the public stakes of AIDS activists.

Both Vernon's work and my reading of research on AIDS remind of the claims by Indigenous AIDS activists that framed this essay, and to which my work is a response. As noted, I write this essay in a moment when I am negotiating possibilities for anticolonial ethnographic research with Indigenous and other AIDS activists worldwide. This essay let me account for what I learned from Indigenous activists and scholars and consider the stakes in my pursuing ethnography with them. For many years I have been located as a non-Native interlocutor in relation to Native Two-Spirit and AIDS activists, notably as a scholar of the histories of their organizing. To date, my writing on Indigenous AIDS activist knowledges reflected a process of citation: I have studied Indigenous claims while participating in conversation with activists about what I have read and written. I submitted my prior writing on this topic to journals and presses publishing in Native Studies, and I distributed that writing to activists and scholars linked to Native AIDS organizing, all in order to increase its availability to critical engagement and my capacity to respond. Thus, I will learn whether I will pursue further research based on how Indigenous AIDS organizers respond—and not just to this or any particular text, but in context of our ongoing relationships. Any work we imagine together will arise within those relationships and will remain accountable primarily to them.

I offer this glimpse into my research to reinforce a point implicit in this essay, and ever more explicit in the work of collaborative anthropologists. Anthropology must become a site where the *process* of knowledge production is itself a subject of study, as it has become in this essay. If we think of relationships as the processual spaces where accountable ethnography can arise, then we might say that the process of knowledge production is the heart of good anthropology, and offers the best measure of whether anthropologists have created a good product. Only a process committed to being reflexive,

coeval, and anti-colonial with research collaborators will lead anthropologists to a product that matches those stakes.[7]

Thus, to centre again the lessons of Indigenous AIDS activists, their anti-colonialism demands that the anthropology of AIDS arise in creative and critical response to the colonial legacies within anthropological research and writing. In turn, their transnationalism demands that anthropologists undermine globalism in their methods by situating themselves and their claims in the very transnational power relations that AIDS activists inhabit and critique. Directly addressing the anti-colonial and transnational conditions of knowledge production then will displace anthropological authority, affirm an integrity in AIDS activist knowledges, and make collaborative knowledge production possible. Doing so also will shift anthropologists' scholarly agendas from cohering disciplinary knowledge to engaging dialogically in multiple and relational modes of theory. All such work will open possibilities for anthropologists in communities affected by AIDS or who seek links to them to create new knowledge together, in decolonizing and border-crossing engagements with AIDS and AIDS activism.

7   Current directions in collaborative ethnography are examined in the contributions by Joanne Rappaport, Les Field, Deepa Reddy, and many more in the inaugural issue of *Collaborative Anthropologies*, edited by Luke Lassiter (Lassiter 2008).

References

Adam, Barry
1997   Mobilizing around AIDS: Sites of Struggle in the Formation of AIDS Subjects. *In* In Changing Times: Gay Men and Lesbians Encounter HIV/AIDS. M. Levine, Peter Nardi, John Gagnon, ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Adam, Barry, A. Sears and G. Schellenberg
2000   Accounting for Unsafe Sex. Journal of Sex Research 37(1):259-271.

Anguksuar, (Richard LaFortune)
1997   A Postcolonial Colonial Perspective on Western [Mis]Conceptions of the Cosmos and the Restoration of Indigenous Taxonomies. *In* Two-Spirit People: Native American Gender Identity, Sexuality, and Spirituality. S.-E. Jacobs, W. Thomas and S. Lang, eds. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Asad, Talal
1973   Introduction. *In* Anthropology & the Colonial Encounter. T. Asad, ed. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press.
1991   Afterword: From the History of Colonial Anthropology to the Anthropology of Western Hegemony. *In* Colonial Situations: Essays on the Contextualization of Ethnographic Knowledge. G. Stocking, ed. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Balin, Jane
1999   A Neighborhood Divided: Community Resistance to an AIDS Care Facility. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Barney, David, Betty Duran and Caitlin Rosenthal
2004   HIV/AIDS Care Programs for American Indians and Alaska Natives. *In* Healing and Mental Health for Native Americans. E. Nebelkopf, M. Phillips, eds. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

Bérubé, Allan
1996   The History of Gay Bathhouses. *In* Policing Public Sex: Queer Politics and the Future of AIDS Activism. D. Bedfellows, ed. Boston: South End Press.

Bolton, Ralph

1992 Mapping Terra Incognita: Sex Research for AIDS Prevention—An Urgent Agenda for the 1990s. *In* In The Time of AIDS: Social Analysis, Theory, and Method. G. Herdt and S. Lindenbaum, eds. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

1994 Sex, Science, and Social Responsibility: Cross-Cultural Research on Same-Sex Eroticism and Sexual Intolerance. Cross-Cultural Research 28(2):134-190

Booth, Karen

2003 Local Women, Global Science: Fighting AIDS In Kenya. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Bouey, Paul and Betty Duran

2000 The Ahalaya Case-Management Program for HIV-Infected American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians: Quantitative and Qualitative Evaluation of Impacts. American Indian and Alaska Native Mental Health Research: The Journal of the National Center 9(2):36-52.

Brown, Michael P.

1997 RePlacing Citizenship: AIDS Activism and Radical Democracy. New York: Guilford Press.

Bruyneel, Kevin

2007 The Third Space of Sovereignty: The Postcolonial Politics of U.S.-Indigenous Relations. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bunzl, Matti

2002 Foreward to Johannes Fabian's Time and the Other/Syntheses of a Critical Anthropology. *In* Time and the Other: How Anthropology Meets Its Object. J. Fabian, ed. New York: Columbia University Press.

Burns, Randy

1988 Preface. *In* Living the Spirit: A Gay American Indian Anthology. W. Roscoe, ed. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Cameron, Barbara

1993 Frybread in Berlin. *In* The Wind: American Indian Alaska Native Community AIDS Network Newsletter 4(4):1, 5.

Carrillo, Hector

2002 The Night Is Young: Sexuality in Mexico in the Time of AIDS. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Clifford, James and George Marcus, eds.

1986 Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cohen, Cathy

1999 The Boundaries of Blackness: AIDS and the Breakdown of Black Politics. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dangerous Bedfellows

1996 Policing Public Sex: Queer Politics and the Future of AIDS Activism. Boston: South End Press.

Davis, Yvonne

2006 Advancing HIV/AIDS Prevention in Indigenous Communities. *In* XVI International AIDS Conference. Toronto.

della Porta, Donatella, and Sidney Tarrow

2005 Transnational Protest and Global Activism. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers

Duran, Bonnie, and Karina Walters

2004 HIV/AIDS Prevention in "Indian Country": Current Practice, Indigenist Etiology Models, and Postcolonial Approaches to Change. AIDS Education and Prevention 16(3):187-201.

Epstein, Stephen

1996 Impure Science: AIDS, Activism, and the Politics of Knowledge Berkeley: University of California Press.

Fabian, Johannes

1971 Language, History, and Anthropology. Journal of the Philosophy of the Social Sciences 1:19-47.

1983 Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object. New York: Columbia University Press.

Farmer, Paul

1999 Infections and Inequalities: The Modern Plagues. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Garroutte, Eva Marie

2003 Real Indians: Identity and the Survival of Native America. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gough, Kathleen
    1968   New Proposals for Anthropologists. Current
           Anthropology 9:403-407.
Grewal, Inderpal
    2005   Transnational America: Feminisms, Diasporas,
           Neoliberalisms. Durham: Duke University Press.
Hurtado, Albert
    1999   Intimate Frontiers: Sex, Gender, and Culture
           in Old California. Albuquerque: University of
           New Mexico Press.
Inda, Jonathan
    2005   Anthropologies of Modernity: Foucault,
           Governmentality, and Life Politics. New York:
           Blackwell.
International Indigenous People's Satellite
    2006   The Toronto Charter: Indigenous People's
           Action Plan on HIV/AIDS 2006. Toronto:
           International Indigenous People's Satellite of the
           XVI International AIDS Conference.
Junga-Williams, Rodney
    2006   Rodney's Journey: An Interview with the
           Aboriginal & Islander Health Worker Journal.
           Aboriginal & Islander Health Worker Journal
           30(sample):1-2.
Kairaiuak, Larry
    2002   Addressing Two-Spirits in the American
           Indian, Alaskan Native and Native Hawaiian
           Communities. Oakland, CA: National Native
           American AIDS Prevention Center.
Keck, Margaret E., and Kathryn Sikkink
    1998   Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks
           in International Politics. Ithaca, NY: Cornell
           University Press.
Lassiter, Luke Eric, ed.
    2008   Collaborative Anthropologies 1.
Lassiter, Luke Eric, Hurley Goodall, Elizabeth Campbell,
and Michelle Natasya Johnson
    2004   The Other Site of Middletown: Exploring
           Muncie's African American Community. Walnut
           Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
Lavie, Smadar
    1990   The Poetics of Military Occupation: Mzeina
           Allegories of Bedouin Identity Under Israeli and
           Egyptian Rule. Berkeley: University of California
           Press.

Manalansan, Martin
    2003   Global Divas: Filipino Gay Men in the
           Diaspora. Durham: Duke University Press.
Mbali, Mandisa
    2004a Iphi i-treatment (Where's the Treatment?):
           Reflections on the Treatment Action Campaign
           (TAC) People's Health Summit, East London,
           2-4 July 2004. Durban: Centre for Civil Society,
           University of KwaZulu-Natal.
    2004b The Treatment Action Campaign and the
           History of Rights-Based, Patient-Driven HIV/
           AIDS Activism in South Africa. Durban:
           University of Kwazulu-Natal Centre for Civil
           Society.
Medicine, Beatrice
    1997   Changing Native American Roles in an
           Urban Context and Changing Native American
           Sex Roles in an Urban Context. In Two-Spirit
           People: Native American Gender Identity,
           Sexuality, and Spirituality. S.-E. Jacobs, W.
           Thomas, and S. Lang, eds. Urbana: University of
           Illinois Press.
Midnight Sun
    1988   Sex/Gender Systems in Native North
           America. In Living the Spirit: A Gay American
           Indian Anthology. W. Roscoe, ed. New York: St.
           Martin's Press.
Mihesuah, Devon
    1998   Introduction. In Natives and Academics:
           Researching and Writing about American
           Indians. D. Mihesuah, ed. Lincoln: University of
           Nebraska Press.
    2005   So You Want to Write About American
           Indians?: A Guide for Writers, Students, and
           Scholars. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
Morgensen, Scott
    2008   Activist Media in Native AIDS Organizing:
           Theorizing the Colonial Conditions of AIDS.
           American Indian Culture and Research Journal
           32(1): 35-56.
    2009   Back and Forth to the Land: Negotiating
           Rural and Urban Sexuality Among the Radical
           Faeries. In Out In Public: Reinventing Lesbian/
           Gay Anthropology in a Globalizing World. E.
           Lewin, W. Leap, eds. Malden, MA: Blackwell
           Press.

Forthcoming   Welcome Home: Settler Sexuality and the Politics of Indigeneity. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Minnesota American Indian AIDS Task Force
N.d.   The Ogitchidag Gikinooamaagad Players: Youth Peer Education 'Warrior Teachers'. Minneapolis: Minnesota American Indian AIDS Task Force.

Naples, Nancy, and Manisha Desai
2002   Women's Activism and Globalization: Linking Local Struggles and Transnational Politics. New York: Routledge.

National Alliance of State and Territorial AIDS Directors
2004   Native Americans and HIV/AIDS: Key Issues and Recommendations for Health Departments. Washington, DC: National Alliance of State and Territorial AIDS Directors.

National Native American AIDS Prevention Center
2006   Landmark Charter Calls for Full Participation of Indigenous Peoples in HIV Programs. Seasons: Newsletter of the National Native American AIDS Prevention Center (Summer):6.

National Native American AIDS Prevention Center and the Rural Center for AIDS/STD Prevention
2004   HIV/STD Prevention Guidelines for Native American Communities: American Indians, Alaska Natives, & Native Hawaiians. Oakland: National Native American AIDS Prevention Center and the Rural Center for AIDS/STD Prevention.

Parker, Richard
1994   Public Policy, Political Activism, and AIDS in Brazil. In Global AIDS Policy. D. Feldman, ed. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.
2000   Administering the Epidemic: HIV/AIDS Policy, Models of Development, and International Health. In Global Health Policy: The Fallacy of the Level Playing Field. L. Whiteford, L. Manderson eds. Boulder, CO: Lynne Reiner Publishing Company.

Patton, Cindy
1990   Inventing AIDS. New York: Routledge.
2002   Globalizing AIDS. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Prakash, Gyan
1999   Another Reason: Science and the Imagination of Modern India. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Puar, Jasbir
2007   Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times. Durham: Duke University Press.

Román, David
1998   Acts of Intervention: Performance, Gay Culture, and AIDS. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Rubin, Gayle
1997   Elegy for the Valley of the Kings. In In Changing Times: Gay Men and Lesbians Encounter HIV/AIDS. M. Levine, Peter Nardi, John Gagnon, eds. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rush, Andrea Green
1989   Models of Prevention: Minnesota American Indian AIDS Task Force. Seasons: Newsletter of the National Native American AIDS Prevention Center:4-5.

Scott, David
1995   Colonial Governmentality. Social Text 43:191-220.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai
1999   Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples. New York: Zed Books.

Smith, Paul Chaat, and Robert Allen Warrior
1997   Like a Hurricane: The Indian Movement from Alcatraz to Wounded Knee. New York: New Press.

Stocking, George
1983   Observers Observed: Essays on Ethnographic Fieldwork. In History of Anthropology. G. Stocking, ed. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Stoler, Ann Laura
1995   Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things. Durham: Duke University Press.

Stoller, Nancy
1997   Lessons from the Damned; Queers, Whores and Junkies Respond to AIDS. New York: Routledge.

Thomas, Wesley, and Sue-Ellen Jacobs
    1999 "...And We Are Still Here": From Berdache to Two-Spirit People. American Indian Culture and Research Journal 23(2):91-107.

Tsing, Anna Lowenhaupt
    1993 In the Realm of the Diamond Queen: Marginality in an Out-of-the-Way-Place. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
    2005 Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
    2003 A Quiet Crisis: Federal Funding and Unmet Needs in Indian Country. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

Vernon, Irene S.
    2001 Killing Us Quietly: Native Americans and HIV/AIDS. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Visweswaran, Kamala
    1994 Fictions of Feminist Ethnography. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Wagner, Roy
    1981 (1975) The Invention of Culture (Revised and Expanded Edition). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Walters, Karina, Jane Simoni
    2002 Reconceptualizing Native Women's Health: An Indigenist Stress-Coping Model. American Journal of Public Health 92(4).

Warrior, Robert Allen
    1994 Tribal Secrets: Recovering American Indian Intellectual Traditions. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
    2006 Native Critics in the World: Edward Said and Nationalism. In American Indian Literary Nationalism. J. Weaver, Craig Womack, and Robert Allen Warrior, eds. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Weaver, Jace
    1997 That the People Might Live: Native American Literatures and Native American Community. New York: Oxford University Press.

Weston, Kath
    1997 The Virtual Anthropologist. In Anthropological Locations: Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science. A. Gupta, and J. Ferguson, eds. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Williams, Brackette
    1991 Stains on My Name, War in My Veins: Guyana and the Politics of Cultural Struggle. Durham: Duke University Press.

A Reflection on Political Research and Social Justice Organizing

Anna L. Anderson-Lazo

Independent Scholar, San Diego

ABSTRACT: As an anthropologist in Guatemala in the late 1990s, my fieldwork among Afro-indigenous community leaders, activists and lay historians participating in democracy-building projects, NGOs, and community organizations during the Peace Process raised questions about the methods and ethics of research and advocacy in the context of political Terror. Now as a community organizer in San Diego with Latino immigrant and African-American communities in recent years, applying an engaged, reflexive anthropological perspective to US social justice organizing models and objectives sheds new light on the political ramifications of familiar practices, such as gathering testimonies, framing an interview, and cutting an actionable issue.

Key words: community organizing; Afro-American diaspora; engaged methodologies

> The central fact for me is, I think, that the intellectual is an individual endowed with a faculty for representing, embodying, articulating a message, a view, an attitude, philosophy or opinion to, as well as for, a public. And this role has an edge to it, and cannot be played without a sense of being someone whose place it is publicly to raise embarrassing questions, to confront orthodoxy and dogma (rather than to produce them, to be someone who cannot easily be co-opted by governments and corporations, and whose *raison d'etre* is to represent all those people and issues that are routinely forgotten or swept under the rug. The intellectual does so on the basis of universal principles: that all human beings are entitled to expect decent standards of behaviour concerning freedom and justice from worldly power or nations, and that deliberate or inadvertent violations of these standards need to be testified and fought against courageously. [Edward Said 1996:11-12]

Introduction

This article began as my contribution to a conversation about political activism and engaged anthropology among colleagues who were increasingly uneasy with the actions of an aggressively, pro-war administration in the U.S., and how the recent, future and ongoing effects of these neoimperialist aggressions would impact the contexts where anthropologists teach and conduct socially committed research, here and abroad. As I reflected on this fraught intersection and our tense historical moment, I began to consider whether my recent work as a social justice organizer in the U.S. had shifted my understanding of the roles, responsibilities and relationships that characterize politically-engaged,

ethnographic inquiry. Initially, I hoped that a thick description of the grassroots organizing models used by labour, faith-based and social justice organizations in the U.S. would shed light on recent discussions that seek to move the discipline toward a decolonizing anthropological praxis; however, I found that my own trajectory, shifting from engaged researcher to employed activist, reintroduced many of the epistemological, methodological and ethics-related questions and frustrations that I had interrogated so vigorously during my graduate training, fieldwork and ethnographic writing since the mid-1990s.

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 endeavour 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.

Insider and Outsider Dilemmas of an Apprentice Activist-Researcher

As a doctoral researcher in Guatemala in the late 1990s, my fieldwork among Garifuna—that is, Afro-indigenous, Black Carib—community leaders, activists and historians who were contributing to the democracy-building projects of the Guatemalan National Peace Process anticipated and raised some of the familiar qualms about the methods and ethics of conducting research in developing nations and among structurally peripheralized groups, espe-

cially in the context of political terror and violence, which seemed at the time of the so-called "Peace" to be escalating rather than subsiding. Initially, my research objective was to advance the understanding of how Garifuna people used their longterm, regional and transcommunal social networks and new legal right to a Garifuna-specific indigenous worldview, or *cosmovisión,* to refract their needs and concerns through the lenses crafted and imposed by distant architects—i.e., the United Nations proctoring the Peace Process and the putatively democratic governance apparatus, an alliance of the new government, the guerrilla, the military, and representatives of the three major Indigenous groups. This approach used participant observation and direct engagement with community scholars to critically reassess the usefulness of previous (often colonizing and empiricist) social scientific studies perennially focused on the "disappearance" and shallow (neoteric) roots of Garifuna culture, the persistence of the matrifocal family and religious traditions, the emphasis of Garifuna heritage on their indigenous linguistic background rather than their preponderantly African ancestry (which had been examined incessantly for more than fifty years), and, particularly salient during the Peace Process, the alleged lack of political participation among Garifuna communities in their home countries throughout Central America since the 19th century.

At the outset, however, my Garifuna interlocutors raised their own, community-specific concerns about outsider anthropologists, especially those from the U.S., conducting field research that contributed little to and often impeded their everyday lives and ongoing political struggles, and they proscribed research activities for me that would meet their needs. In a related vein, they also expressed a growing fear that, beyond a handful of over-utilized professionals, they were inadequately prepared to take advantage of new democratic and development opportunities. For nearly two years, then, at the invitation of Garifuna political leaders, activists and organizers, I attended almost daily Peace Process meetings officiated by government officials, NGO workers and representatives of the U.N. or participated in other social, cultural and political gatherings organized by

Garifuna community groups, with my notes serving to inform those who were not able to attend. Various Garifuna community leaders also suggested that I should visit several learned elders, which I did weekly, to record a Garifuna community history that proclaimed their worldview as the basis for their survival of a civil war that spanned a period of four decades as well as for their resistance to the systematic, structural and racial marginalization of their community over two centuries. These combined activities gave me a sense that my research was respectfully conceived and community-driven, but I frequently encountered the need to clarify my role and my aims. Specifically, I emphasized that I was a student apprenticing in both research and political work, attempting to make my modest institutional and intellectual resources available to the community.

As I describe and situate more extensively in the dissertation (2003), I began to inhabit the role of an apprentice—that is, working in the company of experts and elders to learn about and identify community need; using anthropology to support community efforts; and planning to be transformed by this experience of living among people who were actively seeking to change the historical, cultural and structural conditions that had caused a protracted genocidal civil war and produced a deeply stratified society riddled with poverty, illiteracy, and disease to which they were exceedingly vulnerable. Thus, as my relationships with community members deepened, I sought an anthropological role that placed in the foreground my own trajectory as a young woman of working class, mixed cultural background, African-descended and Native American, whose research interests in community organizing and political practice echoed but, more importantly, could build on my commitments and capacities as an anti-colonial, feminist and social justice activist-researcher. I found that I was seeking more than merely rapport; rather I was working toward research as an intellectual collaboration based on political solidarity with Garifuna community organizers.

Among the various conditions that made my social location relevant and complex, I observed that being a relatively young, female researcher, who was often misrecognized by outsiders as a Garifuna par-

ticipant or representative, offered both advantages and obstacles for me and the people with whom I was conducting my research, especially as community leaders began to use strategically my credentials, expertise and institutional relationships to advance the aims of their organizations and projects. Some fieldwork situations seemed straightforward, even easy, such as using my tutorial in Garifuna language to assist in the funding and development of the first draft of a national bilingual curriculum; however other situations were more nuanced. For instance, midway through my research when I received a Fulbright grant to support my research, I was truly grateful for the funding and other substantial forms of support offered by the program; however I also felt compelled to express my ambivalence about participating in a program that was conceived, largely, to project the "nice face of US imperialism" in the world. Garifuna leaders, however, welcomed and used my connections to the embassy, especially the cultural program assistance provided by the US Information Agency, to amplify their presence through more, positive representations of themselves in the capital. Similarly in another instance, Garifuna leaders strongly encouraged me to participate alongside government ministers and entrepreneurs from several countries in a meeting to advance the development of the Bay of Honduras region as a site of cultural tourism from which Garifuna representatives were expressly excluded, and when my turn to speak arrived, I was told that time had run out so I should simply introduce myself. Noting that I was the youngest, only non-white and female person in the room, I took the opportunity to leverage my citizenship and status as a US Fulbright scholar, stating that my research addressed the crucial significance of the Garifuna to the settling and economic development of the Caribbean lowlands since colonial times, which in that instant became the subject of a chapter in the dissertation I was soon to write.

Again, readers might apprehend the reflexive stance I employ in this essay as a naive reintroduction of advocacy anthropology or as C.R. Menzies describes the latter, anthropology "on behalf," as a remedy to colonial/colonizing research paradigms that long produced knowledge about oppressed

peoples for the sake of the powerful (2001). Rather I agree with Menzies, that research is always, already political, and as I discuss at length in the section comparing social justice organizing and engaged ethnographic inquiry, I concur with him, that the final stage consisting of writing, analysis, revision and distribution is the most important for ensuring that the product of one's research is respectfully engaged (2001:22). My attempts to engage my interlocutors in the design and execution of my research plan were manifold; nonetheless, I found that politically engaged work requires a concerted transgression of hegemonic research norms that extend well beyond the field project. For instance, when I was preparing to leave Livingston, Guatemala in late 1998, I organized a community conference where I would present my initial research findings and receive comments from the community at large as well as a panel of leaders, elders and scholars. I received feedback that intimated the high hopes that my friends, allies and acquaintances had for me. Specifically, they stated that I should more than merely publish their stories, which they thought would benefit me and to a lesser degree help to advance some of their more politically-expedient critiques of anthropological research, but rather they hoped that I would mature as a scholar-activist and perhaps continue to work for their community by forming a development NGO that strengthened their ties to the United States and other transnational entities. While I had a well-rehearsed, postcolonial analysis of development (cf. Escobar 1995) as well as a feminist critique of the NGOization of Latin American social movements (cf. Alvarez 1998), I understood this as a call to action on a deep level that would require more than composing a document that acknowledged the concerns expressed by my Garifuna interlocutors.

My readings, conversations and work alongside other anti-colonial activists and academics in Guatemala and in the US encouraged me to carefully choose subjects that reproduce neither hegemonic categories of difference nor the hierarchies of domination they obscure. More specifically, my feminist training charged me to see my subjective, embodied experience as part of my research (cf., Zavella 1997); and considering the multiplicity of selves (Abu-Lughod 1990; 1991) that arises in the shifting contexts where I conduct action-research, I take up the challenge of post-structural anthropology to understand the texts I produce as constitutive of real, material effects, including producing knowledge to be shared across activist trajectories and interest groups. When, for instance, I shifted my focus, as Mohanty (1997) suggests, from reproducing a category such as "people in struggle" or "women organizers" to advancing a transhistorical understanding of the "work" of organizing that recognizes how common social change goals and activist trajectories can create linkages with other social change "workers," I began to propose that my research might produce transgressive, (perhaps) decolonizing analysis to undermine the intractable insider/outsider dynamics that have required the perennial reinvention, recapturing and retrofitting of anthropology, cultural critique and social analysis (Hymes 1969; Marcus and Fisher 1986; Rosaldo 1989). My hope, as an anthropologist trained in the 1990s, is that new interventions can make use of these key reflexive moments in the discipline to genuinely shift paradigms of praxis in relation to new conceptual frameworks, such as intersectionality, transcommunality, and transnational feminisms, and shared domains of knowledge production and activism.

The Personal is Political: Activist Trajectories and Professional Organizing

During the early 2000s when U.S. progressives were considering how to respond to the fact that despite our protests the far-right effectively had taken control of the federal administration, legislative and executive branches alike, to launch a worldwide, ideological and material war in the name of democracy and freedom both in our "homeland" and everywhere beyond, I finished the long process of writing the dissertation. Frankly, I felt personally accomplished, yet politically disconnected from the United States and the people in Guatemala, whose interests I had hoped to support with my newly minted PhD. To my professional chagrin, I also realized that I was experiencing what many previous anthropologists have lived: the literal and relational distancing of the researcher from the subjects with whom they conduct research.

I began to consider seriously again the suggestion made by Garifuna elders that marginalized communities needed more professionals who are prepared to run organizations, participate in civil society, and government, and I examined how the relatively privileged educational experience that had (literally) saved me from my impoverished roots, had done little to prepare me to be a powerful political actor on my own behalf, much less in solidarity with the people in Guatemala from whom I had received so much.

Thus I found appealing the opportunity to work directly with communities on the U.S.-Mexico border, where I thought my citizenship conferred decidedly "insider" rights and responsibilities that would facilitate my understanding of political power and contextualize my role as an anthropologist within a broader consciousness of historical trajectories of activisms in the United States. Consequently, in San Diego, I took a job as the development director (writing grants and fundraising) for a non-profit organization that focused on using Internet and other technologies to support progressive community building, networking and activism across the 11 villages that make up a sprawling, metropolitan, and largely stratified and segregated city. In this work with its focus on progressive interconnectivity, I found that a host of organizations sought to represent low-income Latino immigrant and African-American peoples in the region, but few actually engaged them in the process. Within a year of moving to San Diego, I was offered a job as a bilingual community organizer with the San Diego Organizing Project (SDOP), a faith-based community organization serving 45,000 families in the region, which had established a strong track record of recruiting and training community leaders and building alliances with progressive organizations, elected officials and working-class constituencies. As a member of what previously had been called the Pacific Institute for Community Organizing (now more succinctly the PICO National Network), representing one million families in 150 cities and 17 states, SDOP worked on social justice issues at the local, regional and national level as part of "one of the largest community-based efforts in the United States." After 35 evaluative interviews with the community leaders for whom I would work

as an organizer, I was hired to mobilize five congregations to address social justice issues, including housing, employment, development, immigration rights, education, neighborhood safety, healthcare and environmental quality.

Many contemporary faith-based social justice organizations claim, as SDOP/PICO does in its training manual, that "churches are among the few organizations that can span the whole range of public and private relationship," and that "faith-based organizing is a means of reestablishing a public voice for people" (PICO Manual N.d.). Admittedly, as I considered what organizing work among religious groups would entail, it was easy for me to cast churches based in the US as hegemonic ideological institutions steeped in a colonial legacy, while the Afro-Catholic mutual aid societies with whom I had worked in Guatemala were easier to situate as libratory groups that had successfully transgressed the repression and genocidal pograms of the counterinsurgency during the civil war. Furthermore, when a prominent San Diego organizer explained that the organizational motto, "never do for people, what they can do for themselves," implies "teaching people to *do* community development," I contemplated how applicable postcolonial critiques of development frameworks would be for me as an organizer. Therefore, as I fought to resist a cozy armchair approach that would pit well-positioned theory against action on the ground, I was forced to confront the fact that my kneejerk fears arose from my relative ignorance of US faith-based organizing history. Thus, my employment offered an opportunity for me to investigate the "work" of organizing in a new social, historical context, to interrogate my own "will to activism" in relation to social change trajectories "at home," and to examine how organizing models much like rather than in conflict with anthropological frameworks, address similar concerns about research, engagement, analysis, action and power.

In an interview in 2007, a PICO national director explained that the PICO model applies "social network theory," which means that they focus on developing community leaders to raise concerns that can be addressed through the political process in "multiple arenas." He described how they are

currently testing their capacity at the national level, by posing the following question: "can a non-hierarchal, grassroots, network movement impact national policy?" While this question seemed mostly rhetorical at the time, I would venture an affirmative answer. Contemporary social movements in the US draw on a deep, historical legacy of successful grassroots political mobilization from previous movements here and abroad, and, clearly, the PICO organizing model builds on a particularly rich intersection of activist trajectories. Thus, by citing such influences as Liberation Theology in Latin America and the work of such figures as Paolo Freire, Deborah Meier (1995), as well as Anne Hope and Sally Timmel, US organizations invoke a body of transnational organizing thought that acknowledges the interconnection and multidirectional flows among these movements and trajectories.

As an organizer for two years, which involved direct relationship-building with the community leaders from the five churches I was employed to support as well as four years of conducting formal and informal ethnographic interviews among participants engaged in activism across a range of non-profit groups, unions and NGOs focused on organizing or civic voluntarism, I found that the most prominent, local and national groups historicizing a specific framework or "model" for mobilizing collective action among faith-based communities explicitly cited the influence of civil rights church groups, trade unionism and the lifework of Saul Alinsky (especially 1971). This trajectory, of course, draws the connection of church-based movements to explicitly class-based struggle. Alinsky's criminology research in the late 1930s among youth in the "Back-of-the-Yards" area of Chicago led him, first, to transgress his received role as a silent observer, and secondly to develop a model for creating what he called "an organization of organizations" that would engage working class communities in the political process (see Skocpol 2000; Whitman 2006). The entity he created eventually became the IAF, a strong, secular national network that today mobilizes grassroots collective action in similar ways to PICO in the United States. While various political analysts suggest that in the context of a decline of (participation in) the public sphere,

especially since the 1980s, these organizations, like other neopopulist schemes, have "run up against the limits of their own localist parochialism and inertia" (Boggs 1997:759), others seek to ground historically an argument that these efforts continue to build powerful social change forces by equipping an engaged citizenry to make use of new solidarities and activism at state and national levels of governance (Wood 2007).

In this vein, a brief though not shallow, recent history of organizing in the United States recognizes the Civil Rights Movement in large part as a church-based movement, producing new political phenomena, such as the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), which served as an umbrella organization of affiliates from various sectors. An array of social science studies explores the intersections of religion with other arenas of public life that point back to the political realm. For instance, examinations of the role of women in changing and politicizing the Black Church (Higgenbotham 1993; 1996) should be linked to the role of these same women in forging national feminist alliances and founding powerful organizations such as NOW, which continues to be construed as a solely white/second wave feminist group (Braude 2004). Other studies show how contemporaneous developments such as Vatican II and the Civil Rights Movement brought about changes in the US that made the Catholic Church a site of social change mobilization, resonating with grassroots social action such as Liberation Theology throughout Latin America. Thus, one might broaden the historical lens for church-based organizing to reexamine such occurrences as the election of the first Catholic US president in relation to the passing of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; to Robert Kennedy's support of the UFW in 1966; and to the emergence of Dr. King's "Poor People's Campaign," but more importantly, we might use these intersections of political and religious life to identify emerging transcommunal, social protest/social change frameworks. In the early 1970s, PICO, formerly the Pacific Institute for Community Organizing, began with secular, neighbourhood organizing in Oakland and recognizing the strength of church-based groups quickly evolved a faith-based model to engage a relatively diverse

sampling of faith communities in the political process, especially Catholic, Protestant and Unitarian Universalist churches, Reform synagogues, and more recently, mosques, and secular non-profits (cf., Wood 2002).

While the 1980s and 1990s are often characterized as being a time of declining political participation; polarizing suburban/conurbanization; disorganized urban dissent (e.g., the 1992 Los Angeles riots); and disempowerment, the charge that this form of organizing is simply issue-based and local, overlooks the sustained energy and powerful relationships that specific victories during this period symbolize. For instance, when SDOP responded to the needs of its own membership, which included undocumented immigrants vulnerable to INS threats and upper middle class families whose grown children could not afford to stay in the region, they seized a political opportunity and commissioned a policy study that demonstrated how city ordinances regarding rents, rental agreements and evictions, in combination with the high cost of housing for workers and families adversely were affecting all sectors. In 2002, the City Council declared a housing state of emergency thus opening the door to many more housing-related gains for SDOP and galvanizing a transcommunal, cross-class alliance including empowered community members, city officials and coalitions across various sectors.

While my focus here is neither how religion serves as an undercurrent in political life, nor simply grassroots organizing among churches, a structural-historical perspective of organizing in the US acknowledges that churches and other faith-based communities have been instrumental in challenging the broader society to confront the contradictions of democratic ideals with the social and economic realities lived by workers, the poor, and people of colour expressly by invoking social justice values. As I prepare to look closely at the organizing model used by PICO and emulated by a host of other US organizations, large and small, I raise for discussion the challenge, which organizing frameworks offer to engaged ethnographic practices: Specifically, organizing frameworks require reciprocal relations of accountability from all participants in a process, which connects empathetic listening to direct action supported by research. My argument is that the best critiques of anthropology as a social science discipline similarly point up the possibility of producing ethnographic inquiry that reflects the needs of the communities with whom we research, suggest specific courses of action that we can take in solidarity with activists; and require accountable relationships throughout a process that does not end with research. Specific points of convergence with engaged anthropology, then, include the emphasis of organizing on the concerns of the people with whom we work, a definition of power that attends to the structural constraints on human behavior, or, phrased differently, a critique of power that seeks to advance and redistribute knowledge about the rules of the political, social and cultural systems in which people can act on their own behalf, both individually and collectively. In what follows, I propose that we can read and work across these domains of power/knowledge production.

Here I turn to a close look at the organizing model and key principles, glossed as "the PICO process," and I relate the latter to the steps for conducting respectful research that engages the radical critique of Western social science as thoughtfully elaborated by Charles Menzies in his work as a Native anthropologist among Indigenous peoples (2001; see also 2004). These closing arguments, then, seek to demonstrate how the primary aims in organizing (the surfacing of issues to be addressed through collective action) overlap with the objectives (and, consequently, values) of engaged research, which is to create knowledge that serves the community.

The PICO Process: "Power Is a Product of Relationships"

While the PICO organizing model can be simplified to five irreducible steps, paid organizers and community members, who are willing to commit to leadership roles for any length of time, receive rigorous local, state and national training on how to develop a shared understanding of the process within the local organizing committee (a.k.a. an "LOC"). Among the tools organizers and leaders accrue are various trainings that break down the model even further, and they practice employing nearly fifty

"principles" that illustrate various aspects of the logic behind the process. When for instance, one says that "organizing is about people, and people are about issues," she reminds herself and others that the work of surfacing issues to be acted upon should never come before an interest in the person. A second principle further elucidates this PICO orientation: "power is a product of relationships." Thus, building the organization is necessary to mobilize the LOC to take collective action, but the strength of collective action lies in people acting out of their own self-interest, which over time broadens to encompass the concerns they share with others. A third principle that synopsizes the entire process is "push on a problem you get issues; push on an issue, you get values." In addition to locating the need to push people to see that injustice contradicts both faith values and democratic values, this statement implies the thrust of the organizing: when people have the opportunity to express their problems and are heard by someone who shares these concerns, they build relationships with other members of the LOC, and sometimes they are ready to take the next steps, which are defining the issue and mobilizing collective action.

When organizers summarize the PICO process, they often use the following flowchart:

1-1's — Research — Action — Reflection — 1-1's

Despite its apparent simplicity, the process of moving an entire congregation to action and beyond can be a long one. Aptly, then, the first and the last step in the PICO process is to listen, using the "one-to-one interview" (hereafter rendered in the organization's nomenclature, "1-1"). By focusing on the PICO process and the methods of anthropology, this article avoids using the personal content of individual 1-1's conducted with community members. Instead I focus on the significance of the interview in the production of power/knowledge. Specifically, I use interviews with organizing directors, the PICO training manual (see references), my training notes from 2003 to 2005, and published literature to draw out the overlap and potential interplay between approaches. Similar to the process for mobilizing social action, Menzies outlines four basic steps for a methodological approach to "respectful research

relations" drawn from his experience as a consultant commissioned by First Nations as well as in the capacity of independent researcher (2001:21). In brief, these include initiating dialogue, refining the research plan, conducting the research, and finally, writing, analysis, revision and distribution (22). In his analysis, the primary principle of engaged anthropological approaches should be to resist expanding "the knowledge and power of the dominant society at the expense of the colonized and the excluded," and he underscores the importance of remaining in contact with the community in the following way: "Whenever possible, meetings should be held to discuss and analyze research results.… The ultimate aim is to democratize access to specialized research skills and research as much as possible so that research can by conducted in the community and by the community and/or complement the research already underway in the community" (22). This approach of using direct communication and equipping the people with whom we work to conduct research articulates with the commitments of organizers and leaders to use 1-1's throughout the process and the explicit aim of organizing to recruit, support and train community leaders as they develop their own capacities as empowered agents of social change.

1-1's: Listening, Talking and Testifying

1-1's are seen as the "foundation" of people-centered organizing, because they are used in every stage of the process to sharpen or regain focus and to build relationships. Specifically, 1-1's are structured half-hour interviews with individual church members who have expressed interest in addressing a specific issue or want to learn more about organizing in their community. Conducted as house-visits or meetings at a local coffee shop by organizers, and sometimes by members of the local organizing committee who are participating in a "listening campaign," 1-1's are vital to the PICO process because they give people an opportunity to express their dreams, hopes, and concerns about where they live; to be heard by someone who cares; and to be introduced to the aims and accountabilities of organizing. Organizing seeks to more than merely elicit a personalized description of a problem; rather as part of the process, the interview

begins to ask people to see how their problems impact the entire community and offers the opportunity to take responsibility to make systemic change as part of a collective. Thus, these interviews begin the process by identifying problems that can be framed as issues to be acted upon, and initiating the relationships that establish power for the organization—that is, those between the organizer and the individual, between the individual and the organizing committee, and between the LOC and the broader society.

Research Is the Bridge

According to PICO, "research is the bridge that takes us across problems to issues," and as the process flow-chart illustrates research traverses the expanse from listening to action. Expressed more evocatively by a lead organizer in San Diego, cutting an action-able issue is "like slicing a loaf of bread." Whereas a problem, such as poverty, is general, vague, often overwhelming and indigestible, an issue, on the other hand is specific, identifying who is affected, who is responsible, who can do something, and which dis-crete steps can bring about change. PICO research then is a collective process, where LOC members meet with each other and think together about how to personalize and polarize problems into issues. Personalizing a problem is crucial, because prob-lems are specific to real people, thus building the power to make change requires relationships among specific persons. Polarizing the issue, on the other hand, clarifies what should be done—for instance, noticing that city allocations pay for sidewalks in La Jolla, and not in the barrio frames the problem as a "winnable" issue, invoking fairness and justice. At this stage, members of the LOC may also meet with offi-cials who may be aware of these issues, know about some of the challenges, and share a common policy agenda. Again, 1-1's within the LOC are vital to this step in the process, because they identify the relation-ships to be drawn upon during the action; that is, the resulting action connects the person who experiences the problem to others with similar experience and to the public officials who are responsible and have the authority to make change.

Action: Pushing the Issues

In PICO-speak, "an issue is a problem we can act upon," so all of the steps of organizing channel problems and pursue action. Actions, or public events, usually occur at the LOC's home church and typ-ically involve publicly confronting public officials with the power to make change, "pinning them" to acknowledging their responsibility, and asking them to commit to taking a concrete step to create change. Here, 1-1's are instrumental to the identification of people who are willing to speak out and to their prep-aration of testimonies that powerfully illustrate the issue and effectively describe an attainable policy change. When sharing their testimonies, LOC mem-bers simultaneously demonstrate to members of the church that their voices (and numbers) matter and to public officials that a valuable constituency both demands change and supports them in addressing community problems. Thus, in the long term, actions "get results" in terms of the policy change and ser-vices that low-income communities need, but in the shorter term, actions create situations where commu-nity members demonstrate discipline (as is implied in the word "organization"), and exercise and build power. To repeat in PICO language: "power is a prod-uct of relationships," so actions forge and strengthen relationships in the LOC, between the LOC and the broader community, and between the community and public officials.

Conclusion: Are Organizing Models Consistent with Methodologies for Engaged Anthropology?

Of course, the PICO process (or model) has many facets that I leave unexplored here, but as the flow-chart demonstrated, the process returns to its beginning and represents a cycle, recognizing that issues and interests shift, but people and relation-ships among them endure. Ideally, the process never ends. Abbreviating the key principle for momentary emphasis to "organizing is about people," one might observe that anthropology is also about people, and that engaged anthropology, too, considers the con-cerns of people with whom we conduct research to be

of critical importance. I have argued that if the purpose of research in organizing is to understand "what could be versus the reality of what is," and "what we can do to change it," then the aims of engaged anthropological research might be understood similarly. What does engaged anthropology as such call us to do or be? Who is activist research for? What contribution does it make? If anthropologists concur with organizers that power is indeed a product of relationships, which ethnographic methods or practices support the relationships that demand, support and facilitate positive social change?

In the PICO model, the structured interview is not a one-on-one, but a "one to one," establishing that "relationships are reciprocal," *quid pro quo*. The interview, then, offers more than merely a method for gathering information and a process for handling testimonies; rather it channels the information through three main exchanges, listening, empathy, and challenge. All of these interactions interpellate both speaker and listener into a two-way relationship. I suggest that decolonized, ethnographic inquiry offers similar opportunities. The challenge from an organizing perspective is when the questions move from listening and actively hearing to confronting rationalizations and contradictions: Why do you think this problem exists; why don't people get involved; and what have you done or not; and why? These questions suggest that there might be a solution, that responsibility rests somewhere specific, and that all parties could work together to act. The PICO model proposes that "challenge involves risk" and "creates tension." The challenge to the anthropologist who is called to action, then, is: are you ready to be in relationship, to be with people where they are at, and to walk them on their journey? And if not, why?

I have attempted to address this last question by reflecting on and interrogating my own role and practice as an apprentice, anthropologist, and organizer in Guatemala and the U.S. In this reflection on the interplay between organizing models and respectful approaches to engaged anthropology, I have attempted to contextualize ongoing disciplinary attempts to decolonize social science paradigms alongside and within shared activist trajectories and to examine how the desires and intentions of researchers seeking to contribute to social change might shift to situate researchers in solidarity (a powerful relationship) with activists and organizers by simultaneously employing respectful, engaged methodological approaches, socially and historically-contextualizing our shared trajectories, and acknowledging values as potentially more useful than an ideology that leaves the anthropologist as an ineffectual, objective outsider.

Acknowledgements

References

Abu-Lughod, Lila
    1990. Can There be a Feminist Ethnography? *In* Women and Performance: A Journal of Feminist Theory 5 (1): 7–27.

    1991 Writing against Culture. *In* Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present. Richard Fox, ed. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Alinsky, Saul D.
    1971 Rules for Radicals: A Practical Primer for Realistic Radicals. New York: Random House.

Alvarez, Sonia E.
    1998 The NGOization of Latin American Feminisms. *In* Cultures of Politics/Politics of Cultures: Re-Visioning Latin American Social Movements. Sonia E. Alvarez, Evelina Dagnino, and Arturo Escobar, eds. Pp 306-324. Boulder, CO.: Westview Press.

Boggs, Carl
    1997 The Great Retreat: Decline of the Public Sphere in Late Twentieth-Century America. Theory and Society 26(6). Decemeber:741-780.

Braude, Ann.
    2004 A Religious Feminist Who Can Find Her? Historiographical Challenges from the National Organization for Women. The Journal of Religion October, Vol. 84(4):513-513.

Eckstein, Susan, ed.
    2001 Power and Popular Protest: Latin American Social Movements. Berkeley: University of California Publishing.

Escobar, Arturo.
    1995 Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Higginbotham, Evelyn Brooks.
    1993 Righteous Discontent: The Women's Movement in Black Baptist Church 1880-1920. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.

    1996 Religion, Politics, and Gender: The Leadership of Nannie Helen Burroughs. *In* This Far by Faith: Readings in African-American Women's Religious Biography. Judith Weisenfeld and Richard Newman, eds. New York: Routledge Press.

Hope, Anne and Sally Timmel.
    1999 Training for Transformation: A Handbook for Community Workers. UK: ITDG Publishing.

Hymes, Dell. Editor.
    1969 Reinventing Anthropology. New York: Pantheon.

Marcus, George E. and Michael F. Fisher
    1986 Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Meier, Deborah.
    1995 The Power of Their Ideas: Lessons for America from a Small School in Harlem. Boston: Beacon Press.

Menzies, Charles R.
    2001 Reflections on Research with, for, and among Indigenous Peoples." Canadian Journal of Native Education. Vol. 25(1):19-36.

    2004 Putting Words into Action: Negotiating Collaborative Research in Gitxaała. Canadian Journal of Native Education Vol. 28(1&2). 2004.

Mohanty, Chandra Talpade
    1997 Genealogies, Legacies, Movements. Introduction to Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures. M. Jacqui Alexander and Chandra Talpade Mohanty. Pp. xii-xlii. New York: Routledge.

PICO (The Pacific Institute for Community Organizing)
    2003 Training Manual. (Unpublished.)

Rosaldo, Renato
    1989 Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis. Boston: Beacon Press.

Said, Edward
    1996 Representations of the Intellectual. New York: Vintage Books.

Skocpol, Theda; Marshall Ganz; and Ziad Munson.
    2000 A Nation of Organizers: The Institutional Origins of Civic Voluntarism in the United States. The American Political Science Review. 94: 3(Sep). Pp 527-546.

Whitman, Gordon.
    2006 Beyond Advocacy: The History & Vision of the PICO Network. Social Policy. Winter 2006-2007. Pp. 50-59.

Wood, Richard L.

    2007 Higher Power: Strategic Capacity for State and National Organizing. *In* Transforming the City: Community Organizing and the Challenge of Political Change. Marion Orr, ed. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas.

    2002 Faith in Action: Religion, Race, and Democratic Organizing in America. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zavella, Patricia.

    1997 Feminist Insider Dilemmas: Constructing Ethnic Identity with Chicana Informants. *In* Situated Lives, Gender and Culture in Everyday Life. L. Lamphere, H. Ragone, and P. Zavella, eds. New York: Routledge.

Reviews and Reflections

Learning from Activist Anthropologists' Praxis

Ann E. Kingsolver
University of South Carolina, Columbia

Fourteen years ago, I organized a seminar at UC Santa Cruz called Engaged Anthropology, and out of that came a session at the Society for Applied Anthropology meetings that year called Politically Engaged Anthropology: Projects Under Construction. Anna L. Anderson-Lazo, the editor of this issue, was one of the presenters. It is an inspiring experience to be part of this continuing conversation, and to hear how these scholars—many of whom I have known during their graduate and even undergraduate student days—continue to live their praxis. In that 1995 seminar, we began with one of the dictionary definitions of engaged, which is "to be mired in muck." As many of the authors have said here, resonating with a larger conversation, this work is not easy, not comfortable, and it is never finished. It can be joyful, maddening, heartbreaking, and the *only* way we feel we can live our lives—finding ways to collectively refuse neoliberal capitalist structuring of our communities, livelihoods, thoughts and relationships. That refusal is a full-time job, it seems, as we see the very forums we use to talk back to white supremacy, to heteronormativity, to neurotypicality and other normativities, and the interests of neoliberal capital, inhabited by those same dominant discourses. Collectivities have been both well-problematized and encouraged by the authors here, and I will comment on what I have learned from these and other ongoing activist/teacher/collaborators.

Lena Sawyer writes about finding role models who live the critique and stand up to power relations in the university as well as talking about power in classrooms. She mentions St. Clair Drake, Zora Neale Hurston, and W.E.B. DuBois. As a role model for all who aspire to live our praxis, DuBois (1940) in particular, documented the very moment of his turn from seeing his role as scholar to seeing his vital role as a politically engaged scholar. He linked his politicization to the carnivalesque lynching of Sam Hose, near Atlanta where Professor DuBois was teaching. As many readers know, he decided at that moment that he could not just *teach* sociology: he had to *use* sociology classrooms to teach about the urgent need to transform power relations in the U.S. He did indeed live and advocate practicing what we teach, so I am glad Lena Sawyer invoked him in this issue. Lena Sawyer is herself a role model in her critique of the use of anthropology and social work instructors to teach "cultural competency"—which may be the only intervention we sometimes have in, for example, the training of health practitioners, and her point that culture can be used as a way to *not* talk about racialized, classed, and gendered power relations is very important. She poses a challenging choice for us: to maintain or to transform power relations with work we do every day, in or out of classrooms.

Scott Morgensen gives us an excellent reminder to *listen* to the salient terms and priorities in circulation in the transnational contexts in which we live and work our praxis, as he discusses Two Spirit identity as a salient position for critically and politically analyzing pandemics. Too often, activist scholars have imposed categories of identity and organizing priorities on the communities we engage, rather than

asking and listening to what is salient, or speaking *from* diverse positions within activist projects. Kristen Hudgins notes that projected assumptions can include the assumption of *community* itself.

Kathy Riley also problematizes, with those she cites, the uses by activist anthropologists of the terms community, partnership, and participation as sometimes facilitating processes of oppression and silencing, with or without the awareness of the anthropologist/collaborator. I have seen several oral history projects with participatory documentary aims railroaded by powerful factions, confirming the politicization of knowledge production in any form—the claim to equitable participation being often just as illusory as the claim Afsaneh Kalantary discusses of academic knowledge being apolitical. That claim, as she shows, has been used to powerful ends, and Kathy Riley also demonstrates the problematic outcomes of presumptive participation.

The authors writing for this journal issue critique reading bodies for identities, proximity for community, and collaboration for agreement. Similar challenges have been pointed out in debates about multiculturalism—not the fact of it, but states' legislative responses, fixing identities with ascribed political positions. As Wendy Brown (2006) has noted, use of the word tolerance in neoliberal state contexts can be powerfully silencing, with assumptions about naturalized subjects tolerating naturalized "others." After 9/11 a Native American woman was run over and killed by men who somehow read her body as Muslim, problematically conflating racialization, religious and political identification. During an anti-immigrant campaign in 1994 in California that targeted and racialized selectively some undocumented immigrant groups and not others, the attackers of two Latina women said that they thought they were "illegals;" their citizenship could not be read bodily, but their attackers' hatred focused on their own formula for inclusion and exclusion. How do activist anthropologists participate in the construction and deconstruction of problematic notions of community, including reading bodies? The decolonizing of knowledge Scott Morgensen says indigenous activists are calling for includes questioning so many categories of identity, community, and experience relied on in

activist anthropological practice. Returning to critiques of multicultural policies of representation as "having it covered," I once heard a student tell her class that such assumptions prevented acknowledgement of everyday racism. She said she was tired of other students asking her for her opinion as an African American (reading her body for her political position) and never as a person experiencing life with one blind and one seeing eye, which was not as apparent to her classmates. Kathy Riley encourages readers to attend to the "importance of historical and contextual daily experiences of political structures" rather than becoming comfortable with categorizations of identity, including citizenship.

Social movements, like notions of community, are increasingly using strategic points of convergent interests across many articulated differences. Adriana Garriga López discusses, for example, the "effectiveness of different activist strategies developed and adopted by various activist groupings." This perspective contests the essentializing of communities that many authors in this issue critique. Recognizing diversity within and across "communities," including anthropological ones, Scott Morgensen and Adriana Garriga López show how one way to stand up to the ongoing structural violence of colonial governmentalities is the cross-talk *between* transnational activist communities, very publicly engaging oppressive silences and fears. Asserting transnational status between Native American nations or Puerto Rico and the colonizing governmentality of the U.S. state is itself strategic in the work of activists Morgensen and Garriga López write with and about. Lena Sawyer writes, also, about transnationalism within a nation-state as part of the work of anthropology as all the authors reject, with most other anthropologists, the conflation of nation and culture.

Afsaneh Kalantary writes about the political and politicized space of universities, pointing out that the same forms of silencing and disenfranchisement from resources that happen in the larger neoliberal capitalist state context occur in the university. This has long been acknowledged in universities all over the world, but a dominant discourse for U.S. academics has shown resistance to acknowledging either the epistemological point that knowledge production,

distribution, and consumption is always politicized or the fact that academic processes like tenure and program and curriculum development are political, too. Afsaneh Kalantary discusses the surveillance and disciplining of Middle Eastern Studies after 9/11, and at this moment of economic crisis there are examples across the U.S. of budget cuts serving as a cloak of expedience for ideological decision-making (like the elimination of interdisciplinary programs focusing on critical praxis). She also points to the political challenges of curricular structures, for example, the assumption of sameness implied by the rubric Middle Eastern Studies applied to a huge and diverse region, as can also be said of all of the "peoples of…" and "… cultures" courses in anthropology departments.

Anna L. Anderson-Lazo challenges readers to see ourselves in relationship *first*, and long-term, and *then* to think about the academic framing of projects, rather than having the relationships entailed to, and necessitated by, academic projects. As a professional community organizer, she has exemplified this kind of choice by sustaining the long-term conversation among her activist anthropologist colleagues as reflected in the act of editing this issue, not because she needs the publication for tenure in an academic setting but because she is committed to continuing the conversation about what anthropological praxis means in diverse everyday work contexts. In the PICO organizing model Anna L. Anderson-Lazo discussed, I was fascinated by the first step she described in that process: a *listening campaign*. I believe, as Ulrika Dahl expressed in the session that led to this issue, that we work as colleagues with others in activism, and we each bring skills to those collective—even momentarily allied— projects. With cultural anthropological training, we bring ethnographic listening skills. But what we have often been trained to be, even as activists, is individual brokers—like Kristen Hudgins described—between stakeholders in communities. Anna L. Anderson-Lazo brings from community organizing to engaged anthropological practice, in concert with other activist scholars over time, a rejection of the modernist and then neoliberal imperative that anthropological practice be a solitary act of intellectual commodification. She describes whole congregations—in the

faith-based NGO context—engaged in "a listening campaign." What if anthropologists *really* did this? At anthropological conferences, what if everyone talked with each other on elevators, talked with the workers making the beds and moving the tables and chairs around, and connected the conversations happening in different meeting rooms? As Sandy Smith-Nonini (2007) has pointed out in her analysis of the anthropologists' responses to the UNITE/HERE lockout at the San Francisco Hilton, the "employees only" doors in hotels swing both ways, and it is important for anthropologists to engage the workers who facilitate those very privileged conference spaces. Our work needs to include the ways we are implicated in the social context we may be critiquing, as in ignoring a homeless person on the way to give a paper about homelessness—the kind of irony Brackette Williams (1995) has discussed so well. As Scott Morgensen points out, the anthropologist does not *control* the conversation he or she may be a part of, and this needs to be acknowledged in activist anthropology methodologies. One method I have tried (Kingsolver 2001) is to organize collaborative interviewing in which each participant—from different nations, disciplines, and institutional contexts—can use the transcript for her/his own writing and publication purposes, including the individuals interviewed. With activist documentation and less class-based control of recording equipment, there are increasing possibilities for multiple uses of what used to be very hierarchical recording events, and Scott Morgensen and others here have discussed this.

Decolonizing Anthropology: Moving Further Toward an Anthropology for Liberation (Harrison 1991) is in danger of going out of print again, at a time when it is as relevant, or more so, than ever— as demonstrated by the references to decolonizing anthropology throughout this issue. It is vital that we read the work of activist anthropologists from earlier moments, and as many have pointed out, that is the work that is most readily marginalized from the anthropological canon. Zora Neale Hurston and Ruth Benedict, who could possibly have been in the seminar that activist social scientists W.E.B. DuBois and Franz Boas team-taught at Columbia University, each had their most activist work subsequently writ-

ten off by most anthropologists. Zora Neale Hurston's novels exemplify a form of activist anthropological documentation that anticipated the politically reflexive storytelling turn in the discipline many decades later. And when Proposition 209, the "California Civil Rights Initiative" aimed at undoing affirmative action policies and drawing on scientific racism to undergird its arguments, was proposed in California, I thought of Ruth Benedict's book, *Race: Science and Politics*, in which she said, "The slogan of 'science' will sell most things today, and it sells persecution as easily as it sells rouge" (Benedict 1945: 232). Decolonizing anthropology is a long-term, global, everyday project, and the authors collected here—some working in contexts marked as anthropological spaces, and some not—have strong mentors in activist anthropologists like Faye Harrison, who not only lays out a very clear plan for engaged praxis (Harrison 2008) but has demonstrated it in her transnational collaborative work against oppression and her extensive work to decolonize classrooms and anthropology meetings. With time, I realize that that is what my dissertation advisor Sylvia Helen Forman was doing—she was not only teaching activist, political, and anti-racist anthropology in classrooms, but she was committing most of her time to her institutional transformation work. She worked in very practical ways, serving as program chair in anthropological associations, and as department chair overseeing faculty and graduate student recruitment practices, for example, to connect U.S. anthropology, so isolated, to international conversations, and to address structural classism, racism, and sexism in the university context (see Shenk 1995).

In my classroom praxis, I continue to learn from my mentors and students. As I get older, mostly the lesson I find I need to learn is getting out of the way and *not* telling a student s/he *cannot* do something. After a class project in a course I teach called Globalization and Cultural Questions, for example, Mica Jenkins went on and decided to get our university's president and student body to sign off on policies making the USC a sweatshop-free campus when it comes to any product sold with the university label, and she did it. In the current economic crisis, since food insecurity is 14.7% and rising here in South Carolina (according to feedingamerica. org), our anthropology department has paired with the local food bank for several projects. Some students are using their social science training to assist the food bank in administering a statewide survey to improve food distribution services. A number of our students need those services themselves. Last week, the students in the globalization class were discussing the case of a couple around their age who had just been arrested in this state because one of their children starved to death; the students questioned the structural violence that doubly penalized this family, and they pooled their available knowledge and found that it would not be easy to find and utilize the services available to prevent hunger in a household, even with the access to information they have as university students. Those volunteering in soup kitchens and homeless shelters talked about the lines of people who had to be turned away each day, and those who are food service workers talked about the food they were supposed to throw away at the end of the day but gave away instead. I agree with Afsaneh Kalantary that there is no classroom wall dividing the political from the apolitical, and with all the authors in this issue that wherever we are is where we act, as activist anthropologists.

References

Benedict, Ruth
    1945 Race: Science and Politics. NY: The Viking Press.

Brown, Wendy
    2006 Regulating Aversion: Tolerance in the Age of Identity and Empire. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

DuBois, W.E.B.
    1940 Dusk of Dawn: An Essay toward an Autobiography of a Race Concept. NY: Schocken Books.

Harrison, Faye V., ed.
    2008 Outsider Within: Reworking Anthropology in the Global Age. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
    1991 Decolonizing Anthropology: Moving Further Toward an Anthropology for Liberation. Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association.

Kingsolver, Ann E.
    2001 NAFTA Stories: Fears and Hopes in Mexico and the United States. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Shenk, Dena, ed.
    1995 Gender and Race Through Education and Political Activism: The Legacy of Sylvia Helen Forman. Arlington, VA: American Anthropological Association.

Smith-Nonini, Sandy
    2007 Sticking to the Union: Anthropologists and 'Union Maids' in San Francisco. *In* The Gender of Globalization: Women Navigating Cultural and Economic Marginalities. Nandini Gunewardena and Ann Kingsolver, eds. Pp. 197-214. Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research Press.

Williams, Brackette F.
    1995 The Public I/Eye: Conducting Fieldwork to Do Homework on Homelessness and Begging in Two U.S. Cities. Current Anthropology 36(1):25-51.