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MISSION STATEMENT OF THE APPLIED ANTHROPOLOGIST

The Applied Anthropologist publishes peer-reviewed articles, commentaries, brief communications, field reports, and book reviews on a wide range of topics. The journal’s focus is on cultural change and adaptation in the modern world. It explores how humans approach, analyze, and develop solutions to cultural, ecological, economic, and technological problems. The journal is supported and underwritten by the High Plains Society for Applied Anthropology. Guidelines for authors and electronic access to back issues are available on the website or by contacting Editor-in-Chief Peter Van Arsdale at pvanarsd@du.edu or Managing Editor Andrea Akers at amakers@rams.colostate.edu. Further information about the society is available at www.HPSfAA.org. Membership information is available by contacting Merun Nasser at 303-449-0278 or at merun@worldnet.att.net.
This issue of The Applied Anthropologist continues our tradition of feature articles, arresting commentaries, and intriguing sets of book reviews. Rebecca Forgash of Metropolitan State College of Denver is to be commended for her work coordinating the five articles that cover tourism and anthropology. These build upon innovative presentations made at the Spring 2011 Annual Conference of the High Plains Society for Applied Anthropology. Larry Van Horn is to be commended for his work, as before, in the role of Book Review Editor. Applied work involving the National Park Service remains one of anthropology’s most compelling venues.

Other journals and newsletters are offering important information that complements what we are publishing. In addition to the well-established journals Human Organization and Practicing Anthropology, both published by the Society for Applied Anthropology, there is the Journal for Applied Anthropology in Policy and Practice (published by Berghahn through its United Kingdom base). Robert Guang Tian, a frequent contributor to these pages over the years, has been key in establishing the International Journal of Business Anthropology. Like The Applied Anthropologist, it is extending its e-reach through on-line initiatives. Gordon Bronitsky, who is well-established in the Rocky Mountain region, publishes the newsletter From All Directions. It includes information on events, seminars, exhibitions, and festivals held in conjunction with indigenous colleagues worldwide.

We are pleased to announce that Constance Holland has joined Joanne Moore and Teresa Tellechea as an Associate Editor of The Applied Anthropologist. She has been a college professor in sociology and political science, most recently at Colorado Mesa University, with a particular focus on the challenges of meeting water supply needs in the SW United States and internationally. Environmental protection and narrative interpretation among water users are complementary areas of expertise. Earlier in her professional life she served as an emergency planner in northern California. We also are pleased to announce that Tim Schommer has joined our team as an editorial assistant. Tim is an M.A. candidate in International Development at the University of Denver’s Josef Korbel School of International Studies. He has a B.F.A. in Graphic Design and eight years experience in that field. He served in Ghana through the Peace Corps. He intends to combine his expertise in design, development, and communications to tackle poverty issues in Africa.

We would like to congratulate Walter Littlemoon and his wife Jane Ridgway on the recent completion of their documentary based on their book, They Called Me Uncivilized: The Memoir of an Everyday Lakota Man which we reviewed in our most recent Volume 30, No. 1-2. This documentary, “The Thick Dark Fog,” was directed and produced by Randy Vasquez, and won the 2011 award for Best Documentary at the American Indian Film Festival. The film will be screened at the HPSfAA Spring 2012 Annual Conference. Please visit www.thickdarkfog.com for more information.

At the Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA) meetings in March, 2011, in Seattle, Washington, seventeen individuals from the private sector, government, and academia came together to form the Pacific Northwest Local Practitioner Organization. Local Practitioner Organizations (LPOs) are regional professional organizations of practicing anthropologists, college professors, students, community activists, and others interested in the anthropological perspective and in using the tools of anthropology and related disciplines to help solve contemporary human problems. Domains of application represented in the initial group include organizational development, natural resource conservation, international development, evaluation research, program planning, and policy development. Special events, publications, and collegial professional and social interactions are anticipated, these to include in-depth topical seminars and strategy sessions on effective work in the policy arena. Initiated by Emilia González-Clements, Kevin Preister and Darby Stapp, themselves all practicing anthropologists, the group determined that the Pacific Northwest region which the LPO will represent is Alaska, British Columbia, Washington, Oregon, western Montana, Idaho and northern California. For more information, contact Kevin Preister at kpreister@jkagroup.com.

Our thanks to those who served as peer reviewers for the current issue: Clare Boulanger, Ph.D.; Arthur Campa, Ph.D.; Ed Knop, Ph.D.; Joanne Moore, M.A.; Stephen Stewart, Ph.D.; Teresa Tellechea, Ph.D.; Larry Van Horn, Ph.D.; Tim Wallace, Ph.D.

--Peter Van Arsdale, Editor-in-Chief
--Andrea Akers, Managing Editor
ABSTRACT
Using Susan Buck-Morss’s Dreamworld and Catastrophe: The Passing of Mass Utopia in East and West as a theoretical backdrop to study the intersection of anthropology and tourism, this article suggests an epistemological shift from structuralism to poststructuralism. Although a standalone theoretical piece, it also introduces each of the articles below as they comprise this special section on anthropology and tourism. Finding common epistemological threads among the four—those of Sorensen’s Viking Village, Maestas’s Native Anthropology, Reyes’s critical epistemological treatment of tourism in Nicaragua, and Forgash’s post-catastrophic commentary on tourism after the earthquake and tsunami in Japan—we collectively move beyond structuralist notions of object and subject, as is discursively implied in an “anthropology of tourism,” to a poststructuralist approach, as is discursively implied in the new frame—“anthropological tourism.”

KEY WORDS: Anthropological tourism, epistemology, poststructuralism, dreamworld

Introduction
As a sociologist and anthropologist working in Yucatán, México near the epicenter of the Dreamworld created through the commodified, consumer-driven romanticism of Mayan antiquity and the so-called Mayan prophecy of 2012, I jumped at the chance to be involved in the 2011 High Plains Society for Applied Anthropology’s conference panel, “Tourism, Anthropology, and Quality of Life: Interdisciplinary Perspectives.” It was organized, as are the articles in this set, by Rebecca Forgash of Metropolitan State College of Denver. As I read the manuscripts by Helle Sorensen, Enrique Maestas, Julie Reyes and Forgash, I was transported back to a startlingly brilliant book by Susan Buck-Morss titled Dreamworld and Catastrophe: The Passing of Mass Utopia in East and West. Buck-Morss speaks of “dreamworld and catastrophe,” which psychoanalytically-framed the death of state-sponsored utopian ideologies and nationalist visions of history. In Buck-Morss’s analysis, the propaganda-soaked imagery of a government-sponsored modernity—the nation-state—was heralded as the rightful decision-making apparatus of histories past, present, and future. The real and the imagined, fantasy and reality became one and were the goals of state policy.

Now in an intricate postmodern, post-nationalist world, the ever-emergent Dreamworld unfolds not from a centralized planning system, nor a state-controlled political economy, but from the clamoring of the free-market and the individual. These claw out from the void remaining from a state-sponsored modernity’s failure to produce the so-called Good Society. Now we find existential fantasies, pleasure principles, avoidance of pain, avoidance of labor, and avoidance of sobriety, that dismembers the past and consume the present, suggesting alternative accounts of the past and more importantly, presenting no legitimate claims on the future. In this sense, the nation-state fails.

This elimination of “real history” cleanses too, the academic from the potential culpabilities and indiscretions of academic imperialism. Now the present can be premised on the truly unreal with the clarity of cynicism. Direct confrontation and also by proxy, the spoils of academic privilege are teased away from the social injustices of government-controlled academic agendas and placed within the milieu of the free market. Contemporary dreamworlds and catastrophes undergo this same gestalt shift to the land of relative interpretations—the place where social facts and social justices go to die. It is in this context that the anthropologist weathers the tsunami on the global high seas of fantasy, consumption, education, and tourism; these are the tangled spaces that are addressed in this special section within The Applied Anthropologist.

We are culpable by proxy as our actions are directed towards cultural redefinition and cultural preservation—all potential continuances of academic charities offered to those in need of a paternalistic cultural guidance. These cultural assemblages can be masked in beneficence, e.g., the medical-tinged ethical principle that allows doctors to mend patients, for the healthy to assist the diseased, for the educated to teach the ignorant, and here, through tourism for the fantasy (perfect) to replace the...
real (flawed). By contrast, native communities actively define social justice and engage in practices that lead more effectively towards those ends. However, social justice in response to catastrophe has also been actively defined and practiced by academia.

**Epistemological Shift**

The importance of this set of articles is many fold. The context from which they emerge must be explained. This work draws on an academic border crossing experience from within academia: Sorensen from the Department of Hospitality, Tourism and Events Management; Maestas, Reyes and Forgash from the Department of Anthropology; and Piacenti (speaking) from Sociology with a background in Psychology and Philosophy. What is more, Sorensen has developed a Tourism Management concentration in the Hospitality, Tourism and Events Management department and with assistance from Forgash and Reyes, is seeking to integrate courses from anthropology and geography. Using this same model, these same parties are seeking to develop a larger and distinct Interdisciplinary Program (IDP) called Cultural Tourism. Likewise, the content of these articles reaches across programs, departments and schools, fluidly existing simultaneously in the School of Professional Studies and the School of Letters, Arts and Sciences at Metropolitan State College of Denver. Meanwhile and in collaboration, Maestas initiates the discussion of anthropological tourism as related to Native Anthropology, effectively framing the epistemological shift from the anthropology of tourism (dualistic structuralism) to what we suggest here—the post-structuralist anthropological tourism.

The anthropological tourist blurs the lines through cooperative efforts and exists on a continuum between native anthropologist, outside ethnographer and the myriad positions found within, ranging from non-profit organizations, governmental entities, corporate benevolence, poets and writers, i-journalists and lone-wolf philosophers motivated by nothing more than human curiosity.

As Reyes and Sorensen return to their respective homelands of Nicaragua and Denmark, they too simultaneously and fluidly exist as insiders and outsiders, tourists and academics. Maestas too, simultaneously coexists as a self-defined and native anthropologist, but one who shape shifts among identities such as anthropologist, gringo, foreigner, Apache, Danzante, and Indian and buena gente or well-meaning tourist. Forgash, who directs a study abroad program to Japan, also practices here the roles of insider and outsider academic, teacher, mentor, and most importantly documentarian and journalist of an unfolding disaster. It is along the lines of the book Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection by Anna Lowenhaupt Tsing (2004).

Below the anthropology of tourism becomes anthropological tourism—the annihilation of object and subject. Historical revisionary reenactments echo backward (and forward) to la bella época—the Golden Years of Hollywood cosmopolitanism sans the low-brow, tabloid reality show and encroaching paparazzi. Real examples of imagined pasts are projected through the paradiseic and parasitic lens of a simulated, yet authentic, lived experience—a fantastic and secure haven for anthropological tourists jet setting towards a heaven within the hell of real catastrophes. Here, tourists (subject) and anthropologists (object) go to die respectively, by experiencing death and where each like a Phoenix rise from their own ashes with Japan in their tangled, consumptive arms of anthropological tourism.

So, going forward as the reader, keep conscious the idea that here, schools, disciplines, programs, and identities are in constant gestalt shift, extending beyond the structuralism and dualities of academia to poststructuralism and the de-centered complexities of a new kind of art—not the anthropology of tourism, but anthropological tourism.

**Helle Sorensen**

In Viking Village Ecotourism Sorensen offers a glimpse of the process by which a new, global humanism and trendings towards diversity reorganizes misconceptions of the past. In Sorensen’s discussion the academia-tourist Viking Village promises “a tourism experience that is in harmony with the natural environment and which respects cultural heritage.” Sorensen calls on us to challenge the crude stereotypes applied to Viking pasts produced by mass tourism and commercialism. These stereotypes are of the Viking as robber, as rapist, as hulking brutal plunderer of enemies; the Viking who is a bloodthirsty savage, crazy on the taste of enemy blood. This modern imagery of mass consumption evokes Sam Keen’s Faces of the Enemy (1991) where wartime propaganda art dehumanizes the enemy into rats and rapists who sully the modern myth of cultural purity and cultural homogeneity. This is the modern Dreamworld to which Buck-Morss gazes and which Sorensen calls on us to overcome.

Rather than draw on and exploit these stereotypical imageries of Viking pasts, the Viking Village Ecotourism experience presents a more authentic, bucolic and pastoral scene. This too is equally Dreamworld, but retells a history of harmony and serenity, rather than relying on violence, brutishness, hostility, and the modern dualities of good versus evil and us versus them. Sorensen eloquently demonstrates the synthesis from which history emerges; Hegelian idealism, not Marxist materialism, is the analytic frame. That is, we re-imagine the Viking past and from this idealism we act as Vikings at Viking Village. Sorensen focuses not only
on deconstructing the stereotype of the brutish Viking through idealism, but also on producing a Marxist educa-
tional-tourist experience that reorganizes the economically-
deterministic relationship between students and their histori-
cally-accurate natural surroundings. Sorensen brings us Marx’s land of historical materialism by focusing on the
sensual nature of the Viking Village environment: the smells,
tastes and sounds of the experience. This ecological orien-
tation is simultaneously couched within the discipline of tour-
ism and academia.

Tourism is typically thought of as a leisurely-paced
experience where the privileged and powerful enjoy the
milk and honeyed atmosphere of exotic places, where lo-
cals in their broken English serve elites wine, cheese and
local game. Here though, Sorensen challenges with a con-
temporary, if not futuristic imagery which re-bundles the
past to fit within state-of-the-discipline understandings of
what tourism could or should be—that it can be satisfying
intellectually, historically accurate, and environmentally
sustainable. Sorensen proposes that education through eco-
tourism has a mandate to conceptualize and produce edu-
cational experiences that take into full consideration the
ecological damage produced by a globalized society while
still engaging tourism through global endeavors, where
students come from far and wide, ironically with equally far
and wide carbon footprints, to experience the eco-
educational good life in the name of forward-thinking. This
bridges the work of Maestas, Reyes, and Forgash, creating
a multi-hued array of the new anthropological tourism. It
provides the broadest re-framing of pasts, presents, and
futures possible.

**Enrique Maestas**

In the Maestas article we are provided with a different example of the academia-tourist complex as the academic
selects “tourist” on their immigration forms mid-flight, before
landing abroad. Maestas initiates the discussion of anthro-
pological tourism as the “complementary activity of an-
thropology and tourism. His choice blurs if not annihilates
the lines between the benevolent social scientist, fun-loving
tourist (looking for the next-best hidden all-inclusive vaca-
tion) and the practices of anthropological tourism examined
through the lenses of his multiple positions as a Native An-
thropologist. In this piece, Maestas offers ethnographic de-
scriptions of anthropological tourism and Native Anthropol-
yogy. The utility of framing himself as an anthropological
tourist, borders on humorous if it were not so profound in
bringing to light how academics do what they do in this
academic Dreamworld. Here, the dirt is in the details, which
are swept under the rugs of official debriefings and actual
methods. However, his discussion of Native Anthropology,
couched within his auto-ethnographic experiences, extends
the discussion of an epistemological shift that decenters
academic power towards community-defined notions and
practices of social justice.

In something out of a Cold War James Bond thriller our
heroes invade Peru under cover of tourism, like CIA op-
eratives. Since the military and science both have been
guilty of war crimes and collusion with regimes of oppres-
sion and hatred, becoming-the-tourist is the shining example
of the new politically-correct way to present one’s intentions
abroad. Though serious in its implications, the tale conjures
Bob Hope and Bing Crosby’s lighthearted jaunts to the
South Pacific, where the Road leads inevitably to the exotic
Dorothy Lamour in her banana republic.

This new imperialism by tourist proxy allows the aca-
demic to be seen as a seemingly-benign visitor, a consumer,
a friend, and a provider of economic support to a tourist-
based economic development. While in-flight, somewhere
over flyover country in no-person’s land, we find existential
liberation; we find freedom through unincorporated and
indefinable airspace—it is utopia which literally means
“nowhere.” In this moment, when not technically belonging
to any particular nation-state, our heroes become tourists
with the flick of a pen and a bag of peanuts.

Once on the ground and controlled by the politics of
soil control our heroines must again shift to the role of tour-
ists when confronted with the social discord of a potentially
violent labor protest fighting for human rights. This is the
stuff to which the U.S. State Department routinely warns in
its warden emails to U.S. travelers (read: imperial tourists of
all agendas) abroad. In something akin to the footage of
the fall of Saigon at the end of the Vietnam War, the aca-
demic embassy is evacuated by anthropologists in tourist
disguise, or is that tourists in anthropological disguise? Our
heroes’ path to survival (and elimination of transnational
red tape) sounds like this: “We are tourists, we are here to
help, and we do not really represent and embody the com-
panies and governments whose funds we request and
gladly use in our endeavors.”

We connect here to the work of Reyes, who evokes
similar lineages of imperialism in Latin America, but where
the music of Guy Lombardo sets the tone of the **bella época**
of the Golden Years, where Nicaragua is the Dreamworld,
the hinterlands, the holy grail of western tourism beyond the
reach of western gods and western science—it is the exotic.

**Julie Reyes**

With personal Nicaraguan roots and as director of a
Nicaraguan study abroad program, Reyes drops the need-
le softly on the record. Through the pops and crackles of
imperialism we hear the notes of nostalgia; “Managua,
Nicaragua is a beautiful town; you buy a hacienda for a
few pesos down.” These lyrics were made famous by Guy
Lombrando and His Royal Canadians, describing la bella época, when jet-setting to Latin America in order to exploit favorable exchange rates and property values was high fashion. This is the cosmopolitan getaway to exotic locales such as Managua, Havana, and Rio de Janeiro and as stated above, to the destinations of Bob Hope and Bing Crosby. Here, though, the Road leads not to Dorothy Lamour (although the song also references sexual intimacy with an exotic señorita) but to the exacerbation of poverty through the misguided policy of tourism-based economic dependence. Reyes’s use of this musical frame to evoke the spirit of the Golden Years is especially adept, as current structures of tourism-dependent economic development in Nicaragua again produce favorable property valuations and tax shelters, bringing forth a new, global bella época.

For Reyes, then, the days of the banana republic are alive and well. In this state of affairs, robber-barons and industrialists, power brokers and soldiers of fortune profit from native workers who are locked in a highly determined monopolistic local economy based on political foreign relations and international markets. Instead of bananas, though, Reyes speaks of banana daiquiris on pristine beaches and banana-wrapped tamales spoon-fed to elites by way of the local economy—dependent on tourism and the all-inclusive, internet-purchased vacation package. The imagery is of the simulated, the surreal, of Disneyland, but with an intellectual gaze at the locals as outsiders staring through the gates of the gated resort communities.

Colonialism, imperialism, militarism, neo-colonialism, cosmopolitanism, and now tourism all claim, as lineage and genealogy, common intended and unintended consequences. Now through the euphemistic if not opaque terminology of structural adjustment, the United Nations Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)—themselves a concerted effort to reduce poverty—are squared directly into the winds of a global tack on a sailboat we could name the SS ClubMed Exploitation or the SS ClubMed Impoverishment. This is the cosmopolitan getaway to exotic locales, where worker rights and human rights are left alive and well. In this state of affairs, robber barons and soldiers of fortune profit from native workers who are locked in a highly determined monopolistic local economy.

For Reyes points out, this economic cocktail of the all-inclusive beachfront results in one of the most remarkable wealth disparities in the world in Nicaragua.

Metaphorically, the separation between those who enjoy the wealth and development of tourism from those who do not is the same separation found at the gated beaches of the resorts; these are the same resorts to which access by the locals is forbidden. In the final analysis, the phenomenon found in Nicaragua is the same phenomenon found throughout the world. In 1968, Lefebvre would coin the now famous and useful theoretical frame of the rights to the city. Here, as in 1968, differential rights to access and determine the full space of the city are yet again evident. As tourism continues to exacerbate preexisting social, cultural, and economic disparities, the metaphorical exclusive beaches of will continue to serve as a not-so-subtle reminder of the continuing differential rights to the city, of which anthropological tourism is part and parcel.

Rebecca Forgash

The work of Forgash is a resounding circumstance in which to discuss the peculiar relationship between academia and tourism. Forgash’s commentary is as personal and existential as it gets in an academic world where the illusion of objective, detached professionalism is implied, assumed and privileged. The recent earthquake and tsunami in Japan caused a temporary cancellation of Forgash’s study abroad program and forced a change in the frame of analysis. Her article is a novel intertextual echoing of 9/11 and analytical framework for the disruption of anthropological tourism. While addressing the broader implications of so-called “dark-tourism” (tourism based on Catastrophe such as visiting Auschwitz or Ground Zero in New York) in the context of Tohoku, we are allowed to peer into the tourist industry as partial victim and partial savior of economy in Tohoku. As with all Dreamworld imagery, the earthquake quickly took a term of catastrophic endearment—the soon-to-be nostalgic term “3.11”. This was promptly followed by initiatives such as “Volunteer Japan”, evoking the Catastrophe of “9/11” where U.S. citizens fantasized of their own innocent victimization and acted upon a new sense of civic solidarity. When President George Bush proclaimed that the U.S. citizenry should live life as usual (seemingly implying that they should fantasize about secure tourism); that they should travel and continue being tourists, not just abroad, but domestically, in the same cities that were likely targets for future attacks, he unwittingly became the ghost in the rear-view mirror and the unlikely echo-link between “3.11” and “9/11.”

With a razor sharp eye on class-based vulnerability, Forgash elegantly lifts the veil of ideological fantasy and exposes the hidden, but very real social catastrophe behind the illusion of an uncontrollable natural catastrophe. Indeed, the (natural) earthquake was followed by a (natural) tsunami. However, these events were followed by a very (social) radioactive fallout and very (social) differences in survival and post-disaster outcomes—so why not a very (social) recovery through tourism? Why not let the fantasy
of tourism and the consumption of the dreamworld of furu-sato (the nostalgic and authentic feeling of home), turn the fantasy of recovery (the dark tourist’s need for an authentic experience) into a real recovery? Forgash closes the reader’s eyes to the streaming-live video from which vicarious global consciousness emerges, where global audiences still damp from the downpour of 9/11 imagery, make 3.11 possible. The distant, the close, and the fantastic become real. From multiple and changing positions, the real event is twisted into the semi-real and fictional, and finally the multiple meanings of the event are click-communicated via Twitter, Facebook, and the collective fantasy of shared concern and humanity is reified. Like the dancing, blurry camera footage of an i-journalist, we are taken to the moment, still smoldering, still flaming, with people and interests scrambling to make sense of it or to make money from it. This is the beginning of the academiatourist matrix of global charity and dark-tourist travel.

Checking Out, Bags In-Hand

The anthropological tourist—the first responder to “3.11”, becoming tangled like a ball of snakes in the transitory unity of humankind—momentously crystallizes towards annihilation, as he always does, surrounding the Catastrophe with Dreamworlds. Akin to the furu-sato-like serenity of Sorensen’s Viking Village, our two heroines (Bing and Bob, Art and Enrique) on the Road to Peru, or Reyes, who returns to the pristine and private beaches of her family’s Nicaragua, the bella época—with its consumption of fantasy through anthropological tourism—comes full circle. As we see in this set of articles, tourism—as it links to globalization, transnationalism, the global politics of economic development, and academic notions of global consciousness—is ripe with the possibilities of expanded discourses for future academic consumption. Of course.

So enjoy these articles by the tremendously talented authors featured—understand both what they share and how they are distinct. They are each shiny pamphlets selling five-diamond resorts placed side-by-side down a bright white beach to the vanishing point of Dreamworlds remembered and Catastrophes forgotten. And why not? You may have already unknowingly paid the admission into this all-inclusive (read: no way out), global resort of academia, anthropology and tourism—that of anthropological tourism.

David Piacenti received his Ph.D. from Western Michigan University. His interests include classical and contemporary sociological and anthropological theory, discrimination, qualitative methods, and immigration with special attention to Yucatec-Mayan migration to the U.S. He is currently an Assistant Professor of Sociology in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Behavioral Science at Metropolitan State College of Denver. He can be reached at dpiacent@mscd.edu.
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ABSTRACT
Few cultures are as misunderstood and under-appreciated as the Vikings. Few people realize that the Vikings, although they led simple lifestyles, were amazingly effective and advanced. The Vikings lived a culture that was truly their own, even though influences from all parts of their known world did impact its evolution. The Viking Village near Copenhagen in Denmark has resurrected that 400 year era. In the village, visitors are challenged to think about the deeper meanings of their participatory activities. The village dares to reveal the truth about the Vikings, shattering their contorted, exaggerated, and incorrect images. The Viking Village is ecotourism at its best. This article shows how village leader Jørgen Poulsen and I have partnered to create an ecotourism experience that is in harmony with the natural environment and which respects cultural heritage. We do this by using the village’s existing educational programs and the experiences of my American college students. My students and I will participate in a pilot project that proposes a new ecotourism program for the village to be carried out in 2012.

KEY WORDS: ecotourism, pilot project, Viking Village

Introduction: Image and Reality
In the wake of globalization that has created homogeneous and standardized mass tourism products, the trend in tourism is to embrace diversity. New forms of tourism preserve a sense of place and bring the experience to life. Natural environments and cultural landscapes have many untold stories that can be used to breathe new life into a destination, attraction, or activity. The Viking Village, in the suburb of Albertslund outside Copenhagen in Denmark, has managed to preserve a sense of place through authentic re-creation of Viking stories, myths, and legends. The Village very cleverly connects its past with the visitors through means that are true to the core principles of ecotourism. There is no question that the Viking Village is an excellent example of this form of tourism.

This article shows how the students investigate and realize the contorted image of a brutal warrior Viking who loots the world. They do this through the Viking Village deconstructions of the stereotypical Viking, through the creation of educational tourism experiences that connect visitors with historically accurate and natural surroundings. Albertslund County near Copenhagen originated the idea of the Viking Village in 1992. The vision was to reconstruct a village with a strong focus on cultural authenticity and active participation. This historical workshop approach is used by educational institutions, especially grades K1 through 12, from Albertslund County. The county runs the village and organizes school visits. All other visitors are charged an entrance fee. The goal of the Viking Village is to make sure the Viking Era becomes a permanent, proud, and accurate part of the Scandinavian cultural heritage. The cliche that tourists should take nothing but pictures and leave nothing but footprints is taken very seriously in the village. The village makes sure that the footprints left behind by its visitors are few in number. Even though a large number of visitors would translate into lots of tourist dollars, the Viking Village maintains the balance of delivering a high quality educational experience and managing visitor numbers.

The village relies on 130 members of the “Friends of Viking Village” organization. The members are private citizens from all over Denmark, even though most members are from the Copenhagen area. The oldest member is 80 years old. Some members contribute to the village through private donations. Others volunteer a few days each year to help with construction, maintenance, and activities. The volunteers leave no details out and take no shortcuts. They take great pride in attempting to create objects with the same high quality standards as the Vikings. There is no question that this attention to quality workmanship has given the volunteers utmost respect for their ability to recreate the past.

This article simultaneously demonstrates an obvious blend of the tourism and anthropological disciplines. As a Dane living abroad, I am what Agar (1996: 56) refers to as a product of a multi-cultural environment where I have become accustomed to cultural diversity. I do not feel threatened by different life styles, rather I tend to become fascinated by them. Therefore, my goal is to show my students how to embrace and appreciate the Viking Village
as a completely different life style that most likely will remove them from their comfort zone. The Viking Village does this through participatory and hands-on experiences. These experiences show how the cultural heritage site of the Viking Village is, in our opinion, a superior example of ecotourism principles successfully applied. To develop this argument, an extensive review of Viking related literature and documents has been undertaken. Since published histories on the Viking Era are often highly contradictory one to another, I have relied heavily on my own personal knowledge and experiences. I grew up in Denmark where the Viking culture was introduced in early childhood. Since then, I have read about, observed, and investigated the Viking era. Much of my Viking knowledge comes from this inner familiarity, awareness, and understanding. My involvement with the Viking Village began six years after my first visit with American college students.

During the visit to the village, I require my students to record data and take field notes. They bring a small notebook and a pencil. They take notes at irregular occasions, because they follow the participatory “hanging-out” method of collecting data while attempting to show an interest in the culture (de Munck 1998). They record information in their notebooks during informal conversations with the village workers. They also make pencil sketches of Viking art and architecture. This article contains several quotes from these student notebooks. (They have given permission to reproduce their work.)

When arriving at the Viking Village, the village workers immediately begin to deconstruct incorrect notions of the Vikings. The most important image the Viking Village shatters is the warrior Viking helmet. The worst truth offender always has been this helmet. The truth is that the Viking helmet did not have horns. In Copenhagen’s tourist districts, it is difficult to avoid the eye-sores of horned helmets – except at Viking exhibits in the National Museum. It is a popular myth that all Vikings wore horned helmets while raping women, killing everyone in their path, and looting the world. Few tourists are aware that horned helmets were used in the Bronze Age (about 2,000 years before the Viking era) and that this earlier history has little connection with the Vikings themselves. Sometimes, it is Denmark’s own fault that their Viking heritage is misrepresented. For example, many Danes are eager participants in this image distortion at international soccer matches. Since the Vikings (and their horns) symbolize power and strength, many Danish soccer fans wear the horned helmet as an expression of fighting spirit. This soccer Viking-type hat is often painted in the two national flag colors: red and white. One is left to ponder whether it is possible that the horned helmet really symbolizes national unity or national pride. In other words, what does it really mean to be a “true” Scandinavian or Danish person? If a person can’t identify with the helmet, does this mean the person is not really Danish? What would happen if an immigrant attends an international soccer match and wears the helmet? Would this person look silly?

Multinational corporations also do an excellent job at maintaining this distorted Viking image. The most obvious is the Capital One credit card company’s Viking commercials on television. These 30 and 60 second commercials have run for several years and are hugely popular. Capital One’s commercial Viking in the Plane is apparently “one of the best Viking commercials” (blog comment, Viktir666). The first statement in the commercial is “Sure, we had a good time pillaging,” while depicting the Vikings as stupid, dirty, and fierce. Even so, the popularity continues: “Whatever they are supposed to be, they are funny, they resemble Vikings … very funny stuff” (blog comment, riddick7810). Different cultural eras are mixed together in the commercial, which is especially evident in their clothing. A few bloggers have commented on this: “They’re mixing up Celts with Vikings again” (blog comment, nameless616). “Since when did they [Vikings] have British accents? I swear, it’s like the movie 300 with Spartans that for some strange reason have British accents. At least give them Greek accents” (blog comment, zoologist2007). On the other hand, is cultural misrepresentation taken too seriously? As one blogger says: “Both are fiction and none of them is meant to be accurate, just relax and enjoy the show” (blog comment, ivancorea)

Because distorted, and often untrue, Viking images are deeply imbedded in our minds, it will be difficult to permanently and persuasively erase them. It is also important to understand that cultural misrepresentations sell really well as a mass tourism product. In the world of mass tourism, accuracy, authenticity, and creativity are not important, as can be seen in the Disneyland tourism product. However, the Viking Village sets the record straight. Denmark is lucky to have the Viking Village.

Ecotourism

The Viking Village staff were not aware that their participatory activities and cultural preservation efforts followed ecotourism principles. That is why it is a tremendous pleasure and rare privilege to experience such a low-key and down-to-earth authentic representation of culture without the traditional mass tourism methods. “[Since] Visit Denmark (formerly the Danish Tourist Board) has not wholeheartedly embraced the concepts of ecotourism and sustainability” and views ecotourism as a “passing trend” (Kaae 2006: 12), the village may possibly be Denmark’s best kept ecotourism secret.

Fennell explains that the “emphasis [of mass tourism] is often on commercialization of natural and cultural re-
sources, and the result is a contrived and inauthentic representation of, for example, a cultural theme or event that has been eroded into a distant memory” (2008:4). Early insinuation of the dissatisfaction with this form of mass tourism developments started in the 1970s. Koning already recognized in 1974 that “an imitation-American culture of commerce has covered the landscape. Travel is destroying one of the most exciting reasons for traveling: to discover the dazzling depth and width of human experience and human going-ons” (1974: 590). A few years later, Valene Smith mentioned that, “host destinations must consciously control or restrict tourism in order to preserve its economic or cultural integrity” (1979: 8). Fennell argues that “[mass tourism] ignored asocial and ecological elements of destinations in favour of more anthropocentric and profit-centered approaches to the delivery of tourism products” (2008: 17). Is it possible that these early anthropologies of tourism paved the way for the concept of ecotourism?

Since then, a myriad of ecotourism definitions have surfaced. A frequently quoted definition is from The International Ecotourism Society (TIES) which was “the world’s first international non-profit dedicated to ecotourism as a tool for conservation and sustainable development” (TIES 2011). TIES defines ecotourism as “responsible travel to natural areas that conserves the environment and improves the well-being of local people”. More specifically, true ecotourism strives to:

1. preserve cultural heritage
2. conserve natural landscapes
3. use resources efficiently
4. ensure cultural authenticity
5. educate and inform
6. bring the tourism experience to life
7. encourage volunteering
8. be sustainable

**De-Hollywoodization of Viking Heritage**

Few cultures are as misunderstood and under-appreciated as the Vikings. Contradictions and disagreements abound among popular authors, scholars, historians, archaeologists, medieval chroniclers, and general audiences throughout the world. Thompson often contradicts himself by describing the Vikings as “the Norse pirates” and claiming that all of Europe felt “the icy grip of the Vikings” (2009: 161) but later admits that the “images of Viking brutality have overshadowed many positive aspects of their culture” (2009: 164). In fact, it seems as if his own writing overshadows his own positive sentence and admission: “most Vikings were farmers” (2009: 166). Thompson completes his stereotype by this powerful sentence: “The ruddy, blue-eyed, merciless pirates swooped through like Vandals … spreading terror through Europe” (2009: 156). The entire statement is easy to refute, especially the biological impossibility that all Scandinavians are born with blue eyes.

One positive, and often overshadowed, aspect is that the Vikings sailed the European Russia rivers to reach the Black Sea and eventually Constantinople. The Vikings traded furs and amber with silks and spices. These Vikings would arrive in the spring and leave in the fall. One surprising fact is that many Vikings were invited to serve the Byzantine royal court in Constantinople as personal guards of the elite. Some Vikings would remain in this service for several years and return to Scandinavia with an enormous amount of gold and silver which they had earned as payment. Sadly, many medieval chronicles have reported that Vikings returned to Scandinavia after having “looted” Constantinople.

Few visitors also realize that even though the Vikings were simple people, they were surprisingly effective and advanced technologically. The circular forts are among the most impressive examples of Viking construction techniques. A Viking king, Harald Bluetooth, constructed two unique circular forts around 980 A.D. in Denmark. The strict and precise geometric plans of these forts attest to the military, commercial, and administrative functions that these forts served. Nor is it appreciated that the Viking culture evolved with few influences from their known world. Therefore, there is no question that the introduction of Christianity forever changed the Viking culture. In fact, the period around 1200 A.D., when Christianity was firmly established in Denmark, symbolically represents the end of the Viking era. The Vikings resisted Christianity for a few hundred years because this new and strange religion threatened the Nordic gods and pagan religion. Pleasing the Nordic gods and obtaining protection from them was crucially important in Viking society.

As noted earlier, the Viking Village does a superior job at ecotourism. Unlike many other tourist attractions with historic and cultural themes, the Viking Village is not selling cultural tour packages that are Hollywoodized, romanticized, or portrayed stereotypically. The village provokes and challenges visitors into thinking about the deeper meanings of their participatory activities. The Viking Village is truly authentic. The village is built on an 850 A.D. Viking farmer’s site in a beautiful meadow where the Vikings had access to plenty of water, timber, and fertile soil. The stunning rural landscape has sweeping views of creeks, rolling hills, and open fields. My student, Tullaya Glimchit, spent a day in the village in May 2010 and made it clear that: “The Viking Village is unique and different from other cultural experiences because it truly puts you into a state of mind where you feel like you are a part of the culture. We were not lectured about the history of the Vikings. We were not dragged around the site simply just to look at what a
Viking Village might have looked like, but quite the opposite. We were split up into groups where we got hands on experience with everything that Vikings used to do”.

Clearly, this is not just another reconstructed medieval village that is built to please masses of tourists. At this village, there is no T-shirt shop, happy-hour bar, or souvenir store. There is not even a medieval festival. Visitors make their own souvenirs and festivities through participatory work. As student Aubrianna DiCaro says: “This cultural experience is truly unique, because it is completely authentic to the Viking era and is run as identical as possible to the time period. Since the village is tucked away, it separates you from reality and really places you in another time to be immersed in the Viking era. It was one of the most enriching cultural experiences I have ever had in my life. It was nothing that I expected.”

In the Viking Village, participatory activities are true to the latest Viking archaeological sites and historical research. These activities reflect Viking daily life so there are many chores to complete. These chores may include chopping wood, baking bread, tending animals, carving wood, or smelting Thor’s hammer. Even though all visitors help build and maintain the village, there is always room for play and games. Student, Cody Johnson, sums it up nicely: “The participation at the Viking Village not only corrected our misconceived notions, but was also an incredible amount of fun.”

Most amazingly, though, the visitors are encouraged to use all their senses in extraordinary ways. As Jørgen Poulsen, the leader of the Viking Village, says: “First you are serfs, then you can eat lunch.” Village workers constantly are touching, or reaching out to, the visitors by bringing the real Viking world into realization through active participation in games and simulations. They breathe new life into the tourism experience by dressing visitors in Viking outfits. These outfits are hand-made using fabrics that closely resemble the textiles that were available 1,200 years ago. The textiles are woven, dyed, and sewn by hand. Visitors spend hours in these outfits while cooking, smelting, weaving, and playing games. However, the Viking games are not just fun games. They represent traditional games designed to prepare them to fight to defend their family, home, village, and kingdom. It took many years of training to build up the strength to fight man-to-man using only a sword and a shield. Some of the games in the village simulate strength building activities. A more obvious touch is the realization that cooking lunch involves being burnt by the nettles that are used for the soup. Student Kathelin Westfall’s honesty is worth noting: “I was not looking forward to the village visit. I think the whole experience takes people completely out of their element and has the potential of really changing how a person thinks. When we first got to the village and starting putting on the dresses it seemed like such a silly thing to be doing, but the second we stepped out of that first ‘welcome building’ I was no longer a college student in 2010, I was a Viking woman in 800 A.D.”

The village also encourages visitors to engage in a deeper looking into the culture. The obvious visual experience is to see local materials that are used for village construction and to learn how the village was reconstructed with Viking tools and techniques. The Viking Village motto is to use the past for the future. However, the past is also connected with the present. Village houses are reconstructed in collaboration with a local museum, archaeologists, and historians. Together, they use excavated Viking sites from the Copenhagen area as models. No modern construction technology or tools are used. Only reconstructed Viking tools, techniques, materials, and knowledge are implemented, with very few compromises. No other medieval experience in Denmark can claim so few compromises. These reconstructed techniques can be examined and admired at the village’s four timber structures with turf roofs. The largest house is the living quarters and the most impressive of the structures. This building is full of color, embroidery, and wood carvings that are reconstructed based on Nordic pictorial interpretations. In another example, a Viking chisel is used to make bowls and spoons for cooking and eating. It takes time, precision, and conscientiousness to create a great variety of things using only Viking tools and techniques.

A more indirect way of looking deeper into Viking culture is by starting the visit by walking backwards into the village, an act which simulates walking 1,200 years back in time. This is an excellent way to get a clearer view of the early Middle Ages. It is also an excellent way to walk-the-talk of ecotourism. Walking backwards brings the experience to life. Walking backwards is harder than what it seems. This kind of walking forces the visitor to slow down and begin to understand the village on their terms instead of on our modern terms.

Implementing the listening skills of concentration, avoidance of assumptions, and reading between the lines is the hardest for students to focus on. Approximating the sound and rhythm of chopping down a lime tree with a reconstructed Viking axe is intimidating, hard work, and humbling. The ability to listen well is put to a true test when visitors walk in unison carrying the felled tree on their shoulders back to the village. However, it will always be village employee Maria Ojantakanen’s opera-type singing that immediately gets everyone’s attention and great admiration. The flute music of Louisa, a village volunteer, is astounding as well. Music and song are often followed by story-telling. The mythologies of Thor and Odin are always popular, but so is Loki. Students are fascinated by the ultimate betrayals and lies
of this Nordic god who is believed to have been related to Odin. Loki is known for having helped Odin create the world. However, Loki’s worst deed was arranging the murder of Odin’s son, Balder, because he was jealous of Balder’s popularity, beauty, and kindness. Another devastating deed of Loki was when he chopped off the long hair of Sif, goddess of fertility and the wife of Thor.

Of course, the highlight is the smilling lunch being cooked over an open fire. One also smells smoke blown by the wind in all directions. But that did not negatively affect Sandra Morris’ village experience: “I really enjoyed helping with the daily tasks in the village. We were able to contribute through learning how to do certain tasks in the traditional Viking way. We worked with some of the villagers to prepare the daily meal. That is definitely something I would be interested in doing again.” Sustainability becomes very clear during lunch, because the food is made from village resources such as herbs and wild plants. Maria sums it up nicely: “It is important to use what the land gives you.”

It is equally challenging in tasting the atmosphere of true Viking life. As village volunteer Louisa says: “No one here asks you why you are not done with something. Vikings finished their task when it was ready. You have to let things take their time.” Another way of tasting the atmosphere is when the village shatters the Viking warrior image again by showing how most Vikings were peaceful and self-sufficient farmers and traders. And this is exactly what the Viking Village is all about: living the life of a farmer. The visit to the village does not involve running around like a wild warrior with big swords. After all, the relatively small numbers of Scandinavians could not have supported large numbers of ships with hundreds of wild warriors, although this is what chronicles from the 10th century monasteries throughout coastal Europe often claimed.

Some authors continue to claim that the Scandinavian population numbers have not changed much since 800 A.D. Others disagree. “Even today the Scandinavian landmass supports a population of little more than 17 million people. In the Viking Age … there were many fewer people” (Batey 1994: 15). According to Russell, the estimated population in Europe by 1000 A.D. was about 35 million (1935: 504). At that time, Scandinavia’s population was less than 2 million (Russell 1935: 504). Since most Vikings were farmers, this leaves very few men in their prime age to pillage the world. Therefore, it seems absurd for Thompson to claim that “by the end of the [9th] century, large parts of Europe were so devastated by Vikings that the countryside was a desolate place” (2009: 166). While some Vikings indeed were attacking and pillaging, especially English and Irish towns, one of left to ponder how an estimated few hundred thousand men scattered all over Europe, West Asia, Northern Africa, and North America could decimate an entire continent.

In order to combat such claims, the Viking Village represents the prevailing agricultural lifestyle. This involves not being allowed to use any gadgets that were not used in the early Middle Ages. This includes not wearing sun glasses. It also includes learning basic phrases in the old Nordic language.

Tourism Anthropology

Clearly, the Viking Village offers complementary activities for both ecotourists and anthropologists. Both share a genuine interest in cultural heritage. While tourists do not engage in ethnographic field work, they often engage in an informal search for answers that can easily be used in anthropological research. A typical ecotourist often unconsciously travels with Agar’s (1996) anthropological model of “being there”. Ecotourists begin a cultural experience with a general passive observation of the activities, people, and physical aspects of the situation. As time goes by, the ecotourist usually then raises their level of attention and wishes to actively engage in activities with local people. I attempt to have my students adopt Agar’s definition of holistic recognition: “That an isolated observation cannot be understood unless you understand its relationships to other aspects of the situation in which it occurred” (Agar 1996: 125). I do this by showing my students how to evolve from being passive learners in the classroom to engage in active participation in the Viking Village. The students’ task is to not observe the village as an isolated place in history. Rather, it is important to experience and understand the village’s relationship with the larger Viking world.

When they visit the Viking Village, students just go with the flow as the day unfolds. In that respect, ethnography is like traveling abroad. A traveler may have a rough idea of the expectations of the trip, such as what to see and what to do. Traveling abroad, even within the Western world, takes common sense and a logical mind. Traveling with an open mind provides a wonderful opportunity to mix with all kinds of people, to learn more about their country and culture. Flexibility and patience yield a relaxing and enriching experience.

Traveling abroad also requires a bottomless amount of patience and flexibility, because it is impossible to plan for the unexpected. Since it is impossible to predict what lies beyond the mountain, the unexpected almost always happens. Often, a traveler must think fast on his/her feet and know how to get out of a situation if it becomes too dangerous or too uncomfortable. During active participation in the Viking Village, it is often necessary to unexpectedly alter one’s trains of thought in order to blend in with new and challenging activities.

My students, like many ecotourists, often take field notes in the form of a journal in which they write descriptions
of what is going on. In ethnographic fieldwork, journal notes focus on verbal and non-verbal tourism behaviors. Identities of persons and businesses are omitted from all circulated written records for the sake of maintaining anonymity and protecting privacy. However, a travel journal is full of names, places, businesses, emails, and phone numbers for networking purposes.

An ecotourist often conducts informal interviews with various members of a society without realizing that he/she is actually doing anthropological work. Ecotourists may also be unaware that they indirectly are adopting Agar’s (1996) informal ethnographic interview style, because they do not have a written list of questions. An ecotourist casually chats with local people, just as an anthropologist does. It is as if an ecotourist understands the strategy of informality minimizing harm to the natural flow of events into which formal questions may intrude (Agar 1996:140). Agar’s comment that “observation and interview mutually interact with each other, either simultaneously or sequentially” (1996: 158) fits very well in an ecotourism atmosphere.

The Viking Village works hard not to lose the spirit of an unusual cultural heritage experience. It does stand away from other tourism and educational ventures. The Viking Village’s approach makes it a publicly recognized ecotourism program that adheres to the concept of sustainability. However, sustainability is too often coupled with an attitude that says: “I want cleaner air, but I don’t want to give up my car.” More properly, sustainability is a life style. The key is to find a way to redefine values to avoid the mass tourism behavior of literally “loving nature to death” (Cousteau 1993). My students and I are eager to work with the village to find a way to attract the ecotourists that would say: “I want real authenticity, and I want to leave technology at home”.

Pilot Project

An overnight stay in the Viking Village holds even greater potential for removing visitors from their fast-paced, globalized, and technologically dependent cultures. This could be the ultimate way to breathe even more authentically as a Viking. That is why I have partnered with Jørgen Poulsen to experiment with a pilot project. The project tests the idea of a small group of ecotourists who will be completely immersed into the earliest 1,200-year-old Viking culture. Since the Viking Village is already true to the core principles of ecotourism, a pilot project that tests a more immersive educational tourism program makes sense. The pilot project implementation date is set for May 21-22, 2012.

My students will visit a variety of Viking sites in Denmark before arriving at the village, with the goal to have them better appreciate the basic idea that the Vikings were just Europeans with a different way of life. First, they will visit Denmark’s oldest town, Ribe. The town was founded around 700 A.D., a little before the Viking era. Over the next few hundred years, Ribe evolved as a major trading town and port that was ruled by the Vikings. A visit to a Viking chieftain’s burial site will give the students a better understanding of what life and death were like in 10th century Denmark. The chieftain was buried in a Viking ship. Today, the wood has disappeared, but the iron pieces remain, as well as the bones of horses and dogs that were buried with the chieftain. They will also learn how to oar a Viking ship and manage its sails during a two-hour sailing in war and cargo ship replicas along the coast.

Another important visit is to the town of Jelling which bears the legacy of Denmark’s first two monarchs. These monarchs were also Vikings: King Gorm the Old and his son King Harald Bluetooth. In Jelling, King Gorm the Old was originally buried in a large mound but his body was transferred to a wooden church after Denmark began to convert to Christianity around 965 A.D. Harald Bluetooth raised two rune stones, the first inscribed with the claim that he converted the Danes to Christianity. The other stone claims they were the rulers of Denmark. Runes were symbols, an alphabet often carved in stones. These runic inscriptions usually depicted power and possession in a verse or stanza format. When Denmark had completely converted to Christianity, the Latin alphabet was used instead. In Jelling, students will learn how to connect the Viking past with the present and future Danish monarchy. Students will also spend time at King Bluetooth’s Trelleborg Viking Fort, constructed around 980 A.D. The precise geometric plans, military attributes, and sheer size of this circular construction likely enabled it to house between 500 and 800 Vikings. Another legacy of King Harald Bluetooth is Roskilde Cathedral which has been the favorite burial place of the Royal Family since the early 15th century. The first church was built in wood by King Bluetooth. The current cathedral in red bricks was
The Viking Village staff will be permitted to use student work for tourism ideas. There will be a prize for the winning student. Volunteers, who will vote for the best and most feasible eco-tourism criteria. During the village visit, students will discuss and present ideas for a 3-day and 2-night educational tourism program in the village. Students will help make sure the educational tourism experience is maintained at a sustainable small-scale level through applying course concepts related to ecotourism and in collaboration with village volunteers. Students will work in tight collaboration with the village staff to make sure the ecotourism program meets the overall vision and mission of the Viking Village. Furthermore, students will adhere closely to decisions made by the village staff before creating a program and activities that meet eco-tourism criteria.

For now, the ecotourist target market is one American family. During the village visit, students will discuss and present their educational tourism ideas with the employees and volunteers, who will vote for the best and most feasible ecotourism ideas. There will be a prize for the winning student. The Viking Village staff will be permitted to use student work and ideas in any capacity they deem appropriate.

Conclusion

It can be argued that ecotourism is a luxury of the affluent. The concept of ecotourism can therefore be criticized to be an activity for the elite tourist. To counteract the elitism reaction, this article has shown the importance of the Viking Village as it elevates its programs in order to preserve cultural heritage in an authentic and accurate way. It is widely understood in the international tourism community that it is important to consciously and deliberately control or restrict tourism in order to preserve a site’s cultural integrity (Smith 1989: 14). Ecotourism often accomplishes this by controlling the number of visitors. “Wealthy tourists obviously have more money to spend, and therefore [the Viking Village] needs to draw fewer visitors, reducing the possibly negative effects of having too many tourists hanging around” (Chambers 2000: 37). The drawback could be that affluent travelers sometimes “require the provision of goods and services that are unlikely to be locally available” (Chambers 2000: 38).

However, it is time to accept that tourism can be an equally happy and fun experience without the mass tourism need of shops, bars, and crowds. The formal embrace of ecotourism in the Viking Village could help the visitors rethink their lifestyles and values while learning to focus on the interconnectedness among environmental, cultural, and economic variables. It is also time to accept that tourism will have a difficult time prospering if too many people draw on too few resources. The Viking Village is alive and survives because, following Cousteau (1993), its life support system functions to balance and maintain a habitable environment. In the Viking Village, everything is connected.

Helle Sorensen is an Associate Professor of Tourism Management at Metropolitan State College of Denver. She received her Master’s degree in Cultural Anthropology from the University of Colorado. She has worked for many years in the international tourism business, in three countries. Her tourism expertise includes ecotourism and sustainable tourism, with one focus being Denmark’s Viking Village. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the annual meeting of the High Plains Society for Applied Anthropology, held in Denver, Colorado, in April 2011. She may be reached at sorenseh@mscd.edu.
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Anthropological Tourism

As anthropologists we often find ourselves engaging in informal aspects of ethnographic access and participant observation that have much in common with tourist practices involving eating, travel, lodging, and cross-cultural interaction. Often these reflect and signal class-based standards of food and habitation. These tourist practices can be extremely economical according to U.S. Middle-class standards, but they are qualitatively different than the living conditions of the people being studied. This demonstrates the economic predication of the anthropologist as a patron (but not the type of debt peonage) or padrino. In some cases, it is rationalized that the best way to help the people is to contribute to their economic empowerment by paying for their products and services. Another role taken by the anthropologist and tourist is the observer, who avoids personal interaction and involvement. A role usually taken only by anthropologists is the expert who has come to solve a problem. Each of these roles determines the ways that an anthropologist employs participant observation differently.

At times, anthropological fieldwork is conducted under the guise of tourism, especially when doing research outside of the U.S. This practice of engaging in anthropology and ethnography while being a tourist, or using tourism as a cover for anthropology and ethnography, is generally referred to as anthropological tourism in this paper. Through this lens we can see that anthropology and tourism are complementary activities that offer important lessons about fieldwork and the negotiation of borders and power relationships. Importantly, the correlation of anthropology with tourism based on common eating, lodging, and travel practices also strongly suggests that anthropologists often engage in globalization in much the same way as tourists. Although anthropologists may focus their efforts on humanitarian or conservation projects, their American habits of consumption have a globalizing character associated with tourist spending and cross-cultural interaction.

But let us talk about this on the theoretical level. Taking a postmodern and post-structural approach to agency it is important to examine the anthropological tourists. As tourists and anthropologists, a specific combination of social predisposition, privilege, and socialization provide a recognizable savoir faire. This savoir faire, being the ability to say or do the right or graceful thing, is one of the more intimate products of Pierre Bourdieu’s (1984; 1990) habitus. Applying this micro-social theory provides a view of tourism and anthropology as intersecting and overlapping cultural fields in which anthropologists and tourists interface with familiarity derived from their habitus. Imagining anthropology and tourism as a set of ideologies and practices that the anthropological tourist utilizes in custom-
ary and familiar ways, provides a view of the habitus as the social disposition and tools derived from socialization that provide the meaning and action that the anthropological tourist engages in a foreign land. I argue that this produces a relationship that is qualitatively different from that of a native anthropologist engaging the habitus, observable as ideologies and practices customary and acceptable in Native society. This paper progresses from a discussion of anthropological tourism to a discussion of Native Anthropology, which eschews identification with the social disposition and perceived action of tourism and even anthropology itself. This can result in the ethnographic collaboration of a Native Anthropologist identity based in solidarity with the Native community and enunciated by statements such as, “yeah, but he’s not that kind of anthropologist.” This understanding of the enunciated statement as an affirmation of social truth or ideology is derived from Foucault’s (1972) The Archeology of Knowledge.

However, before we move the discussion towards Native Anthropology, let us examine anthropological tourism. The following ethnographic examples illustrate the practice of disguising anthropology as tourism in Peru, how being tourists saved anthropologists from mob violence, and the unintended use of anthropology-as-tourist to learn about an ideology whereby Mexican drug cartels protect tourists and anthropologists in Copper Canyon.

Anthropology in Disguise

First, the practice of disguising anthropology as tourism can expedite travel and relationships that help to mitigate negative attitudes toward anthropology and anthropologists. This is based on the understanding that ethnographic access through travel, and community willingness to accept the ethnographer, provides key conditions making ethnographic fieldwork possible, this in turn contributing to the quality of ethnographic access. Ethnographic access constitutes the conditions to engage Malinowski’s caveat that the anthropologist must be able to say, “I was there!”; thus, providing opportunities for the researcher to engage in social context through participant observation and producing ethnographic data.

Sitting on a CopaAir jet approaching Lima, Peru, a flight attendant brings over the visa and declaration form. Upon filling out the form with my personal data, I come across questions asking my reason for visiting Peru. Feeling like a real anthropologist I consider officially declaring myself to be one. But just before I put pen to paper, I feel a tap on my shoulder. It’s Arthur Campa of Metropolitan State College of Denver telling me, “I hope that you did not put research or anthropology as the reason for the visit because we will be held up by customs and they may not even let you through.” It is very difficult to get the Peruvian government to officially sanction research efforts and Non-Governmental Organizations in general. I ask: “What should I put down instead?” He tells me, “Just write ‘tourist.’”

Although I had done this many times in Mexico, this was the first time that I realized that such effacement was official anthropological protocol. Were we undercover anthropologists? In further discussion, I found that Peruvian Eco-sustainability through Research and Understanding [P.E.R.U.] and Engineers Without Borders, the NGOs that we represented, were both unofficial organizations in Peru, just as we were “unofficial” anthropologists. In addition, a number of occurrences in Peru (as will be noted) provide important lessons on how being a tourist can serve as cover and protection for anthropology.

Second, being a tourist provides a unique application of participant observation of the tourist service worker and tourist context. So, if this context exists and the anthropologist enjoys the service of the tourist service worker the class position of the anthropologist is self-evident. However, the tourist service worker may also be a successful entrepreneur and of comparable class, especially as the economies of Peru and Mexico grow and the spending power of the American anthropological tourist decreases.

Based on these ethnographic understandings of anthropological tourism, we can see anthropology and tourism constituted by complex political and economic relationships tied to globalization and its attendant hegemony of consumerism. This social context, commonly referred to as development, progress, and neo-liberalism, historically results in exploitation and perpetuates asymmetrical power relations at the class, gender, and race levels. José Limón’s (1994) use of Antonio Gramsci’s concept of hegemony specifically outlines the conditions of globalization that progress towards greater deregulation in order to optimize flexible accumulation, which increases the wealth of the elites and impoverishes the lower classes. Anthropology has been key in providing critical ethnography regarding the ways that tourism becomes a new experience of hegemony, assimilation, and cultural devastation in the wake of globalization. In response, local communities engage in various counter-hegemonic processes and present challenges to globalization, the practice of which ideologically relegates tourism and often anthropology to antagonistic roles. Under certain circumstances Native Anthropology becomes the work of a “special case” anthropologist who operates as a collaborator and recognized ally by the ethnographic community.

To provide a brief example, this opposition became most poignant at Mission San Juan Capistrano in San Antonio, Texas, where local community members and Native American activists witnessed the transformation of a site of...
considerable historical and cultural importance, first into an archaeological site and then a National Park Service managed site (Maestas 2003; Thoms 2001). This supports the theory of hegemonic globalization and counter-hegemonic local response. It provides a conceptual stage upon which we can examine tourism, anthropology, and Native Anthropology. The following two sections relate specific ethnographic experiences that demonstrate the complex and often ambiguous relationship of anthropologists and their intersection with tourist practice and position.

How Being Tourists Saved Us from Mob Violence

In mid-July 2010 my wife and I were in the small city of Chao in northern Peru. We were conducting health surveys and facilitating the formalization of a weaving cooperative in a small town outside of the city, but our lodging was the Hotel Oasis right on the Pan-American Highway, which runs through the center of Chao. This is an area ideal for people watching because so much is always going on. We had been in town for a little over a week and had made some acquaintances in local stores and restaurants, so we were starting to feel more comfortable - maybe too comfortable. My Spanish was good and getting better by the day.

About a week into our visit, we noticed a crowd of workers on the west side of the highway opposite the Hotel Oasis. We were on the second floor and had a commanding view. Asking around, we learned that local laborers had started gathering the day before for a strike and public declaration of their grievances. After stopping outside the hotel for a kachanga [fried bread] and avena [oatmeal], we walked over to the local public school. On the way we passed in front of the crowd of strikers, which had grown to include people on both sides of the street leading to the Chao Market. A truck pulled up and two men were throwing mandarinas [mandarin oranges] to the crowd and soon the air grew thick with the sweet smell. A couple of hours later, we walked back from the school; the crowd had diminished and regrouped in a single location outside of a street-side business.

We returned to the Hotel Oasis for lunch and spoke with Gloria, the manager of the hotel and daughter of the owners. She told us that workers usually began strikes because they were being worked longer hours without extra pay. Gloria told us that Chao had been the site of a violent labor dispute three years earlier regarding health insurance and raising the minimum wage. She backtracked a little to give us some background and explained that her family had moved to Chao when she was 14 years old in the 1990s. CampoSol, the largest multinational and agribusiness corporation in the region—owned by Peruvian President Alan Garcia and his U.S. partners—moved into the area in 1997 after the Chavimochic Irrigation Project made water available. (James Kus [1987] outlines the development of the Chavimochic project and the migration of people to work in the newly watered Chao Valley.) According to Gloria, CampoSol had a history of abusing and exploiting the workers. She told us that three years earlier a strike had taken place that resulted in violence, death, and doubling of the minimum wage. After beginning in much the same way as the strike we were witnessing, the earlier strike had continued, and during the third week thousands of strikers had chased out the small local police force, which precipitated military intervention. Over 100 national police officers had entered Chao and tear-gassed the people. Gloria described this as a scene of people, including many children, lying unconscious in the streets. In all, the earlier strike resulted in several deaths, many injuries, and dangerous exposure to tear gas by strikers and locals alike. It also spurred a series of negotiations partly responsible for raising the minimum wage from 10 soles/US$4 to 20 soles/US$8, and to improved health care benefits.

Hearing this brought me a sense of anticipation and concern. However, when I asked about the current strike I was told that it probably would not last long because it was only being held by the workers in the vegetable packing plants. Their grievance had to do with preparing asparagus for freezing and packaging, for which they had to peel the outer skin of the asparagus spears with a knife. This action released a milky substance that ran over the skin of the workers because their work uniforms had a space between the shoulder short sleeves and the protective sleeve that they wore over their lower arms. Because the protective sleeve was plastic, when the asparagus fluid spread over the arms of the workers it became trapped and caused a fungus that led to itching and skin disorders. The strike was intended to communicate the demands of workers for better protective clothing and health care that would alleviate these skin disorders.

By the morning, large holes had been dug in the dirt on the side of the PAH opposite to our hotel. We could hear speeches being given and see increasing crowd activity across the street. As we were preparing to leave for the villages up the valley, my wife started taking photos from the 2nd story window of our hotel. This seemed to spark some agitation in the crowd. We made our way downstairs and to the corner where small buses waited to take people up into the villages, and my wife took some photos of the buses and the people traveling.

Suddenly a small group of strikers surrounded my wife and me, demanding that she give them her camera. They accused us of being company or government informants—which would be one and the same given the Garcia/U.S.
partners ties. One loud woman started screaming and threatening us with a stick, and soon many of the strikers moved across the PAH and centered on this altercation. Just as this happened, a boy ripped the camera from my wife’s hands and a man grabbed my pants by the pocket and made a small tear. The boy with the camera started looking at the pictures and demanded that my wife “Borrar las fotos,” which means to erase them. She and I both tried to explain that we were working on projects to help the villagers in the region. The strikers were yelling that we were “gringos!” which is a generally negative term for foreigners. However, there was another chant coming from other locals, saying “¡Son turistas! ¡Son buena gente! Están haciendo proyectos.” They are tourists! They are good people! They are doing projects [in the valley]. Our defenders eventually calmed the crowd and we were able to listen to some of the strikers explain their position. Being seen as tourists saved us from mob violence.

There are various elements of significance in this experience. For the novice ethnographer and graduate student, although this is one of the most difficult obstacles to be faced, it is essential to work on one’s communication skills. Language competence will improve. It is also an important signal of humility; this can result in friendship bonding between the ethnographer and the people with whom one is working or studying. For us, the urgency and open communication from a shared experience with the potential for crisis brought out conversations at a deeper and historical level. Although we would not have sought out such a cultural faux pas, it provided a means for understanding social history and political economy in Chao (at the local level) and Peru (at the national level).

At the same time, transportation workers on the Pan-American Highway closed the road with burning tires because of labor disputes, partly to gain attention by delaying travel during the Peruvian Independence holiday. Yet, it is also important to note that tourism is welcome and sought after in the region as an expanding market that will bring prosperity to the people. This is evident in the justifications for shielding us from violence. It is also interesting to grapple with the way that the identifiers gringos, turistas, and haciendo proyectos clearly tie the practice of foreign applied anthropology (itself not a phrase in the local vocabulary) to tourism in the words of the people with whom we interacted. Overall, this provides strong ethnographic evidence for correlating tourism with anthropology under the term anthropological tourism.

This also points to a specific case in which the crisis bonding made possible by the cultural faux pas of taking unsolicited photographs opened up a conversation about a local woman’s eyewitness account and interpretation of labor disputes in Chao. Whether through tourism or anthropology, or as a tourist or anthropologist, this is not a dream, but clear enunciation of a local voice laced with social truth.

In the next example, the ambivalence and ambiguity of tourism and anthropology draw out further methodological and theoretical considerations.

**Mexican Drug Cartels Protect Tourists in Mexico’s Copper Canyon**

On a separate occasion, my wife and I were traveling by bus between the Mexican states of Coahuila and Chihuahua. We accidentally ended up in a town called Janos, south of El Paso, Texas, on New Year’s Eve 2008. Our intention was to reach Casas Grandes and spend New Year’s Day at the ancient city of Paquime, but we missed the stop and could not get off for about 40 miles. During our trip from Del Rio, Texas, to Janos, we were warned and admonished by my wife’s family members in both Coahuila and Texas that we should not travel because of drug cartel violence. Janos itself appeared to be the quintessential drug cartel town with highway crossroads and few streetlights. The next morning was New Year’s Day and it turned into a series of disappointments as we waited for public transportation back to Casas Grandes or even to El Paso. After several hours at the side of road, an elderly white couple pulled in for some snacks and after introductions invited us to accompany them to Casas Grandes. If we were not tourists before, we certainly were once we joined Oz and his wife, a couple of avid Mata Ortiz pottery collectors.

Over the hour’s ride to Casas Grandes we heard about Juan Quezada, a man who had learned Hopi and Zuni ceramic traditions and taught them to his family and community. Today, Mata Ortiz, 20 minutes outside of Casas Grandes, has a population of some 600 people and boasts 400 potters. Mata Ortiz pottery has become the premier contemporary pottery tradition in Mexico, standing alongside Pueblo and Navajo pottery in many shops. That evening we were hosted by an anthropologist and met a group made up of a mixture of American Mexicans who were anthropologists, artists, and of course tourists.

At this party, I heard an amazing story about the nature of the Tarahumara Indians in Copper Canyon. It was explained that the Tarahumara Indians constituted the drug cartels of the region and maintained an enforced autonomy with respect to the Mexican government and its military forces. It was well-known that narcotics traffickers frequented the canyon. Less well-known is that anthropologists and tourists are especially welcomed and appreciated in the canyon, and that they are specifically protected. There is a standing drug cartel order to leave anthropologists and tourists alone. Why? Because anthropologists and tourists are important (if unwitting) players in the money-laundering
of the drug cartels. This information introduces us to a constructed ideology that Tarahumara drug trafficking in Copper Canyon has tipped the balance of power in favor of Tarahumara cultural conservation over Mexican government regulation and intervention. However, when we look at other sources—journalists and Tarahumara activists—the Tarahumara are represented as victims of drug cartel violence and extortion, this forcing them to grow and engage in the trafficking of marijuana and opium for heroin (Frontera NorteSur 2008; Salmon 2010; Weisman 1994). We see an interesting narrative emerge that projects a false ideology arguing for the safety of tourists and anthropologists in the face of clear evidence to the contrary, i.e., the August 18, 2008 massacre at Creel (Frontera NorteSur 2008).

In all, the examples of anthropology in disguise, how being tourists saved us from mob violence, and the ideology that Mexican drug cartels protect tourists and anthropologists in Copper Canyon provide a glimpse into the complexity, ambiguity, and ambivalence that exists in the world shared by the tourist and the anthropologist. Methodologically, this pushes us in the direction of examining the roles and research strategies that we engage as anthropologists, but more importantly, it describes the practical ethnographic efficacy of getting involved, and of learning what the social context you have entered means to the people there. In essence, these are stories and voices that most likely will find you as their only outlet and chance to reside with the people he or she is working with, and are always at the heart of the cultural whole, the gestalt. In the next section, I look at the negotiation of identity through cultural and language code-switching as part of participant observation.

Application of Participant Observation to the Tourist Context

Being an American, can be masked or emphasized for those of us who are multicultural. I shift between Apache, Azteca, Indian, Chicano, American, Mexican, and Native American quite easily and have been mistaken for mixed race Filipino, Japanese, Peruvian, and Ecuadorian, among others. Tourist behavior emphasizes American identity abroad, while using another identity will provide for different responses. In this way we can see that an anthropologist’s behavior can alter the context of participant observation. Sometimes, this may even provide access to the tourist service worker context. My facility in Spanish allowed me to engage in conversations, sometimes as an American and sometimes as a Mexican. As a Mexican, I was given unguarded opinions about American mistreatment of situations and people, whereas as an American tourist I never heard these ideas.

As a tourist visiting the Huaca del la Luna, an ancient site in northern coastal Peru pertaining to the Moche culture, I become part of a tour group, a central practice for tourists. As such, I may receive an authoritative representation about the site complete with tales of virgin sacrifices. If I do not take a tour, my identity as a tourist is in doubt and an effort is made to ignore me. In finding lodging, a tourist is often catered to, though in a begrudging manner. This brings us again to the roles taken by both tourist and anthropologist. However, the ideological position of Mexico and hence, Mexicans, is distinct from the United States and hence, Americans who are referred to as gringos or norteamericanos are grouped with Canadians. Language and cultural competence allows for multiple dimensions of ethnographic experience and is the first step towards Native Anthropology. It is interesting to note, that such linguistic and cultural competence is the textbook recommendation for anthropologists to conduct the most successful and desirable form of fieldwork and ethnography. However, most anthropologists do not achieve this, so this type of fieldwork has become an important contribution of Native Anthropology. The examples that I will refer to are Americo Paredes, José Limón, Jomo Kenyatta, Nakanishi Yuji, Kirin Narayan, and Darren J. Ranco. However, I will relate this literature review to my own understandings and ethnographic experiences of Native Anthropology.

Native Anthropology and Its Applications

Returning to the discussion of Malinowski, it must be recognized that there are different levels of “being there.” For instance, researchers may find that ethnographic access is restricted to limited visits. The ethnographers may sadly find themselves in formal accommodations distant from the community. I say sadly, because informal accommodations in which ethnographers are invited to engage in cohabitation provide much greater depth and breadth in the acquisition of ethnographic data, mainly allowing the researcher to engage in and observe daily routines and chores. One important difference between Anthropology and Native Anthropology is that informal familial cohabitation without prejudice is much more likely with the latter. So, if a researcher has a chance to reside with the people he or she is working with, it should be taken! This will certainly improve ethnographic access as well as linguistic and cultural competence, and it may open the door to the social bonding that will push in the direction of Native Anthropology.

Importantly, Native Anthropology is used to refer to a continuum of practice, because some people are certainly “more native” than others when it comes to linguistic
and cultural competency. This was the lesson provided by Americo Paredes in his scalding criticism of Anglo sociologists and folklorists regarding their linguistic and cultural incompetence in looking at the people of South Texas. In a more positive light, Jomo Kenyatta (1965) provided a clearly definitive anthropological and ethnographic account of his people, the Kikuyu. Similarly, José Limón (1994) demonstrated his bilingual and bicultural facility in central and south Texas. He outlined the processes of globalization in the production of a lived experience that he named postmodern Mexicano.

To avoid essentializing the Native Anthropologist, we can point out that some non-native speakers gain native-like facility and gain access to a much wider array of data than linguistically challenged Native Anthropologists. This is similar to Kirin Narayan’s (1993) suggestion of a deessentialized conceptualization of Native Anthropology. In my case, I couple my facility with central Mexican Spanish with a general Latin American indigenous or mestizo phenotype, and can gain access to political rhetoric in Lima, Peru as both a Gringo Americano and a Mexicano. As a Mexican tourist, I was privy to complaints about US anti-immigrant attitudes, while as an American these topics were never broached. Although not suitable for formal fieldwork, this can be an important way to gain general understanding about ideology and provide important background knowledge. However, speaking Spanish like a Mexican could only take me so far; it appeared that my knowledge of world cup soccer was also an effective ice breaker. More importantly, my collaboration as a Native Anthropologist has always been established on my acceptance and advocacy of the local community project. Examples are the establishment of Native American religious freedom at Mission San Juan Capistrano, Native American reburial and restoration of burial grounds in Victoria, Texas, documentation of the oral and written tradition of Danza Azteca in Colorado and Texas, and the religious use of peyote in Texas.

Native Anthropology is most effectively different from other forms of anthropology because it configures an identity distinct from tourists and anthropologists. A common basis for comparison with regards to my work in Mexico is the contrast several of us make between Native identity and both tourist and anthropologist identity. For instance, unquestioned unalienable Native rights to identity, religious practice, and cultural heritage can be contrasted with the tourist and anthropologist perspectives about legal and social conditions regarding these Native rights. Ideological boundaries exist in the practice of Native Anthropology as activist-oriented that often distinguishes its methods and relationships from those of tourism and certain approaches to anthropology. These ideological boundaries are drawn around the legacy of mistrust engendered by paternalistic and colonial roles played by anthropologists that have resulted in perceived damage to communities, families, and individuals. My particular experience has been with the native perspective regarding archaeologists seen as grave robbers and people committed to native cultural appropriation.

Thus, ideological distinctions arise in conducting Native Anthropology that lead to constructed identities which eschew correlations with both anthropology and tourism. Nakandu Yuji (2010) provides a detailed cultural and historical analysis of the growth of Japan Studies as a form of Native Anthropology that provides a basis for establishing the perceived cultural and historical authenticity of Japanese folklore. Because of political and economic barriers blocking inclusion of this field of study in anthropology, Japan Studies scholars constructed a new identity for themselves that Yuji represents as Native Anthropology. Similarly, but on a more personal level, Darren J. Rancio (2006) narrates his struggle to establish a Native American anthropology that serves a community-centered agenda.

My own experience can shed light on these ideological boundaries and the circumstances of engaging in Native Anthropology. The primary distinction between Native Anthropology and other forms is that my engagement and integration into a community pre-exists my work as an anthropologist. In addition, the intention of research to focus on the needs and agendas of the community takes precedence over academic or applied anthropological agendas. It is truly reflexive. In some cases, this becomes part of the conditional expectation for collaboration and can be likened to the political term “common ground.” For example, when working with the Lipan Apache to negotiate the restoration of burial grounds, my Native Anthropologist identity was antithetical to that of the archaeologists and other cultural anthropologists working for Coastal Environments, Inc. and the Army Corps of Engineers. In this case, referencing the primary dataset of the Buckeye Knoll TXVT98 archaeological site in Victoria, Texas, private- and government-contracted anthropologists and archaeologists made political and academic use of the data in an attempt to convince the Invista Victoria Nylon Plant to marginalize the Lipan Apache Band of Texas, Inc. On the other hand, I used the same dataset to convince Invista to establish a stewardship of the Native American burial grounds on plant property with the Lipan Apache Band.

Another example involves my work in Guerrero, Mexico, in which my identity as Danza Azteca granted me access to ritual space closed to other tourists and anthropologists. In this case, the decision to advocate rather than publicize resulted in non-inclusion of certain geographical and ritual knowledge in publications, thus making it less accessi-
ble to tourists, anthropologists, and others. This is very similar to the expectations and admonishment expressed by my adopted Hopi family, who frown heavily upon unauthorized sharing and use of Hopi knowledge.

In a final detailed example from Mexico, engagement with the Danza Azteca community of Calpulli Tecuanichan (based in the city of Chilpancingo) led me to work with the village of Xipetlan. I gained access to these communities because of my position and involvement in Danza Azteca. By way of background, in 1992 I traveled to Mexico City to take part in ceremonies marking the 500-year date of Columbus’ landing in the Western Hemisphere. Ideologically, this marked a celebration of survival and resistance of Native American peoples. On October 12 of that year, I took part in a Danza Azteca ceremony in the Zocalo central plaza of Mexico City. During the ceremony, I was introduced to representatives of Tecuanichan who played music for the ceremonial dancers. Two weeks later I traveled to Chilpancingo and toured the nearby towns and visited with members of Los Pueblos Indigenas en Resistencia. I was then invited to attend and participate in a Spring Fertility ceremony in the remote village of Xipetlan.

My identity enabled my invitations. The agenda set forth in Xipetlan was to revitalize fertility ceremonies because the village was experiencing a crisis of low birth rates and poor crops. Although residents maintained many aspects of the fertility ceremonies, the village did not have ceremonial dancers to make appropriate offerings. This is where other Danzantes and I were invited to play a role. At each point of introduction and travel, I was reminded that this was not for tourists or anthropologists. This was for indigenous people in resistance to cultural destruction brought about by the legacy of the Spanish invasion and subsequent governmental intervention. The words used to represent general group membership and solidarity were, “somos los pueblos indigenas en Resistencia,” which means “we are the indigenous peoples in resistance,” connoting resistance to the European invasion that had been going on for 500 years.

On the journey I was taken on a charter bus because even the entrance to the dirt road that leads to the village is not served by buses from outside of the region. Traveling with a politically-motivated extended family that indoctrinated me with native ideology was quite distinct from the practice of taking formal tourist transportation. I was specifically admonished against engaging in anthropology, signaled by a pantomime with me playing the role of an Indian, the admonisher playing the role of an anthropologist with a huge insincere smile with his arm around me, and his wife taking a photograph of us for my book exploiting the village and culture for my personal advancement. So, rather than engaging in traditional ethnography I found other ways to do anthropology.

The primary reason that I had been invited to attend was as a traditional ceremonial collaborator in which songs, dances, and ritual were to be conserved through shared practice among the village of Xipetlan, Calpulli Tecuanichan, other Danzante Aztecas, and me. Once I carried a Ph.D., I took on other roles which proved beneficial. In the roles of official investigator and negotiator, I provided credibility for community projects. In addition, I later engaged in a trade in feathers and traditional crafts to support the Tecuanichan community and the allied Danza Azteca communities in the U.S. In essence, my presence and participation hinged on my not being a tourist or anthropologist and instead on my identities as a Danzante and indigenous person.

Conclusion

Anthropological discussion of the complementary nature of tourism and anthropology provides practical lessons about how to use tourism as a disguise for anthropology by expediting travel and relationships. This discussion also highlights ideological distinctions that arise in conducting Native Anthropology and becoming part of a counter-hegemonic identity that eschews perceived connections with anthropology and tourism. Stories of my own experiences demonstrate the dual nature of tourism as a hybrid cultural context engaging globalization processes, and also demonstrate key methodological implications of Native Anthropology as a distinct type of ethnographic fieldwork practice.

Anthropology and tourism are clearly complementary activities that provide practical knowledge for new anthropologists going into the field. They address important theoretical implications for understanding the conditions of ethnographic fieldwork and differences in the practice of Native Anthropology. However, this discussion also raises important issues of ambiguity and ambivalence regarding ideological distinctions that become fluid and negotiable over time, as access to and understanding of Native intentions, agendas, and issues are considered.

In sum, anthropological discussion of the complementary nature of tourism and anthropology provides practical lessons about how to use tourism as a disguise for anthropology, theoretical implications regarding the dual nature of tourism as a hybrid cultural context that highlights globalization processes, and methodological implications of Native Anthropology as an identity oppositional to anthropology and tourism.
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THE ROLES OF SUSTAINABLE TOURISM IN NEOLIBERAL POLICIES AND POVERTY REDUCTION STRATEGIES: DO THEY ADEQUATELY ADDRESS QUALITY OF LIFE?

JULIE REYES

ABSTRACT
In Central America, neoliberal policies and ideologies generally instituted a set of processes, under the aegis of market forces, which have led to a subjugation of political, social, and cultural rights which the global market has failed to amend. The continued burgeoning disparity between substantial foreign investment in the developing world, and the limited resources available for domestic development, are embedded within the strategies to reduce, if not ameliorate, poverty. Moreover, this approach is broadly enmeshed in a similar discourse that suggests poverty reduction can be achieved through economic growth, by initiating strategies that encourage tourism development. Using both primary ethnographic data from Nicaragua and secondary data from international development documents, this article questions the extent to which tourism exacerbates inequalities by promoting greater accumulation of capital among already-wealthy Nicaraguans. Exploration of the structural violence embedded within the nexus of tourism, economic growth, and poverty provides a deeper understanding of how the growing numbers of foreign and ex-patriot investors are further impoverishing one of the most poverty-stricken countries in the hemisphere. This is linked to a failure to address the increased cost of living, land displacement, and legal marginalization of Nicaraguan citizens.
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Introduction
Over 60 years ago, in 1946, Guy Lombardo and His Royal Canadians put Nicaragua on the musical map with the song entitled, Managua Nicaragua is a Beautiful Town. It portrayed Nicaragua as an exotic getaway, with coffee, bananas, tropical temperatures, a place where you could buy a hacienda for a “few pesos down”; where “every day is made for play and fun, because every day is a fiesta.” It may seem outdated or old-fashioned, yet tourism today in Nicaragua is being promoted within the same representation of an exotic getaway, steeped in a discourse that suggests tourism can generate economic growth as a way to alleviate poverty. The promise of tourism for Nicaragua, as a mechanism for gaining a competitive advantage and as a vehicle to poverty reduction, is criticized because it is a strategy associated with dependency on an external source of growth (Croes and Vanegas: 2008). In this article, I explore whether tourism actually exacerbates inequalities by promoting greater accumulation of capital among already-wealthy Nicaraguans and growing numbers of foreign and ex-patriot investors, furthering the impoverishment of one of the most poverty-stricken countries in the hemisphere (Smith and Duffy 2003). Kaplan (1996: 63) argues that, “tourism arises out of the economic disasters of other countries that make them ‘affordable’ or subject to ‘development,’ treading upon long-established traditions of cultural and economic hegemony, and, in turn, participating in new versions of hegemonic relations.”

Neoliberal Policies and Poverty Reduction Strategies
Current discourse and critique around international development implies that neoliberalism is a complex and differentiated set of policies and practices steeped in contradictions. These critiques range from notions that neoliberalism increases the economic power of elites, to the destruction of organizations or institutions that get in the way of making a profit through a market economy (Scarritt 2010: 27). Furthermore, the complexities and contradictions of international development emerge from a perspective that neoliberalism is fundamentally shaped by structures from which it emerges and within which it operates (Williams 2012). I do not view neoliberalism as a precise or concrete set of policies that operate autonomously separated from global political economy, but rather as a framework, which represents a complex history of what international development actually is for whom it actually serves. This perspective posits that neoliberalism and international development policies and practices are not shaped by what a developing country needs, but are critically influenced by ideological structures that operate from a paradigm which suggests that economic growth is a panacea towards poverty reduction. The process of inter-
national development implementation is reproduced through a definition of poverty that suggests poor countries must strive to achieve the standards of wealth of more economically advantaged nations. This process is rooted in historical political-economic forces that perpetuate an unequal access to resources, services, rights, and security, which in turn limit life chances through institutional practices domination, hierarchies and ideologies that exacerbate social indifference through structural violence.

A political economy approach suggests that development is driven by a combination of market mechanisms and government decisions (Robinson 2010). However, these complex processes are experienced in everyday interactions between structures and institutions that maintain the process of poverty as a reality for many. One process that has historically exacerbated both the quantitative and qualitative aspects of poverty has been Structural Adjustment Policies (SAPs), more recently termed Poverty Reduction Strategies. The Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) was used by the World Bank as a tool to examine what drives and constrains progress. A report released in June, 2010, reported that—despite economic growth being a prime catalyst toward eradicating poverty, reducing hunger, and increasing employment opportunities—these benefits do not reach the poorest segments of the population, especially in rural areas (The Path to Achieving the Millennium Development Goals: A Synthesis of MDG Evidence From Around the World: p.19).

World Bank and IMF policies not only emphasized free market forces, but also the removal of restrictions that would enhance the goal of eradicating poverty in half by the year 2015. As such, the economic policies that set forth pro-market, anti-state conditions favored privatization of public commodities such as communications, banking and finance, and agricultural enterprises, commonly known as Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs).

There are four ways in which adjustment policies have contributed to the further impoverishment and marginalization of local populations, while increasing economic inequality. The first is through the demise of domestic manufacturing sectors and the loss of gainful employment by laid-off workers and small producers due to the nature of trade and financial-sector reforms. The second relates to the contribution that agricultural, trade and mining reforms have made to the declining viability and incomes of small farms and poor rural communities, as well as to declining food security, particularly in rural areas. The third relates to the retribution of workers through privatization and budget cuts, in conjunction with labor-market flexibilization measures; it has resulted in less secure employment, lower wages, fewer benefits and an erosion of workers’ rights and bargaining power. Finally, poverty has been increased through privatization programs, the application of user fees, budget cuts and other adjustment measures that have reduced the role of the state in providing or guaranteeing affordable access to essential quality services (The Policy Roots of Economic Crisis And Poverty: 173-187).

The economic policies that comprise the core of Structural Adjustment Programs have failed to engender the healthy economies promised by their architects. In fact, the overall impact of adjustment policies has included: the generation of increased current-account and trade deficits and debt; disappointing levels of economic growth, efficiency and competitiveness; the misallocation of financial and other productive resources; the “disarticulation” of national economies; the destruction of national productive capacity; and extensive environmental damage (Pisani 2003). Poverty and inequality are now far more intense and pervasive than they were 20 years ago, wealth is more highly concentrated, and opportunities are far fewer for the many who have been left behind by adjustment.

For the countries that have traveled down the adjustment road, the problem is that the reform process has failed to generate economic benefits. These benefits have tended to be concentrated in a relatively few hands, both domestic and foreign, while millions of other people have increasingly been deprived of the resources and opportunities they require to move out of poverty.

Nicaragua: A Case Study of Neoliberal Policies

SAPs were initiated in Nicaragua in the beginning of the 1990s as a new vision of development that incorporated an “outward integration" founded on a sustained growth of exports, a reduction in the state’s participation in the economy, the promotion of the private sector as the main investor, the privatization of public companies, and trade liberalization (Dubcovsky 1999: 2). This was in response to the Sandinista revolution in which the Sandinista government changed the country’s economic orientation through the state nationalizing domestic trade, foreign trade, and the financial system, and creating state corporations that were considered to be the “people’s property.” Under the Sandinista government, agrarian reform involved a third of the country’s land, by democratizing property and fostering collectivization of agriculture. The country’s history of armed conflict, American trade and financial embargo, and natural disasters prevented Nicaragua from implementing a successful development strategy, and SAPs were put into effect.

After the Sandinista government lost power in what was considered by foreign observers to be a free and democratic election in 1990, the United States stressed a foreign policy that reinforced development through democracy in order to cure ailments left over from the Sandinista gov-
Is Tourism a Way Toward Eradicating Poverty?

How does tourism fit into this framework—as an outlet to alleviate poverty, if not ameliorate it altogether, by the MDG-designated year 2015? Florence Babb, an anthropologist whose research in Nicaragua spans the past two decades, situates the concept of tourism as “a set of cultural practices that are under constant negotiation that may illuminate broader social and historical processes” (2011: 42). While her work consists of connecting current tourism mired with past representations and/or misrepresentations of revolution and long periods of instability and civil war, I use her work as a springboard to explain that economic practices associated with tourism do significantly influence and shape social and historical processes in Nicaragua, specifically by catering to foreign investors, while limiting labor laws to decrease workers’ rights to a fair wage. For example, The World Bank reports that the Minimum Wage Commission sets minimum wages, in which representatives of the unions, the government, and the private sector negotiate their levels. There are a total of twelve different minimum wages and are differentiated according to formal sectors of economic activity in an attempt to take into account the level of education of the labor force in each sector. The four largest sectors in terms of employment consist of: agriculture, culture, manufacturing, community services and commerce. (Gutierrez, et al. 2008: 20-22). According to the Nicaraguan Ministry of Labor (MINTRAB), the current minimum wage for each sector ranges from approximately: US $1.26 per day for agriculture to US $10.35 per month for commerce. However, most Nicaraguans working in the service and tourism industries fall within the informal sector, and are usually paid in cash. In fact, the going rate for domestic workers (as of July, 2011) was approximately 1000 to 1200 cordobas per month. With the current exchange rate, this translates into roughly US $45 per month. By the mid-1990s, the Nicaraguan Institute of Tourism (INTUR), in collaboration with the national universities, was promoting tourism as a key area for professional training. By the year 2000, the annual number of visitors to Nicaragua approached 500,000, which is significant in a country with a population of four million. The International Monetary Fund suggests that tourism in Nicaragua is evolving, as are policies keyed to furthering this activity. In this context, the government is promoting significant transformations concerning infrastructure in order to stimulate economic growth. A report by the IMF states that it “is also important to maintain levels of political and social stability so as to minimize the perception of risk among potential visitors. Thus Nicaragua may be attractive as an opportunity for internal and foreign direct investment, which will have an effect on the growth of the tourism industry” (IMF 2010: 30).
The government has a policy of offering incentives to small tourism projects and an intensive policy of positioning the country in the world economy, to which end the promotion of tourism is essential. Tourism has the potential to generate a multiplier effect in economic activities, generate employment and promote consumption, all of which contribute to the overall goal of fighting poverty. Tourism in Nicaragua received $40.29 million US for a six-month period in 2009, second only to free trade zones and energy projects. However, Nicaraguan labor and foreign investment policies do not address the increased cost of living, land displacement and legal marginalization of already impoverished Nicaraguan citizens; they instead promote economic growth by allowing for bargain real estate and investment opportunities for the Nicaraguan elite and foreign investors.

Moreover, tax incentives can be extended if a project undergoes extensive expansions. Additionally, the current labor policy (in place since 1990), does not include a government policy to protect workers’ rights. The imperfections of the system and the lack of an adequate legal framework create an adverse setting for the development of an efficient labor market. Today wages are inadequate in real terms, and working conditions carry implicit a high degree of risk for workers. In many regards the gaps between poor and non-poor are determined by an inadequate distribution of income and consumption. SAPs acted as a mechanism which alienated peasant smallholders, undermined the peasantry as a class, re-concentrated land, and fomented a new, modernized capitalist agribusiness sector between 1991 and 1999. These same credit and related adjustment policies have also undermined urban workers and small farm holders.

The main, economically profitable tourism industries attract and cater to foreigners and wealthy Nicaraguans. Montelímar is an excellent example. Montelímar, the premier Pacific beach destination, which was formerly owned by the Somoza family and then nationalized under the Sandinistas, was sold to the Spanish company Barcelo and turned into an exclusive, expensive, five-star resort complete with three ambient-temperature swimming pools, one of which is considered the best in the whole of Central America. It also has two children’s pools, tennis courts, a mini-zoo, horse riding, basketball courts, and a discothèque.

What the advertisements do not disclose is the fact that the locals from around the community are forbidden on the beach and that armed security guards patrol the beach 24/7. Locals living around the area of Montelímar complained to me as far back as 1995 that fishing, their main mode of livelihood to feed their families, has been taken away from them as a result of the resort with no compensation or voice in the matter. I encountered two men fishing just outside of the restricted barbed-wire fence boundaries set up by the Montelímar security office, further enhanced by signs stating “Prohibido el Paso” (No Trespassing). I asked the men how the fishing was, and they stated it was better under Somoza. I asked what they meant, and they said, “Well, even when Somoza was here, we used to be able to fish when we wanted to. He let us get away with it, as long as we didn’t come here every day. There are not many fish here anymore, and sometimes the security guards raise their guns and tell us to move on. We need these fish to feed our families.”

Economic Growth: Panacea or Calamity?

As the developing world continues to rely heavily upon foreign aid and the global market to stimulate growth and generate wealth, it has not been without a disparity in terms of who will benefit and who will not. The global market has failed to amend the burgeoning disparity between substantial foreign investment in the developing world, and the limited resources available for domestic development. The modern concept of development is predicated upon a discourse of “problemitization” (Foucault, in Couzens Hoy 1986; Escobar 1995; Foucault 2001) which defined poverty as not only a problem to be fixed, but a social problem mired within the notion of “lack” or “deficiency.” Poverty was seen as representing the opposite of what rich nations had, and became a reminder that two-thirds of the world’s population was living in an undesired, undignified condition, for which the only remedy of escape was through the concept of economic structures based on others’ perceptions and experiences (Esteva 1993: 10). Predictably, the socio-economic index for defining poverty became quantitative and one-dimensional as the World Bank identified those earning less than $1.25 per day as living in “extreme poverty,” categorizing over one billion people as such. New and “unique” solutions became the panacea to “fix the poor” who represented a growing social problem for which economic intervention was necessary.

Poverty as a Process Rooted in Social Relations

Despite modest reductions in poverty in recent decades, significant progress has not been evident especially in low-income countries. A critical examination in A Sourcebook for Poverty Reduction Strategies of which policies best promote economic growth and reduce poverty in low-income countries, suggests that poverty is multidimensional, extending beyond low levels of income. It includes factors surrounding low levels of consumption and income; little or no improvements in health and education indicators; exposure to risk and income shocks that may arise at the national, local, household, or individual levels; and the capability of poor people and other excluded groups to partici-
pate in, negotiate with, change, and hold accountable institutions that affect their well-being (Klugman 2002: 1-3).

Poverty, however, involves a complex set of processes that reflect both qualitative factors such as loss of rights, political powerlessness and voicelessness, and quantitative factors, such as life expectancy, infant mortality rates, and gross domestic product (GDP) or real income per person. The latter became the mechanism for measuring economic growth vis-à-vis “development” and “progress.” GDP was used not only to indicate quantitative progress, but also inferentially as a qualitative measurement of development, as it was closely related to factors such as life expectancy, personal consumption, and educational achievement (Pender 2001: 398). Using multiple indicators to characterize poverty may not increase the number of people considered to be poor, but rather, it will highlight the fact that the poor suffer from multiple deprivations.

Economic growth, although touted as key, has not been effective in reducing poverty for three reasons. First, public policy in Nicaragua has not been traditionally pro-poor, and concomitantly has not been aimed at sustained growth with social responsibility. Second, in an effort to protect the economy’s productive sectors, the benefits to privileged groups in the form of tax shelters have outweighed the fiscal resources allocated to social protection. Third, low levels of technological progress have correlated with low levels of labor productivity.

For example, most of Nicaragua’s large-scale gold-mining industry, which is now foreign-owned, receives generous incentives, tax breaks and offshore accounts for export earnings that have minimized returns to the government. With foreign firms often the beneficiaries of privatizations of state holdings in this and other sectors, dual economies have emerged (or become more pronounced). The development of local industries has been threatened. The increased ease of profit repatriation, capital withdrawal and, in many sectors, plant relocation has had a strong destabilizing effect. At the same time, key economic and social decisions have been removed from national hands. This removal of localized participation and decision-making is an example of the insidious invisibility of structural violence embedded within current poverty-reduction strategies. The invisibility reflects a complex web of inequality manifest throughout political, economic and social forces that tend to constrain individual choice and participation.

Structural Violence and Quality of Life

The theory of structural violence provides a useful framework for understanding how institutional structures influence unequal distribution of power and resources, both of which figure in poverty as a process rooted in social relations. To understand structural violence in the context of poverty and inequity requires a perspective that situates institutional structures as central to the analysis of political, economic, and social relationships. Of central importance is the focus on the interdependent relationships among individuals, institutions and/or organizations, and the notion that individuals are embedded in relational structures that shape their identities, interests, and interactions (Ho 2007). Identifiable institutions, relationships, and ideologies that are realized locally, internationally, and globally within the unequal market-based terms of trade between industrialized and non-industrialized nations, can result in structural violence. In Latin America, throughout the 1980s and early 1990s, neoliberal policies and ideologies generally instituted a set of processes advanced through market economies which lead to a subjugation of political, social, and cultural rights (Kehl 2009: 19).

Originally, the concept of structural violence came from Marxism and the liberation theology movement of Latin America. However, the term was formally coined by Johan Galtung, a Norwegian social democrat, as a critique of the United States Cold War understanding of nationalist and socialist revolutionary movements. Galtung (1990: 300) explored six domains of cultural violence, and suggested that empirical science, through neoclassical economic doctrine, represented one example. Buried in the very core of economics, unequal comparative advantages serve to legitimize a structurally intolerable status quo steeped in a hegemony that favors those countries rich with the capital, technology, skilled labor and scientific inquiry necessary to process raw materials.

Recently, however, structural violence is a term most popularly associated with Paul Farmer (1996; 2001; 2005). Farmer, a physician and anthropologist, looks beyond the details of fragmentary explanations to seek an integrated understanding of a complex reality. He states that structural violence is “a process in which the most basic human right—the right to survive—is trampled in an age of great affluence that influences the nature and distribution of extreme suffering” (Farmer 2005: xiii). Furthermore, he stresses that structural violence is shaped by historically given (and often economically driven) processes that conspire—whether through routine, ritual, or, as is more commonly the case, the hard surfaces of life—to constrain agency.

An example as this relates to my work follows. In an article in the newspaper La Prensa entitled, “Desmoralizada pero no derrotada” (Demoralized but not destroyed), published July 29, 2011, women in Nicaragua demanding justice for the numerous victims of violence were met with resistance in the Supreme Court of Justice. Specifically, the case involved Fatima Hernandez, a victim of rape, whose perpe-
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The Roles of Sustainable Tourism...


ABSTRACT
On March 11, 2011, the northeast coast of Japan suffered an earthquake of unprecedented 9.0 magnitude followed by tsunami waves that destroyed seaside hamlets and farmland in five coastal prefectures. Recovery efforts have been complicated by radiation leaks at the tsunami-hit Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant. Tourism—cast as both casualty of the disaster and key to post-disaster recovery—represents a key node of public discourse on the disaster. In this article, I examine the role of tourism in emergent popular understandings of the “3.11” disaster, recovery, and reconstruction. The discussion focuses on the early development of post-disaster tourism and discourses that support tourism development. Particular attention is given to the convergence of tourism and disaster recovery under the auspices of “volunteer tourism.” The discussion raises critical questions about how differently positioned individuals and groups in Japan and abroad are approaching, analyzing, and developing solutions to the disaster, as well as the changing meanings and impacts of tourism in local communities.

KEY WORDS: disaster recovery, volunteer tourism, media analysis, Japan

The Disaster and Its Immediate “Tourism Aftermath”
On March 11, 2011, the northeast coast of Japan was rocked by an earthquake of unprecedented 9.0 magnitude. The quake, which sent workers streaming into the streets and temporarily halted the subway system in Tokyo, was followed by a series of tsunami waves that destroyed seaside hamlets and farmland in Iwate, Miyagi, Fukushima, Ibaraki and Chiba prefectures. Workers at the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant struggled to stabilize the facility’s six reactors whose cooling systems failed after being bombarded by tsunami waves more than 30 feet high. Government bans on consumption of spinach, milk, and beef produced in affected areas, and the detection of higher-than-normal radiation levels at water processing plants outside Tokyo, contributed to an undercurrent of fear discernable throughout Japan and abroad. Dubbed the Great Eastern Japan Earthquake by the Japanese government, the events of March 11 and the ensuing nuclear crisis have been branded “3.11” (pronounced san-ichi-ichi) by citizens.¹

Tourism, cast as both casualty of the disaster and key to post-disaster recovery, has emerged as a key node of public discourse on 3.11. In a “white paper” to the Japanese Diet, the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport, and Tourism reported that nearly half of all reservations for travel and accommodations during March and April were cancelled countrywide following the disasters (Japan Tourism Agency [JTA] 2011b). Meanwhile, the Japan National Tourism Organization (JNTO) reported that in April, foreign visitors to Japan were down more than 60 percent from the previous year, the largest decline since records began in 1964 (NHK 2011a). A general mood of self-restraint (jishoku) was blamed for domestic trip cancellations, while “harmful rumors” regarding the radiation danger were blamed for the drop in foreign visitors.

Soon, the national tourism industry began vigorously promoting tourism, drawing on the nostalgia-laden Japanese cultural concept of tasukeai no seishin (“spirit of mutual aid”) (JTA 2011a). The first post-disaster domestic travel promotion campaign was launched on April 21 utilizing the slogan “Ganbarou Nippon!” (“Never Give Up, Japan!”), while urging touristic consumption for purposes of economic recovery. The media reported that Japanese youth were traveling in great numbers to Tohoku to assist with clean-up efforts and reconstruction (e.g., Huffington Post 2011; NPR 2011; Wall Street Journal 2011b), and travel agencies began offering “Volunteer Japan” tour packages, representing a new turn in the industry.²

I examine the dual role of tourism—as both victim and savior—in emergent popular understandings of the 3.11 disaster, recovery, and reconstruction, as well as some of the potential impacts of post-disaster tourism on local tourism providers and community residents. Japanese discourses on post-disaster tourism strike a familiar chord, drawing on and building national narratives of collective hardship and solidarity that have been central to postwar formulations of Japanese identity. Centering on the sparsely populated hamlets of coastal Tohoku, the dis-
course blends nostalgic yearnings for traditional Japanese culture and village life, a theme that has resonated in domestic tourism since at least the 1970s (Creighton 1997; Ivy 1995; Robertson 1991), generating complex connections between national identity, disaster, and tourism.

Post-3.11, this richly layered discourse has found new expression in emerging forms of “volunteer tourism.” A recent concept in Japan, volunteer tourism is linked in the public imagination to a generation of young people who have been criticized as lazy, selfish, and apathetic. After 3.11, young volunteers are said to represent a new social and political awakening, even as local tourism providers are criticized for catering to tourist voyeurs who yearn to see tsunami-devastated areas for themselves. Drawing on media reportage, scholarly ethnographic accounts, and personal accounts posted through social media, I examine the convergence between tourism and reconstruction efforts as an uneven and politically charged process, raising critical questions about how differently positioned domestic and global actors are developing solutions to the disaster. The discussion is not always linear due to the immediate and ongoing nature of the crisis. However, critical study of the events, imagery, and language of 3.11 is essential at the current moment, as opportunities for conducting ethnographic fieldwork are opening up, and while official accounts of the disaster have not yet been thoroughly codified.

Situating Discourses on Disaster and Tourism

Anthropologists approach natural disasters as complex social phenomena occurring at the interface of the social, environmental, and technological (Oliver-Smith 1996; Oliver-Smith and Hoffman 1999; Gunewardena and Schuller 2008). Within this literature, disasters are treated as “contexts for the creation of political solidarity, activism, new agendas, and developing new power relations” (Oliver-Smith 1996:310), although analyses of the tourism industry’s role in post-disaster recovery are rare (cf. Stonich 2008). Media and tourism, as purveyors of disaster narratives, and as the means by which persons not directly affected by a disaster may experience the tragedy, are critical to understanding the social dimensions of disaster because of “their potential to mobilize popular sentiment and collective action, and even their capability to witness or offer testimony” (Kleinman and Kleinman 1996: 1). Tourism in places of disaster engages multiple and diverse narratives of tragedy, while promoting particular interpretations of events and silencing others. Sather-Wagstaff (2011) argues that the motivations, experiences, and interpretations of tourists at Ground Zero in New York and other sites of mass trauma, popularly referred to as “dark tourism” (Lennon and Foley 2000), are part of the complex processes of recovery and remembrance. Visiting sites of disaster is a powerful way for individuals to viscerally experience events that have had a defining impact on their lives and identities. Counter to popular and scholarly notions of dark tourists as rubber-neckers lured by the macabre as a form of entertainment, Sather-Wagstaff argues, “The sense of curiosity that these visitors have is not one for seeing where people died and taking some kind of morbid pleasure in this act but a simple curiosity about what the site actually looks like to literally make the event real rather than as mediated through the news” (2011: 75).

While World War II sites have been major tourist attractions in Japan since the early postwar, disaster tourism and especially disaster-volunteer tourism as defined and practiced in the West, is in its infancy. In Japan, volunteerism has been described as weak, and it has been claimed that Japanese society lacks a tradition of private philanthropy, depending instead on family to provide support for the needy. Although government tax laws have been unfavorable toward non-profit organizations, independent volunteers have played an important role in local communities throughout the post-war period (Avenell 2010). Kage (2011) explains that 20th century disasters such as the 1923 Great Kanto earthquake and the 1995 Kobe earthquake were followed by a surge of voluntarism and significant restructuring of Japanese civil society (see also Aldrich 2011).

What aspects of Japanese tourism culture contribute to the recent emergence of disaster-volunteer tourism? In The Tourist, Dean MacCannell posited that individuals embarking on touristic journeys are primarily driven by a quest for “authenticity” that is missing in their daily lives (1999; orig. 1976). In Japanese contexts, this quest has primarily manifested in nostalgic longings for Old Japan (e.g., Ivy 1995; Creighton 1997; Guichard-Aguis and Moon 2009). In particular, the concept of furusato (literally “old village,” but evoking the warm, nostalgic feelings of “hometown”)—pervasive in Japanese travel brochures, mass media advertising, and government planning rhetoric—embodies “authentic” Japanese culture and society as it is imagined to have existed in pre-modern rural farming and fishing villages (Robertson 1991; Creighton 1997). Rural landscapes, forested mountains, rice fields, and thatch-roofed farmhouses evoke the affective relationships and sociabilities presumed to characterize life in such settings—including compassion, camaraderie, tradition, and even motherly love (Robertson 1991).

Furusato imagery is carefully manipulated within the domestic travel industry. References to specific places are avoided so that any rural location may symbolically be appropriated as one’s own furusato (Creighton 1997). Village matsuri (festivals) have been revived and invented...
throughout Japan, most notably in urban and suburban areas, to attract tourists and induce “furusato-mindedness” in local citizens. However, as Robertson’s account of a government-created festival in Tokyo demonstrates, planning and participation in new matsuri may provoke and reinforce local sectoral and factional differences (Robertson 1991). As Robertson argues, furusato-zukuri (“native place-making,” including furusato imagery in tourism advertising) is always “a political project through which popular memory is shaped and socially reproduced” (1995: 15).

Somewhat at odds with the furusato boom but still part of the quest for “authenticity,” Moeran reported in 1983 that group travel and sight-seeing packages were gradually being replaced with a new emphasis on individual travel and travel for purposes of recreation and experience. Younger tourists, in particular, were interested in travel that promised opportunities for “participating with one’s own skin” (jibun no hada ni sanka suru). With the growth of “rural tourism” in the 1990s, experiences sought by these travelers came to include staying and working at farm inns, picking apples, harvesting rice, collecting local wild vegetables, fishing and weaving. These are activities which contribute much-needed low-cost labor to local farms and therefore can be classified as “volunteer tourism,” but which have almost never been discussed in these terms. Post-3.11 disaster-volunteer tourism then represents a new convergence of voluntarism and domestic tourism in Japan.

The following discussion develops more contextualized understandings of post-3.11 tourism, including volunteer tourism, through a discussion of Tohoku as an unusual tourism “site.”

Tohoku in the Touristic Imagination
The natural beauty of Tohoku was enchanting, but the towns and villages proved a little disappointing. I could not help recognizing that the old Japan I have long sought has been rapidly disappearing. Westernization and urbanization are taking its toll on the lifestyle of even the most remote locations in Japan (Moriko Watanabe, email message quoted in Berger 2010: xxv).

The Tohoku region encompasses six prefectures—Aomori, Iwate, Miyagi, Akita, Yamagata, Fukushima, and Niigata—which make up the northeastern third of the main island of Honshu. Surrounded by water and craggy coastlines on three sides, with the Ou Mountains and several minor ranges running north-south at its spine, the region has stunning scenery, numerous natural hot springs, and long, cold winters with heavy snowfalls. Despite extensive agricultural and infrastructural development in the 19th and 20th centuries, the region suffers from lingering perceptions of backwardness, while at the same time local artisans are recognized as among the few remaining practitioners of “traditional” Japanese crafts and culture.

Developed as the nation’s rice production center following World War II, Tohoku was also exploited for low-cost labor, with workers migrating to work in Tokyo factories. During the 1970s, local communities began to invite electric power companies to build nuclear power plants, which offered jobs and state subsidies. Like other rural areas in Japan, the region has a rapidly shrinking and aging population, and a series of village amalgamation laws have caused the decline of small retailers and public transportation services, negatively impacting regional tourism (Traphagan and Thompson 2006). Not surprisingly, the 3.11 disaster has worsened this situation considerably.

Sites in Tohoku that attracted significant numbers of tourists prior to 3.11 included the Jomon period ruins at Sannai Maruyama in Aomori, the folklore-related sights of Tono village in Iwate, the scenic Matsushima coastline in Miyagi, the frontier castle town of Aizu Wakamatsu and pottery village of Aizu Hongū in Fukushima, and the feudal period samurai district in Kakunodate, Akita Prefecture. Drawing on the popular view of Tohoku as quintessentially traditional, the furusato motif was manipulated skilfully to lure Japanese tourists to appreciate the natural beauty of the region, enjoy the many hot springs and ski resorts, and to consume an imagined past via heritage tourism.

Post-3.11 Tourism in Tohoku
Following March 11th, 25 percent of the 285 registered hotels and inns in the six Tohoku prefectures suspended operations, including eight facilities that were heavily damaged (JTA 2011b). Tourists affected by the closures were moved to other prefectures in accordance with the national Disaster Relief Act. Existing disaster and safety net funds were implemented, along with a special 3.11 recovery fund to provide relief to small and medium sized businesses affected by the earthquake and the Fukushima nuclear plant accident. Additional loans were made available through the Japan Finance Corporation. The direct and indirect economic effects of the March 11 disaster on the region’s tourism industry have been significant, and the JTA asserts that redeveloping tourism will contribute mightily to the region’s economic recovery due to its potential to generate employment (JTA 2011b).

Tourism in Tohoku is being embraced by the Japanese government not only for its economic benefits, but also for its symbolic value. As an example, on May 18, Environment Ministry officials announced the combination of six national and regional parks along the Sanriku coast into a single national park that will symbolize the area’s reconstruction (NHK 2011b). According to the report, the new park will
feature observation platforms where people can learn about the disaster, as well as trails for emergency evacuation that link beaches with communities and mountains. The Reconstruction Design Council’s June 25 report to the Prime Minister contains the following statement regarding tourism in a newly developed Tohoku:

It is expected that local tourism resources including natural views of the beautiful sea, etc., the rich local food culture, indigenous cultural assets such as festivals and shrines and temples, and brands including national parks and World Heritage sites will be widely utilized to create new tourism styles that are only possible in Tohoku and transmit the “Tohoku” brand to the entire country and the entire world (Reconstruction Design Council 2011).

Chairman Iokibe Makoto spoke at length in an interview about a proposal to construct a “hilly of hope” from tsunami debris that would serve both as a memorial to those who died in the disaster and as a barrier against future tsunamis (Wall Street Journal 2011a).

Reporting on the proposed national park, NHK cited without additional commentary the Environment Ministry’s plan to hire disaster-affected fishermen and farmers as tour guides in the new park. What plans exist for the reconstruction of local fisheries and farming itself? An interview with Iokibe provides some detail: “We should give priority to the local people who have suffered, but since the population is declining and the sea in that area is abundant in natural resources, there aren’t enough local people to make the fishing industry prosperous” (McCurry 2011).

The Council has recommended redeveloping the Sanriku coastal fisheries along a new model: “To revitalize the region’s fishing industry, more than 200 ports should be consolidated and major ports equipped with piers for large deep-sea fishing ships, seafood processing facilities and a distribution center needs to be established” (Reuters 2011). Implementation of the Council’s recommendations is likely to further displace local fishermen operating on a small scale. Cross-analysis of even this limited set of articles thus reveals the complexity and contradictions, as well as the inequalities among various local stakeholders involved in the development of post-disaster reconstruction and tourism, a topic that anthropologists are well-positioned to explore (Stonich 2008; Wallace 2005).

During the same time period as coverage of the new national park, the media amplified the debate surrounding local businesses that were already engaged in activities that might be construed as “recovery tourism” in affected localities. An Asahi Shimbun article reported that Sanriku Railway Company is currently dispatching employees as guides for local municipal officials, contractors, and other organizations planning visits to sites devastated by the tsunami (Asahi Shimbun 2011). Railway officials arrange for overnight tours of five disaster-hit sites for groups of 10 or more people, providing guide services and arranging for bus transportation and accommodation. Calling the company’s new service “controversial,” the newspaper cites employee concern that they may be seen as “cashing in on local people’s misfortunes” and the protest of one resident who allegedly complained that the company was “placing disaster-hit areas on parade.” The report then added, “But Sanriku Railway concluded it needs the income, be it small, now that the earthquake and tsunami put its very survival on the line.” The report concludes, “Even before the disaster, the company reported losses for 17 consecutive years due to the falling population in its service areas. The company estimates that up to 18 billion yen will be needed to restore operations after suffering damages in 317 locations from the earthquake and tsunami. The company and local governments along its railway lines are calling on the central government to foot the bill.” The suspicious tone of news coverage of private companies engaging in tourism activities contrasts sharply with the neutral tone of coverage of government-led reconstruction projects.

News coverage concerning volunteerism and volunteer tourism in Tohoku has been equally inconsistent, consisting mainly of sentimentalized community interest stories and first-hand accounts penned by journalists who have participated in volunteer trips. Periodic reporting of overall numbers of volunteers and the organization of volunteer centers in Tohoku has appeared, as well as stories concerning the problems caused by the influx of large numbers of volunteers into the region. In preparation for the upcoming Golden Week holiday, for example, Yomiuri Shimbun ran a piece essentially warning volunteers against “inundating” municipalities affected by the disaster.

Offers of help have been so numerous that some local governments have decided to temporarily stop accepting volunteers—partly because they were not prepared to handle the flood of people expected during the holiday period and also to prevent overcrowding and confusion on the roads…. The (Ishinomaki) city government was spooked by the prospect of a huge surge in volunteers. Anticipating more than 2,000 people could inundate Ishinomaki during Golden Week, the city government worried whether it would be able to organize them all (Yomiuri Shimbun 2011).

By mid-June the press reported 450,000 volunteers had traveled to Tohoku since the disaster (The Nikkei 2011).
On Twitter and other social media, volunteers describe shoveling sludge from beneath the floorboards of homes and shops, scraping dried mud off Buddhist temples, cleaning residue from family photographs, and hauling unusable appliances to community junk heaps, all while interacting with local citizens who have lost their property, livelihoods, and loved ones. Twitter, the only available media immediately after the earthquake, was used to disseminate information about emergency phone lines, tsunami alerts, altered train schedules, and the status of friends and family. As relief and recovery efforts moved forward, volunteers in Tohoku tweeted about their motivations and experiences. Top Tour Corporation (Tokyo) and other travel agencies offering volunteer tours also advertised their Tohoku tours packages via Twitter and other social media.2 Yomiuri staff writer Fumiko Endo participated in a three-day, two-night volunteer trip to Miyagi Prefecture. She wrote, “I wanted to see the reality of the devastated areas with my own eyes, so I could comprehend the disaster in more depth. As I have neither a car nor enough free time to register for regular ongoing volunteer duties, I had searched online for short-term volunteering expeditions” (Endo 2011). Volunteer participation like Endo’s has been recognized and praised by the Reconstruction Design Council, even as it is reformulated as service to the nation.

The way in which so many people, including the members of the Self-Defense Forces, came from around the country to engage in dedicated relief activities is truly an inspirational example of linkage and mutual support being put into practice. If all the people of Japan join in ongoing efforts to support the reconstruction of the Tohoku region, it will serve to nurture “hope” for the revitalization of Japan and make it easier for everyone to identify with (Reconstruction Design Council 2011: 9; italics added). The italicized terms, linkage and mutual support, refer to a central goal of the Reconstruction Design Council’s plan, developing strong kizuna, or interpersonal bonds, in communities under reconstruction. The Council writes, “How do we resolve comprehensive issues in the context of a compound disaster?... (T) through “linkage” activities to other people and things. Linkage comes in many forms: people to people, community to community, company to company, municipalities to prefectural and national governments, local communities with other communities at home and abroad, eastern Japan with western Japan, and country to country.... The gentle support of the national, prefectural, and municipal governments of the various modalities of the cultures of the communities will allow the community members to reconfirm the depth of their kizuna (2011 8, 24). The concept of kizuna is evocative of the furusato theme discussed earlier. Both quotes from the Council’s report also reveal a barely-concealed attempt at redirecting individual volunteer efforts and community/private plans for reconstructing localities toward an overall goal of revitalizing the national collective. Critics of the Council’s plan point out the many problems Tohoku faced even before 3.11 that were a direct result of national policies that placed the region in service to the nation, and particularly Tokyo (Oguma 2011).

Conclusion: Ethnographies of Tourism in the Wake of 3.11

Critical analysis of media and personal accounts of post-disaster tourism in Japan reveal the complexities and inequalities involved in post-disaster recovery and reconstruction. While the surge of civic engagements of Japanese citizens volunteering in Tohoku has earned the admiration of foreign journalists, the local tourism infrastructure is informally criticized for putting disaster on display. Meanwhile, the Reconstruction Design Council’s report clearly represents an attempt at bringing volunteer-related travel into the national narrative. Ultimately, the diversity of knowledge, experience, and interests of those involved in disaster-volunteer tourism is contributing to an emerging collective memory of the 3.11 disaster. With regard to the role of tourism and tourism discourses in post-disaster Japan, there are a number of questions that must be asked: What worldviews underlie the various discourses related to post-disaster tourism? What political and ideological frameworks? What social and moral imperatives?

For anthropologists there is an immediate need for careful ethnographic research, including perhaps participatory work as/alongside volunteer tourists, in the communities of Tohoku. A number of factors currently constrain possibilities for foreign researchers in Tohoku. These include the hesitancy of international funding organizations and universities to approve research in a region that continues to be perceived as “dangerous” due to ongoing problems at Fukushima Daiichi nuclear plant. With the easing of the U.S. State Department travel advisory in early October, the outlook for local research possibilities is improving.5 Participant-observation and in-depth community surveys, coupled with critical analysis of media and other textual sources, will greatly contribute to our understanding of the various stakeholders involved in local community development through tourism. This includes urban volunteer tourists, industry advertisers and providers, government regulators and ideologues, local business persons, and residents of Tohoku.
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Notes
1. In Japan, dates are written with a dot rather than a slash—thus, 3.11 rather than 3/11. Calling to mind the events of September 11th, 2001 (kyūichi-ichinichi in Japanese), the moniker succinctly conveys the sense of horror and shock experienced by viewers of the tsunami media footage. For an examination of the linkages between Japan’s 3.11 and 9/11, see R. Taggart Murphy’s discussion of the shared status of 3.11 and 9/11 as “hinges of history” and as examples of government negligence (Murphy 2011).
2. Tour packages were developed for domestic and foreign travelers. Companies offering “Volunteer Japan” tours to the Tohoku region include InsideJapan Tours (U.K.), H.I.S. International Tours (Los Angeles), and TopTour Corporation (Tokyo).
3. The Reconstruction Design Council, comprised of prominent academics, industry leaders, and prefectural governors, was established by Prime Minister Naoto Kan in April and charged with developing a comprehensive plan for reconstruction of areas devastated by the 3.11 triple disasters.
4. A sample Top Tour itinerary includes roundtrip chartered coach from Tokyo, accommodation in a Japanese ryokan (traditional inn) in Matsushima Bay, evening meals and several lunches, and a multilingual tour guide. In the case of cancellation of volunteer activities due to rain, sightseeing in Matsushima and Hiraizumi is arranged. The company’s website states that there will be no sightseeing in devastated areas. Inside Japan Tours (U.K.) also provides rain boots, rubber gloves, a cap, dust mask, and dust proof goggles on its tours. Companies offering volunteer tours partner with Japanese NGOs working in the region.
5. The EASIANTH listserv is one avenue through which U.S.-based scholars are developing research projects in collaboration with Japanese universities and in-country colleagues. The Digital Archive of Japan’s 2011 Disasters at Harvard University also promises to become a valuable clearinghouse for media and ethnographic data on the 3.11 disasters. Meanwhile, study abroad programs to Japan are resuming, many, including the Metropolitan State College of Denver program, with an added volunteer component.
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ABSTRACT

The wars in Afghanistan and Iraq brought controversies regarding anthropological involvement with the US military to the forefront. These controversies stem from the US military’s adoption of counterinsurgency (COIN) strategy in the mid-2000s, as a means to overcome stalling efforts in Afghanistan and Iraq. One major result of the transition to COIN was emphasis on civilianization of military operations, thereby generating employment of social scientists, including anthropologists. Consequently, some anthropologists, most notably Roberto González, challenged this practice as being ethically and scientifically inappropriate. Yet, as this commentary suggests, the issue is not simply one-sided. This is because of the complexity of warfare in the 21st century, a complexity that complicates straightforward assessments about the role of social science in US military efforts. In sum, not all types of anthropological involvement with the military are negative.
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Civilization of the US Military

In the mid-2000s, the US military hit a juncture, with respect to resolving its engagements in Iraq and Afghanistan. In brief, the military adopted the doctrine of counterinsurgency (COIN) to replace a failing effort at the more traditionally utilized enemy-centric approach, which, in the cases of Iraq and Afghanistan, relied on defeating adversaries and eliminating terrorist organizations, such as the Taliban, Saddam Hussein loyalists, and Al-Qaeda (Jones 2009). More specifically, COIN is associated with practices that emphasize improving relations between the military and the local population in ways intended to deprive insurgents of legitimacy, thereby rendering insurgent activities ineffective and without appeal among the larger population. That is, COIN is based on military participation in the local society to provide not only physical security, but other services, including those identified with institution- and state-building, such as the construction of infrastructure, the strengthening and development of governance, and in generating and fostering the local economy. Subsequently, this makes COIN a long-term, labor-intensive, and expensive strategy that relies on a host of non-military actors, including social scientists (Kilcullen 2009; Galula 2006; Field Manual 3-24; Marston and Malkasian 2008).

Moreover, military critics see COIN as untested and difficult to prove as effective, given its long-term nature (Freuhling 2009). Likewise, COIN is labeled as problematic by social science critics who regard it as a type of social engineering, since it involves manipulation of a local population in a manner suitable to the goals of the military performing COIN (González 2010). Within this context of critique, I raise my commentary about the complexities surrounding the processes associated with the civilianization of the military and what this means for applied anthropological work on behalf of the military. I argue that to understand better the realities of doing such work, we need to utilize a more nuanced approach grounded in critical social theory. Accordingly, it is possible to overcome a one-sided perspective that identifies such work as entirely negative or positive.

Controversial Perspectives

To begin, I contend that the US military and many militaries around the world are becoming increasingly civilianized due to the growing influence of non-military forces that pervade their strategies and operations, especially since the onset of COIN as a viable alternative military strategy. COIN became a thinkable option in the mid-2000s not only because of insurgent issues, but because of a plethora of changes in Western societies that, strongly and often predictably, permeate how the military functions. For example, privatization and the reach of global business interests do not allow the military to do business
as in past conflicts. As scholars have noted (e.g., Chatterjee 2009; Singer 2003; Avant 2005; Schall 2007; Shearer 1998), the impact of international business leaves no aspect of the US military untouched. Recruiting is done by private contractors. Weapons systems are developed and operated by contracting firms, whose personnel commonly have no formal military experiences. Likewise, logistics and some security work within military campaigns are largely the domain of private companies that do the brunt of the work, from managing fuel supplies to running mess halls. Even certain high-level research and analysis with strict military consequences is handled by contracting firms (Van Arsdale and Smith 2010). Thus, military operations are heavily influenced by thinking and behavior that have roots in non-military environments such as the business world, making traditional military philosophy open to civilian-oriented transformations.

Of course, there are those who see the arrows moving in the opposite direction. Scholars, such as Lutz (2009), González (2010), Giroux (2007), and Turse (2008), argue that we are really experiencing the militarization of civilian life. González, for instance, argues that evidence for this is abundant, as our schools and universities are targeted by the military-intelligence-industrial sectors for recruitment by means of campus visits, scholarships, and outreach programs to minority-dominated areas of the country. And, perhaps most obviously, our popular culture is saturated with images and content of a militarizing nature, from Hollywood films to television programming to video games about war and espionage (González 2010). Yet, I argue that the patterns González describes should not be read simplistically. González is correct as far as one body of evidence is concerned. That is, there is no denying that the military-intelligence-industrial complex is well represented within numerous aspects of American life. Nevertheless, if we examine how such a military-intelligence-industrial complex actually functions, we see a somewhat different picture crystallizing.

The military-industrial infrastructure has changed significantly in past decades and for a variety of reasons. The rise of COIN to prominence in the mid-2000s is primarily informed by trends existing outside the military. That is, the military had to turn to civilian institutions, personnel, and practices to implement COIN in both Afghanistan and Iraq. In fact, military scholars, such as Collin Gray (2006), have long lamented the slow transition of the US military into the 21st century, with respect to accepting a drastically changed global security environment that no longer is simply about a bipolar struggle between the USSR and the United States. And as scholars and observers, from Peter Van Arsdale to Derrin Smith (2010), have demonstrated, the military has had to quickly implement outreach to the non-military population for lessons learned and best practices when trying to implement COIN. For instance, the military now works closely with NGOs and private sector actors that have no stated military interests, so that the military may better implement its strategy of COIN.

One specific manifestation of this is the National Guard Agribusiness Development Teams (ADTs) employed in Afghanistan. While essentially a military operation, the ADTs cannot exist without a majority civilian infrastructure, which includes US farming bureaus, agribusiness firms, universities (e.g., Texas A & M), and civilian agencies (e.g., the USDA), as well as Afghan civilians, ranging from farmers to agricultural professors and government officials (USDA 2010; Leppert 2010; Center for Army Lessons Learned 2009). Thus, a central argument I make is that we need to be cautious about our interpretations of whether the military-industrial complex informs civilian life, or the other way around. Thus, while I do not disagree with González’s trepidations, I believe closer analysis reveals the opposite trend.

Moreover, if we reexamine González’s evidence, we might disprove some of his assessments. For instance, González (2010) points to popular culture content as proof that American society is being militarized. Yet, González’s content analysis is relatively weak. One could as easily draw the conclusion that popular culture content reflects broader concerns within society, as opposed to ones pushed down into society by an alleged Pentagon agenda. In other words, the civilian imagination informs the Department of Defense imagination in powerful ways that González does not acknowledge. This interpretation might even raise a more serious concern about military-society relations, given the susceptibility of the military-industrial complex to the workings of a civilian society that not only informs its content, but also is constitutionally and legally in control of it. Perhaps, then, it is better to frame the analysis in terms of a dynamic construct through which society interacts with the military-industrial complex to produce, perpetuate, or reinforce behaviors and norms that define military-society relations.

Returning to the implementation of COIN by the US military, COIN represents a rediscovery of the value of social science and humanities research for the military. This dynamic is not new, but represents an extension of past practices that extend back into the history of the US military. That is, the US once made concerted attempts to recruit and incorporate members of the social science community for military and intelligence-related efforts, with varying degrees of success. For example, the use of area studies experts was common during WWII to combat Germany and Japan and, in the case of geography, several leading scholars, including Isaiah Bowman, played an active role in the WWII war-fighting effort as academics (Desch 1998;
For one, most anthropologists who work in the HTS work for the benefit of the US military in conflictive environments (González 2009). Their arguments point to an argument. Consequently, this makes conclusions about US imperialism difficult to assert with great confidence, except through a politicized perspective, be it for or against US military operations and civilian involvement abroad.

Moreover, there are important reasons to support anthropologists and other social scientists who decide to engage in DoD-centric work. One reason has to do with the changing security environment worldwide. The parochial view that nation-states are distinct entities responsible only for their domestic concerns is outdated. We are on the crest of dramatic global transformations that frequently cause catastrophic harm to human life. For example, climate change and natural disasters continue to occur with consequences that no single nation-state can manage. We have
seen this recently in Japan, Haiti, and Burma. Furthermore, because national economies and populations are linked internationally, a major disaster in one nation impacts other nations regionally and more distantly. And often, it is militaries that possess the best capacity to manage such large-scale emergencies most effectively.

Thus, I would argue that contemporary military practices forwarded by the US, especially those emphasizing humanitarian aid, are forward-looking and should continue to be civilianized through the incorporation of non-military actors, including those who concurrently work in academia in social science fields. This is not to dismiss the caveats raised by critics of such practices, but it is to expand the discussion to account for the evidence that militaries worldwide are playing increasingly important humanitarian roles in traditionally civilian arenas (e.g., Hodge 2011; DiPrizio 2002). In related fashion, this would keep civilian-military relations more transparent, by exposing and monitoring the increased level of interactions between civilian (including NGO) and military actors, thereby improving the relationship as well as the practices and doctrines of the military.

Here, then, critical social theory provides important insights. The civilian-military dynamic demands understanding the practices, symbols, and meanings associated with the relationship. This is highly contextual, in both historical and geographical terms. Thus, I would advocate avoiding politicization of the dynamic as we interpret historical and geographical contingencies and experiences, from the oppressive Japanese occupation of China to the ominous rise of Nazi Germany to the socially suffocating military-intelligence-industrial complexes that formed in the USSR and its satellite states in Eastern Europe. A reexamination with greater precision of the contemporary military-civilian relationship can shed light on how security institutions have changed over time with regard to civilian control and how such control is symbolized as it reflects the identity and activities of such institutions. Thus, it is valuable to avoid being bogged down in debates that artificially separate civilian and military social spheres. We should favor discussions that address how these spheres, in the spirit of scholars such as Pierre Bourdieu (1977), inform, shape, and mediate one another in ways that are symbolized by and become manifest in contemporary military-civilian relations.

Future Considerations for Military – Societal Relations

Finally, as traditionally opposing voices about the US security apparatus increasingly converge to agree that the future of human security is vulnerable to problems requiring military and civilian cooperation, the demand to understand better military-societal relations concomitantly grows. This suggests that now is the time to engage heavily in military-civilian discussions. One way to do this is to focus the social science research program (writ large) on specific aspects of civilian-military interactions and further develop research methods for such analysis. For example, in the arena of humanitarian aid, research might entail an inductive approach based on feedback and evaluation from indigenous populations affected by the military’s entrance into this type of work. This might include local rapid-assessment studies by independent social scientists from various countries inquiring into attitudes of local populations served by the US military within the context of a humanitarian aid operation. This form of research (which has been attempted in some locations) would serve several purposes, including finding out what local populations want and what they feel most comfortable with intervention-wise, as well as reducing the contest between those favoring military work in this area and those criticizing it as subversive to the ideals of humanitarian aid.

Put simply, we need more empirical research in this arena that accounts for the perspectives and felt needs of those in the “receiving” communities, instead of only debate by those of “sending” communities. In this way, the US military may avoid the peculiar conundrum of being simultaneously labeled humanitarian and imperialist.

Adalric "Rick" Hilliard Tuten is a 2011 graduate of the University of Denver's Josef Korbel School of International Studies. His research interests include non-traditional security, military-civilian relations, and (from a regional perspective) issues involving Central and East Asia. He can be reached at adalric.tuten@comcast.net.
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I. The Problem
Is the concept of “the sustainable community” a product of popular intellectualism, a sort of liberal, quasi-spiritual goal, or something that has real potential to alter human existence? If it is to be achieved, will it be by theoreticians or pragmatic doers, or will this new future be created by these two different types working together and those rare folks who have done both? Is it merely a luxurious thought of the educated wealthy and not relevant to those too poor to worry about anything but survival?

Is this concept simply just the most recent hip lingo of social Darwinists? We destroyed the only sustainable cultures in the world because of social Darwinism and we continued to erode their self-sufficiency with misguided programs right up to the present. Now sadly we hope as a luxury of our own western curiosity that those same cultures don’t die out completely because of another hip term, “diversity.” Perhaps it is reassuring to have these quaint curiosities survive. But, as this commentary stresses, few academics in my experience really believe in cultural diversity. At most universities and colleges it is largely politically correct “speak” for gays and racial minorities who are at the least all western thinkers and at the most dominant society sub-cultures. As I’ll demonstrate, few academics really appreciate what it means to get down and dirty, and to demonstrably help those in everyday communities.

My comments are framed by my 40 years of work with Native American communities. My colleagues and I have been able to achieve demonstrable change in the face of adversity. We’ve also had many frustrations. My comments also are framed as the experiences of a professional who is intimately engaged in the “applied” realm but has been all but banned from campus life. Credentialing will be discussed critically.

We are not producing enough people who value the application of academic theory in the real world of poverty and human suffering. We are not producing enough people who are actually working or willing to work in inconvenient or tough environments. This trend is fed by academically successful students who want to live and work in nice, comfortable communities with all the right amenities, communities where universities are usually located. When asked, most students say “I just want to teach,” to become professors like their mentors. Mucking about in the trenches of human or societal engineering is for lesser types than the “Academic Elite.” University life and all that goes with it is a deeply entrenched culture in its own right, with a powerful inertia that has actually changed far less than other aspects of American life.

Imagine actually applying sociology or using applied anthropology! That leads to an important question which further frames a central issue in this commentary. Is Community Development merely reflective of a job description that can be performed by anyone, or does it reflect the real application and testing of academic theory combined with real world skills, used while working alongside fellow citizens?
Here is what the Community Development Society states are its accepted professional goals:

We believe that adherence to the Community Development Society’s Principles of Good Practice are essential to sound community development.

- Promote active and representative participation toward enabling all community members to meaningfully influence the decisions that affect their lives.
- Engage community members in learning about and understanding community issues, and the economic, social, environmental, political, psychological, and other impacts associated with alternative courses of action.
- Incorporate the diverse interests and cultures of the community in the community development process; and disengage from support of any effort that is likely to adversely affect the disadvantaged members of a community.
- Work actively to enhance the leadership capacity of community members, leaders, and groups within the community.
- Be open to using the full range of action strategies to work toward the long-term sustainability and well being of the community (updated 2011).

In my professional career as a community development facilitator I have worked with common people to create a variety of schools, from colleges to those covering the traditional Lakota arts. Together, we have encouraged and implemented local control of education, helped to start ambulance services and fire departments as well as built swimming pools, small businesses, cooperatives, and community development associations like the Pine Ridge Area Chamber of Commerce.

Because of our accomplishments and my desire to extend further, I recently applied for a rural community development position with the USDA. I did not get a job interview because I did not have a degree in biology. Is a biologist equivalent to a community developer? This sad reality raises some serious questions. What are “the most important credentials” to effect real change? Is rural America worth saving? Is a sustainable, increasingly urbanized America to be devoid of vigorous rural communities if competent change agents can’t be employed there? Viewed through a different lens, do human populations need to be better spread out across the land? Is the future of rural America only related to agriculture or in fact, is the old idea of rural America as a place based in agriculture and ranching, largely a sunset dream being quickly replaced by large agribusinesses whose purpose is to eliminate jobs, dominate large land holdings and -- in effect -- kill off rural communities? Which kind of professional, working in concert with common people, is needed to create the proper, sustainable landscape?

If we are to achieve a higher level of community sustainability, which will create the momentum, provide the leadership, alter beliefs, yet sustain needed cultural values? What will those people have to look like? What will be their skill set? Who will take theory and make it practical? Will it be self-absorbed, insulated, isolated, self-important, comfortable, tenured academics?

II. University Problems

I believe that this type of effective human product is not possible from today’s universities. If it is, I have not witnessed it in my life time; 99% of educated non-Lakota who have come to the reservations to “help” have left defeated because they do not have the skills or theoretically-based insights to be effective. Most left in an angry state of significant culture shock.

Real change agents are risk takers who must intimately know the place they are working in. Risk-taking is a personality trait they seemingly are born with, and a university education is not even a factor. If anything a university education may pre-defeat risk takers. Sadly it is only academics who believe that it is they who count. Academics by nature tend not to be risk takers or even know how to lead, nor do they often have the personalities, skills or inclinations of leadership except within the ivy-grown, interdepartmental politics. I say this as someone who has lived in both worlds. Academics believe in the relevance of their lives out of self-serving, blind faith with little or no proof except through clones who also teach, but have never practiced.

If the idea of sustainable human communities has the power to change human cultures, who will make that happen? Will people with the technical know-how to build and invent the new technologies be valued? Most academics have no track record in anything but playing the academic game. Those same “game player” personalities are the opposite of what is needed to change the world. The flaming hoops of the “degree and writing-for-promotion game board” were all ignited and put in place by folks, mostly dead now, who were produced by and thus trapped in, their own self-fulfilling, self-promoting ideologies.

Academics place little value on risk-taking personalities. Trendsetters and real leaders take risks. Academics strive for a personal world of security and institutional approval where paychecks and advancement are byproducts of being a good team player, not a boat rocker. As a re-
sult, those who question the very nature and relevance of the modern academic model become outcasts.

Will people caught in the real world of day-to-day survival be willing to listen to or follow people who have no useable skills and have never done anything but go to school? Will these unskilled “do-gooders” be met with anger and skepticism and frustration? Yes, and I believe that is where we are today.

Can people from so-called western cultures, such as white America, with their belief in the importance of the individual, their myth of rugged individuality and their dream of material success (i.e. “gross consumption”) be convinced to change their views so that they may serve as examples and actually feel the “pain” to better understand the forces that create and sustain poverty? Or will these people of the west make a token effort that in the end is just empty, political correctness?

How will the ideas and real practices of sustainability be introduced and developed? How will they be used to create major cultural and ideological changes when the distance between academics, political elites and average Americans has never been greater?

How will the average, working American be affected by an academic culture that sees getting their hands dirty and doing real, physical labor as beneath them? How will they be convinced to listen to those who they cannot relate to? Will they be able to relate to those who have traditionally made no attempt to relate to them? Is it possible to bridge this cultural divide in order to effectively achieve common goals?

III. Academic Drift

It is the view and real experience of this writer that American Academia is drifting in a direction that makes its potential for effectiveness more and more remote. A couple of extremely disturbing trends need to be considered. First, in this day and age, a doctorate seemingly is always required in order to become a university teacher. Of course, the ability to teach and a doctoral degree actually have little to do with one another. The skill of teaching is based in a combination of enlightened perspective (read: education), talent, human insight, personality, and of course very real experience. A doctoral degree on the other hand, is based on the accumulation and reproduction of information received from books and research; the talent to teach is secondary. Certainly there are professors who are good teachers but it is becoming increasingly accidental. University relevance and effectiveness were sacrificed in the structuring of the modern American academic success model. The trend to hire solely based on credentials is all but sacrosanct. Are there exceptions? Yes, but we are generally stunned when we meet one!

The pressure to get a doctorate is placed in the minds of college students studying liberal arts or social sciences as freshmen. Universities under pressure to justify departmental stability or growth are under increasing pressure to create more graduate students. A mediocre GRE score and the ability to read and regurgitate seemingly are now the only criteria for acceptance into graduate school. Life and work experience are still talked about, but in reality are hardly considered.

Since a bachelor’s degree is now the academic equivalent of a 1950s high school diploma and a master’s degree is, at best, the equivalent of yesterday’s bachelor’s degree, a master’s is now seemingly an irrelevant degree in the academic world. It is merely a papered intermediate step towards a doctorate. The doctoral or post-doctoral recipient, by his or her self-declared and sanctioned status, is beyond actually working with non-academics or getting involved with real life situations. So what to do? Maybe, just maybe, a bachelor’s or master’s degree in Sustainable Communities will be re-enlivened and result in the actual mastery of a useable skill set which includes basic building construction and applied economics.

Since universities and colleges are in the “student business,” producing degrees is their end product. This end product fuels budgets and justifies faculty positions. The pressure to maintain a healthy population of undergraduate and graduate students is very real to university CFO’s. So in a sense, any warm body with a moderate IQ will do. The actual ability to teach or inspire and contribute new information or ideas is secondary. We now have hundreds of thousands of people who have achieved doctorates by merely recycling other people’s research in a slightly altered format. The result of this recycling process is called a dissertation. While research may be a valid skill, the ability to apply those skills is often overlooked.

With the pressure to go automatically and unquestioningly from bachelor’s, to master’s, to doctorate, the acquisition of real world experience in a chosen academic field or in life in general, is too often side-stepped. This lack of experience outside of academia produces folks who have “great credentials” but little else to offer by way of personal insights based on experience. Furthermore, the pressure to make the financial value of a doctorate “real” has inspired the creation of a university world where a doctorate has been established as the only valid criteria for membership. As a result, real world skills and experience have become largely irrelevant.

These pressures and trends reduce college to a place where too often, immature personalities with little or no real world experience, professional or personal, are creating the very divide mentioned above. I have taught or
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A Potential New Role...

If that is my experience, what about the people who have worked for years making real contributions, learning real-world skills but who haven't written books or published papers? All that they know will be lost when they retire and die. These highly knowledgeable, grassroots experts in their fields, are rarely invited to share or participate in the enlightened guard of current academia. It is as if degrees and intelligence are somehow inextricably intertwined. This is tragic nonsense and all of us here know that, as uncomfortable as truly registering that truth may make us.

How are people going to remake the world in a sustainable model when they can't do anything but read and regurgitate? Problem solving and building real and working strategies are not theory. From which sources are today’s college faculty pulling from for their body of knowledge? They are mostly quoting dead academics. If you don’t think that the mistakes in thinking of one generation of academics are not blindly quoted as fact by the next, you are wrong. These blind quotations are only attempts to speak the Lingua Franca of their sub-specialty, and impress colleagues in their field.

As the elite world of the doctorate is further subdivided into smaller and more finite post-esoteric sub-groups, the possibility of their effectiveness in the world beyond academia is made even more remote. People with doctorates hang with their own isolated fraternity, as do lawyers and medical doctors. While these cliques reinforce their own self-importance, are they at all useful?

Where and when do you see the academic world interact with civilians? Outside of the student/professor relationship within the ivy-covered walls, their lives and academic achievements are largely a self-serving non-sequitur. No one bothers to tell those in the academic world this, because they would not, could not, believe it anyway.

It has been said the Obama brings a new respect for intellectuals. True creative, inventive and contributing intellectuals are rare and always have been. So-called “educated people” are increasingly common. The prestige associated with getting good grades, reading skills, test-taking skills and writing to impress peers are confused with actual giftedness by all the hoop-jumping involved within the “board game” called modern academia. Are the Beta minds creating an evil empire for the Kappa, where the Alpha minds don’t fit?

Being secure in your job, wearing good clothes, never getting your fingernails dirty, believing all the politically correct ideas, and only living and working with people very much like yourself is not the starting place to change the world. These are all luxuries that in fact only isolate and insulate. I pose this question, “Is it possible to be a victim of your own bullshit?” Modern American social science academia, in fact the university system as a whole, is a world most often built on perfected following, not leading. We are
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I was young and certainly didn’t know if any of this was useful. I spent the next forty years testing it. Was this curriculum useful? Extremely. Does the major still exist at my college? No! Imagine actually studying group leadership or group dynamics as preparation for working on sustainable communities? What a concept! Have I learned things worth sharing with a younger generation of students with a social conscience who want to help move real communities? I know I have.

Before we know the role of universities and education in building sustainable communities, we need to know what kind of person would be most effective. What would an individual who has the potential to effectively encourage and achieve change look like? First of all, they would have to be well versed in both theory and practice. They would need to be real and subtle leaders, not the type who "lead," based only on job title or credentials. They would have to be self-starters, have a high level of energy, patient persistence, true endurance, and real skills in terms of working with people. They would have to be willing to be forgotten and receive little or no "credit" when the community succeeds. Such facilitators must be willing to face long periods of getting to know the target community, learning its structure, cultural mores, and true leaders. They would have to be tolerant and supportive of very slow movement, learn and invisibly lead, and be able to understand group dynamics and problem solving. They would have to know the process of helping a community identify, prioritize and solve its problems in a strategic and systemic way based on existing resources. Truly effective encouragers must be able to look at and understand details along with the big picture, simultaneously. They have to know how to move through and overcome failures. They might have to live where they are needed as opposed to where they want to be. They would have to have a broad general knowledge of many things from basic construction to applied economic theory and applied business principles. They would have to be with the people, not better than the people they work with. They would have to be willing to earn people’s trust over a long period of time. Lastly, they must be comfort-

able with the fact that their job might not pay very well.

Paulo Freire, a great 20th century social change theorist who wrote Pedagogy of the Oppressed (2007; orig. 1970), said that true charity means elevating the receiver to the level of the giver and I think this applies to community de-

velopment regardless of the community. He wrote about banking useful skills and knowledge in people. Being a humble and effective teacher is certainly part of this task. The ability to encourage and strengthen the resolve of people who have known little success in life may also be part of the job. He or she must be a dreamer and a pragmatist to be able to see the finish line before the race has started.

IV. Prospects for Innovation and Change

What would a university look like if it were to impact the lives of real people, including its students? It would be populated by as many doers as theorists. I answer this as someone with an undergraduate degree in community development, who has spent a lifetime in this field. What did my training look like? Was it useful? Was my life and career an opportunity to test social science theory in the real world? I recently sent for my long-forgotten, undergraduate transcript. This is what I found:

group Education, Community Service Experience, Economics, Contemporary Social Issues, Human Development, Intro to Inter-group Relations, Principles of Problem Solving, Social Psychology, Principles of Problem Solving 2, American Government, 10 Credits in Field Experience, Anthropology of Culture and Personality, History of Economic Thought, Crimi-

ology, Case Work, Case Work and Community Develop-

ment, Politics of Development, Minority Cultures in the U.S. I even researched and wrote a course called “Continuing Problems of the American Indian and Development.” This was between 1968 and 1972 at Springfield College in Massachusetts.

V. Dramatic Curricular Change

So how do we get there? Who will be the practitioners out in the field? I believe they will be bachelor degree folks, and even folks who either don’t have a bachelor’s degree or don’t care about earning one. We must include
students who do not share our culturally-based, pretentious affection for degrees and only want to have the skills to address desperate community needs. Will this movement address only the U.S. or will it be relevant to poor countries abroad. Can we have a greener world if we only focus on those that are culturally and economically like us and share our needs and wants?

Recruiting students who have real potential will require a new approach to admissions. We need to give these folks a relevant, useful and applicable undergraduate degree program, emphasizing human interaction and group work skills. The ability to take theory, apply it, and test it is the logical beginning point. But if we equip young undergraduates with real job skills and discourage them from immediately pursuing advanced degrees until they have had real experience, we must recognize that this approach flies against the prevailing winds of academia.

Exposure to people who have extensive real world experience in the field of community change is absolutely necessary, since students can smell a phony a mile away. They need to be exposed to folks who have “really done it” to clarify personal beliefs, critical attitudes, skills, grassroots insights, and engage a useful and available support system of tried and tested professionals from a wide range of human enterprises. These folks will not often have been part of the typical academic community, since they are doers not “talkers” or “observers” – and of course the doers have never been invited to be part of the “club”. The students will absolutely need all of this.

The people who teach economic, sociological, psychological, political science and anthropological theory are absolutely critical in my experience. However they must teach their discipline with a different mindset. They must carefully retool and tailor their offerings, knowing that the undergraduate needs to be able to apply what they have learned in real time, in real life. If the student plans to work only in mainstream America, the preparation may be somewhat different. This is not as easy as it sounds nor is it the usual goal of these courses, where “knowledge for knowledge sake” is the traditionally-stated goal.

These students will need exposure to folks who have proven expertise in many fields from sanitation to architecture, to a multitude of engineering areas in emerging green technologies. They will need to be taught to genuinely appreciate the value of these people. The successful practitioner of applied social science will need to have access to resource banks of experts who may not be members of the academic community, but can be called upon when needed. The university or institution that takes this on must do so in a new and open-minded light. A commitment beyond the general self-serving and self-absorbed, traditional academic is a key component to success. In order to accomplish this, a collaborative approach to teaching involving teams comprised of theorists and practitioners needs to be developed. Since effective people are not generally the result of undergraduate social science programs, open minds and new approaches are critical.

Another reason to be taught by seasoned experts is their ability to recognize and take advantage of conditions provided by accidental circumstance; the community’s self-identified needs and planned programs. Because there is little useful literature on this, anecdotal information based on real situations with real communities and real success and failures is part of the answer.

A simple bachelor’s degree is not the only way to accomplish this. Third world countries and poor minorities in this country might benefit more from non-degree based, practical seminars and summer-long training sessions that (while perhaps credit-based) may not lead directly to a specific degree as much as to the imparting of real skills.

Degrees are expensive and time-intensive. With a sincere commitment to the cause of reducing poverty and human suffering along with a desire for a greener and more sustainable world, other delivery models must be developed if this movement is to take place in anything resembling a realistic timeline. However, there will be great resistance from those deeply invested in the academic status quo.

VI. The Future

President Obama has called for a sweeping change in American foreign policy. U.S. military belligerence is to be replaced with community development. Can radical anger and poverty be replaced by hope and movement? How will this be accomplished in a useful, timely and effective manner using the staid practices of traditional American higher education?

New methods of training and education that break the traditional molds will have to be invented soon. Faculty teams may have to travel to areas of need and work with their citizens. They must work with indigenous educators with a common purpose of developing internal capacity to produce their own agents of change within the community.

These folks cannot be traditional academics! I have heard all the “nation building” criteria of the Kennedy School of Government. What high-minded, pseudo-intellectual nonsense! Will poor countries have to wait until “all their institutional ducks are in a perfect row” or is progress to be measured by raising sustainable living standards one village at a time? Or as with poor Native American communities, will we tell them repeatedly to “just hurry up and wait for all them ducks to line up”, while secretly blaming them for their non-western cultural legacy?
What will be the role of American universities in encouraging international community development and working in Native American communities? Will we train folks from third and fourth world, colonized, politically unstable, disease and poverty impacted nations? How will we train them? Will it take eight years before the first finished products pop out of the university ovens? As a practitioner I can’t even envision that! It will be self-defeating. Academic people who are sincere will have to open their hearts and their minds in order to reinvent themselves, their departments and their universities.

Is the movement toward sustainable human communities realistic or achievable? The election of Barack Obama indicates that cultures can change and in a relatively short time. When I was in college the idea of a black president was pretty far out there. Forty years later, it has become a reality. It took a shift in thinking, a new political culture and a new generation to accomplish this, but it has happened. Nothing in human existence is impossible.

We must remember that movement toward community sustainability is not the property of universities. It must reach all levels of human life including manufacturing, agriculture, construction, retail, K-12 schools, individuals, and families. While universities may create some leadership and theory, as well as technical research, true sustainability will be defined by a cross-society movement. This movement must be based in an ethos of true inclusion, not elitism.

Mark St. Pierre has worked in community development primarily in Indian Country for 40 years. He has a B.S. in Applied Sociology or “Community Leadership and Development” and a M.A. in Community Education Administration. Mark has had three books and numerous articles published, has created documentary films, and is currently the CEO of the Wounded Knee Community Development Corporation in Wounded Knee. He can be reached at: mstp@gwtc.net.
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My father was an avid fisherman. As soon as my brother and I were old enough to float on an inner tube, he piled the whole family in the station wagon and headed up to the High Sierras. It was an annual adventure and involved as much exploration as it did fishing. On one of those early trips, Dad pulled off the road somewhere on the June Lake Loop, northwest of Mammoth Lakes, California, for a “call of nature,” and I went off exploring on my own. I came upon a pile of odd-looking black rocks. Scattered around a large piece of this rock were many small pieces, as if something had shattered the rock. I picked up a piece at random. It was black as midnight, oval shaped, with a smooth depression that fit my thumb perfectly, and incredibly sharp, scalloped edges. I ran back to the car and showed it to my dad. “That’s obsidian,” he told me, and looking more closely, said, “It looks like an Indian hide–skinning tool.”

On the drive to our camp, I sat in the back seat and fingered the piece of obsidian wondering who’d made the tool, how they’d used it, and what their life had been like. I didn’t know it at the time, but I was forming ethnology questions of archeology and ethnography. I still have that piece of obsidian, and, after all these many years, I still have that piece of this rock were many small pieces, as if something had shattered the rock. I picked up a piece at random. It was black as midnight, oval shaped, with a smooth depression that fit my thumb perfectly, and incredibly sharp, scalloped edges. I ran back to the car and showed it to my dad. “That’s obsidian,” he told me, and looking more closely, said, “It looks like an Indian hide–skinning tool.”

As Jacilee Wray writes in her forward to the issue, the NPS established an applied ethnography program two decades ago. Muriel “Miki” Crespi was hired to develop and lead the program (p.40). Unfortunately, as Erin McPherson and Kat Byerly point out in their essay, “The Challenge of Ethnography,” after Crespi passed away in 2003, her position was left vacant and NPS ethnography program funding was decreased, staffing declined, and the program’s effectiveness and visibility deteriorated; thus Jerry Roger’s call to action.

It’s apparent from the essays in this issue that Crespi, with the support of people like Rogers, Rowland T. Bowers, and Douglas Scovill, did ground-breaking work in creating a substantive ethnography program that addressed the complex of laws and policy that lay persons like myself — people who visit and enjoy our national parks — know little or nothing about. These laws, which have acronyms like NAGPRA, NEPA, NHPA, AIRFA, and ANILCA, deal with a maze of issues and ideas like cultural patrimony, cultural affiliation, historic preservation, and religious freedom. Respectively, these laws are the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, and the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act. As the essays in this slender volume point out, they define several things. One is the way our setting aside of and use of the special places that make up our national park system affect our access to, enjoyment of, and stewardship of the parks. A second is their preservation of cultural and natural resources. And a third is relating to the indigenous or traditionally associated peoples whose lives have for so long been inextricably bound to them such cultural and natural resources now managed by the National Park Service.

It is heartrending and instructive to read of the testimony of a Native Alaskan, described by David J. Krupa in...
his essay (p.101), who spoke to her concerns during the hear-
rings on the establishment of the Alaska National Interest
Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA):

All these years people live there and it is still the same. 
They never ran out of moose. And when you get that 
moose you get a moose skin. And you make your moccas-
sins so you make it through the winter and you wouldn’t 
freeze...We pick berries every summer, and all kinds of 
places back there to pick berries (Flora Bergman, Al-
lakaket, Alaska,1979)

An essay by Wray, Alexa Roberts, Allison Peno, and Shirley Fiske, serves as a retrospective on the impressive 
body of work done by Muriel Crespi to create an ethnogra-
phy program within the National Park Service that recog-
nized the broader cultural significance of national park lands 
to Native American and other traditionally associated peo-
ple. Again, the writers lament the fact that since 2003, when 
Crespi lost her third battle with cancer, “the position of chief 
ethnographer has remained unfilled” (p.48). David Ruppert’s 
essay points to the same lacuna and stresses the need to 
rethink ethnography in the National Park Service.

Essays by Michael J. Evans, by Jenny Masur, and by Bar-
bara A. Cellarius give the reader insight into ethnography 
applied in specific areas of interest for the NPS, some of 
which, for example, dealing with Native Americans’ connec-
tion to Pipestone National Monument, Minnesota, via the so-
called “peace pipe” made famous in Western movies, will 
open the park visitor’s eyes to the legitimate concerns of tra-
ditionally associated peoples.

Walter R. Echo-Hawk, Jr., in his essay, “Under Native 
American Skies” (pp. 58-79), calls for a new American “land 
ethic,” in the vein of Aldo Leopold, the influential American 
ecologist, who decades ago urged us to think of ourselves as 
members of the “biotic community.” Echo-Hawk laments the 
conqueror and colonizer mentality of European settlers, who 
indiscriminately despoiled the land and displaced or de-
stroyed the native peoples who lived upon it. For him, this 
mentality still exists, for example, in the agriculturalists who 
feel they must combat nature with toxic pesticides to pursue 
their ends, or in the industrialists, who remove whole mountain 
tops because it is more economical to get at the coal under-
neath.

I will be forever grateful to my father for sharing with me his love of the outdoors and his spirit of adventure. My 
boyhood experiences exploring places along the Tioga Pass 
in the High Sierras, the Devils Post Pile, the Giant Sequoias, 
and many others, including the incomparable Yosemite — all 
in California — instilled in me a reverence for nature that is 
hard to put into words, but that I found reflected in the essay 
by Echo-Hawk, who writes of “…a wondrous land where 
everything has a spirit, including the earth, water, every liv-
ing thing, and even the mystical powers of the uni-
verse” (p.67).
An overview of the remaining articles reveals a common theme: ethnography plays an important role in reaching out to and consulting with peoples traditionally associated with ethnographic resources in the parks. Beyond that, however, there is a need to clarify what actions follow, or should follow from consultations with stakeholders. Differing positions are presented, ranging from basic consultations as required by law to the less common practice of fully engaging stakeholders in decision-making actions.

Ultimately, the National Park Service is a bureaucratic organization held responsible for managing the resources of the parks. The NPS not only has the authority but a legal responsibility for carrying out its mission; yet within that mandate, the Service is required by laws and executive orders to consult with and collaborate with traditionally associated peoples, leaving open to question, exactly what is required for full compliance and how might clarification help in creating or redefining a new vision.

An essay by Kirsten Leong et al., “Moving Public Participation beyond Compliance,” dissects the issues of public involvement and notes that relationships between agencies and stakeholders are critical to effective resource management. Through interviews with numerous resource managers, the authors suggest there is a problem of power distribution between the extremes of top-down management with no stakeholder and full public engagement where stakeholders have the ability to influence (though not control) decision making.

In their essay, Leong et al. provide qualitative evidence of the obvious: working cooperatively with stakeholders provides more satisfying results for all parties involved. The authors emphasize the need for what they call “relationship building” as an important component of the ethnography program. The desired outcomes of relationship building could be articulated and hence useful for refining a new vision for the ethnography program.

Following the curiously placed “Foreword,” Jaci Lee Wray et al., provide a summary of Miki Crespi’s vision for the ethnography program and her work to realize that end. The essay, “Creating Policy for the National Park Service,” clearly outlines Crespi’s intentions in program development, raising the curious question as to why a loss of vision ever occurred. The authors point out the importance of institutionalizing the ethnography program to prevent gaps in its implementation, but for whatever reasons, Crespi’s position was not filled following her death, thus disrupting the continuity of the program she established.

David Ruppert sounds the same alarm regarding the lack of a chief ethnographer to maintain the momentum. Further, he believes that advances of ethnography in working with traditional peoples have diminished and need to be revitalized. Ruppert’s emphasis is on consultation and information gathering to allow the National Park Service to satisfy legal requirements. He understates the role ethnography could play by involving traditionally associated peoples beyond consultation.

Michael Evans, in a case study from Pipestone National Monument describes the role of ethnography similarly, but seeks to negotiate the needs of stakeholders with park management policies. The work at Pipestone clearly attended to the needs of stakeholders and the importance of the resources to them, and demonstrates the additional role ethnography can play by using data to help shape policies.

Barbara Cellarius discusses the Ethnographic Overview and Assessment (EOA), as a basic research document but one that can also be used to initiate engagement with traditionally associated peoples. This is illustrated in an example from Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve in South Central Alaska, where the EOA was used to collect and analyze documented information about people associated with parks, but it included some interviews and discussions with the traditionally associated peoples. Input from the people resulted in an expansion of who ought to be included in the EOA and their participation motivated them to contribute additional information through research of their own initiative. Thus, the EOA served not only as a starting point for ethnographic work, but it began the process of engaging people in the project to the extent that the community itself became involved in assembling a body of data important to the EOA.

David Krupa, dealing with national parks in Alaska, emphasizes the value of traditional ecological knowledge, as he says, to “inform our collective knowledge” in ways that make managers aware of stakeholders’ needs. He acknowledges the complaint of local peoples when their views are solicited but then are often overlooked in the aftermath. He identifies the need for “substantial input into the management of the resources that support their lifestyles...” with an emphasis on a “meaningful role in subsistence programs from concept to completion.” As with the essay by Leong, et al., the outcome of “involvement” or “relationship building” is left without defining the end result.

Erin McPherson and Kat Byerly conclude the volume with an essay, “The Challenge of Ethnography,” noting the standard body of legislative mandates requiring ethnographic work, usually consultation, with traditionally associated peoples. Further, they take note of the Director’s Order no. 28, Cultural Resource Management, issued in 1985 and which called for a distinction between archaeology and applied cultural anthropology. They concur that the ethnography program has been losing ground, partially for lack of current leadership, but also because attempts to consult traditionally associated peoples are met with “no response,” raising the question of exactly what actions are...
required to satisfy requirements for consultation. This could technically be met by submitting a letter through the postal service, as had been done frequently before Crespi's time at the helm. However, Crespi pushed for far more involvement with traditionally associated peoples.

In searching for a new vision, ethnographers might consider visiting Clinton’s Executive Order 13084, calling for “regular and meaningful consultation and collaboration [emphasis mine] with Indian tribal governments in the development of regulatory practices on Federal matters that significantly or uniquely affect their communities...” While not all traditionally associated peoples are American Indians, the intent of Clinton’s Executive Order has been largely overlooked for its potential in working with stakeholders. Both Krupa and Cellarius demonstrated the value of involving traditionally associated peoples beyond consultation. It remains to be seen, to what extent ethnographers will be amenable to engaging traditionally associated people in decision making processes rather than merely to gather data and opinions from them prior to insular decision-making by NPS personnel.

Jenny Masur’s essay addresses some of these important points. She raises the notion of “civic engagement,” which she differentiates from “public involvement” by drawing on language in NPS 2006 Management Policies calling for “reasonable and effective means to involve the public in decisions at the park and program level.” Masur, along with Leong et al, highlight that point: that is, the park bureaucracy clearly holds the authority and the power to remain the sole decision maker, but within that power, NPS workers can engage traditionally associated peoples in decision making activities beyond collecting data from them or by simply consulting with them.

Further, Masur rightly stresses the need for professionally trained, professional ethnographers to do this work. Several authors follow up on Rogers’ claim that the ethnography program has experienced setbacks, yet they have not addressed the problem of non-ethnographers, particularly archaeologists infiltrating the ethnography program, even though, as McPherson and Byerly point out, a clear distinction between archaeology and applied cultural anthropology is necessary. Archaeologists’ training and orientation differs from that of ethnographers who are trained and prepared to engage in the kind of civic participation Masur urges.

In this volume, several authors emphasized the need for a new vision and/or new leadership in the ethnography program. Walter Echo-Hawk addresses the big picture in terms of a need for a land ethic, and refers to the work of Aldo Leopold, who recognized the need for a world view valuing the relationships among all animals (people included), the plants, and their connection to the earth. Echo-Hawk acknowledges Leopold’s view as consistent with the beliefs of American Indians and other indigenous peoples.

In contrast, he sees the direction of resource management as the result of a cosmology of domination, of religious dogmas apart from the earth, of colonialism and its drive to control resources, and of resource managers steeped in the bureaucracy and the political atmosphere surrounding it. These are powerful forces that operate in opposition to the land ethic called for by Echo-Hawk but that need to be reckoned with for constructive management.

Echo-Hawk responds to the need for a new vision of ethnography along with other managerial programs in our federal agencies. His point is that indigenous peoples have long held views needed for good resource management, and that many NPS operations are steeped in views antithetical to them. Ethnography has reached out, in varying degrees to indigenous peoples, but Echo-Hawk believes an ethnography program can additionally bring back to managers the mind-set found in indigenous communities. His arguments support the need for involving the knowledgeable, traditionally associated people in the decision-making processes going far beyond consultation. While his ideas may appear radical to an entrenched bureaucracy, it is within the power of ethnography to reach out to stakeholders and reorient resource management practices as a result of their direct input. By involving those who have lived sound ecological practices in decision-making, the ethnography program is certain to produce sound resource management practices.

George S. Esber holds a Ph.D. in anthropology from the University of Arizona. He was the first Southwest regional ethnographer in the National Park Service. He recently retired from the faculty of the Department of Anthropology at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio. He may be reached at 3489 Riggs Road, Oxford, Ohio (OH) 45056-9245 USA, at 513-404-0437, and at gsesber@gmail.com.

**REVIEW**

**DARBY C. STAPP**

The collection of papers on the National Park Service (NPS) Ethnography Program is an important addition to the literature on heritage protection. The papers focus on traditional places and resources and the efforts of a dedicated staff to make them available to groups with historical and cultural ties. Collectively, the papers describe the development, goals, execution, and evaluation of an important NPS heritage program. Described are individuals, policies, struggles, peoples, and accomplishments over a quarter century. Administrative histories and reflexive contributions such as these are important because they provide documen-
The NPS Ethnography Program is important to document because of its use of cultural anthropologists as professional ethnographers. Since the 1960s, hundreds of historians, archaeologists, architectural historians, landscape architects and museum specialists were hired to help the Federal government protect the country’s heritage; cultural anthropologists, for the most part, did not share in the bounty. Even when new laws or guidance began being implemented, elevating the importance of traditional use areas and the need to consult with Native American tribes and other affected groups, cultural anthropologists only occasionally became involved. Many of these duties, which included meeting with tribal representatives and learning about important places and resources were simply added to the responsibilities of existing staff. Ethnographic research and consultation were typically conducted by archaeologists, communication staff, or someone else—if they were conducted at all.

The NPS Ethnography Program description provided in the George Wright Forum allows us to see what cultural anthropologists can do when they have the resources and authority. As the program evolved, the NPS staffed headquarters and the regional centers with professional ethnographers, as did a few high profile parks. The program was designed to meet four main objectives: help the agency comply with new requirements associated with Native American involvement, begin identifying traditional groups that used specific areas now designated as national parks, learn about the traditional places and resources that people used in order to better understand the human and environmental history of the park, and work with contemporary groups to facilitate use of the land and its resources and help perpetuate traditional ways of life.

The program never fully reached its potential due to inadequate funding and ambivalence by bureaucrats and park managers. The post-2000 period was especially difficult, when the founding program manager passed away, leaving a key vacancy that has yet to be filled. Nevertheless, as these papers demonstrate, substantial work was accomplished. Throughout the articles we learn how ethnography can be applied to real world settings and where positive contributions can be made. We also learn about the things that did not go so well. The authors indicate that the program is at a crossroads; without more funding and management support, the program will flounder.

I found the papers to be highly informative. Being in the heritage protection field, I had heard about the NPS Ethnography Program for years, knew some of the people, saw some of their presentations at professional conferences, and read some of their work. But I never fully understood the Ethnography Program or its scale. That gap has been filled after reading this set of papers.

The articles were particularly interesting to me because they provided a good comparison to the alleged protected area where I work. The Hanford Nuclear Reservation is not a national park, but it is a government facility 560 square miles in size. Although considered to be among the most polluted places on earth, it has also come to be regarded as an environmental and cultural treasure: the last 52 miles of Columbia River undammed, large tracts of natural habitat, and sacred to Mid-Columbia Tribes. Part of Hanford was declared the Hanford Reach National Monument in 2000 by President Bill Clinton. Located in the heart of Indian country, there is active involvement of three federally recognized tribes (Yakama Nation, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian reservation, the Nez Perce Tribe), and one unrecognized group (the Wanapum). The papers made me wonder how we might have made better use of ethnographers following the NPS model, as opposed to the minimal ethnographic efforts that we managed to get funded and accomplish with existing staff.

Most agencies, in fact, do not have an ethnography program, and as we learn from the papers, the majority of national parks do not either. Whereas the National Park Service issued a policy directive specifying that traditionally affected people need to be consulted as part of park management, most other agencies develop cultural resource programs to comply with requirements found in laws such as the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA), the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). These laws require consultation with Native American groups, interested parties, and the public. Understanding the ethnohistory of the area is an important part of the job, as is working with indigenous peoples to learn about the resources. But the driver behind most of this work is point specific: approval of construction projects (NHPA, Section 106), repatriation of human remains (NAGPRA), or archaeological site looting investigations (ARPA). With short-term goals such as these, good ethnography gets under-valued by those involved.

This has led to a situation where we have lost the forest for the trees. Agencies are spending tens of thousands of dollars to dig holes to get an archaeological clearance under Section 106, but will not spend comparable sums to conduct historical or ethnographic research, or to interview people who might know about the place. Agencies will spend tens of thousands of dollars to recover and report on artifacts, but won’t explain the information to descendants or consult with them to help mitigate the effects of the project on their way of life. We as a profession need to take a mo-
ment, step back, remember what it is we are trying to do, and get rebalanced.

Jacilee Wray is quite clear about the direction she thinks we need to go: “As professional anthropologists and ethnographers, we must preserve for today’s people and for future generations the lifeways of traditionally associated peoples” (p. 42). I agree with this statement. Traditional lifeways are dynamic. Persistence and replacement are two cultural processes constantly at work. We should be using our expertise to assist traditionally associated people in their efforts to maintain their cultural identity. We need to explain options, help explore alternatives, and most importantly, give people the freedom to choose for themselves, even when our professional judgment says otherwise.

Why? Because traditionally associated groups have a wisdom unique to them, much of which is based on many generations of experience with the environment. Their knowledge and unique ways of making decisions and solving problems has great value and is needed by humanity. This wisdom, this collective experience should not be lost, at least not involuntarily. Those groups perpetuating their way of life should be assisted in accessing places they care about, in obtaining resources that are needed to maintain traditional ways, and in sharing economic opportunities such as jobs or grants. Walter R. Echo-Hawk provides an excellent discussion on this issue, and helps explain why the dominant society fails to value the knowledge and wisdom of the less dominant.

While I agree with Wray’s statement, I think it important to note that not all anthropologists and ethnographers would agree that we have a professional responsibility to help preserve lifeways of traditionally associated peoples. The statement suggests a level of activism that make many anthropologists uncomfortable. As long as we are there to assist—not direct—traditionally affected people in their desire to maintain a way of life, then to my mind, we do have this professional responsibility.

We as a profession have a long way to go to meet the goal of aiding the perpetuation of traditional lifeways. The papers indicate that the national parks are notoriously under-staffed and under-budgeted for all the things they want to do. Without clear direction to the contrary, most park supervisors and other land managers do not put ethnographic research above the spending line. As a result, decisions being made about the park and its resources are not fully informed, so that there is an incomplete understanding of the history, environment, traditional resources in the areas being protected. That means that the benefits of applied ethnography are not accrued, and that our goal to preserve traditional lifeways is not being met.

The papers make clear that NPS budgets are too small to do the things that need to be done. This is common throughout the federal agencies, but especially so within the Department of Interior, where the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Fish and Wildlife Service reside. Good research, be it ethnographic, historical, architectural, or archaeological, usually takes the back seat to the short-term efforts required by new projects and new directives. There is no time for important long-term activities because everyone is too busy clearing new projects, updating management plans, writing procedures, justifying work that needs to be done, and writing white papers and recommendations that sit on desks and bookshelves across the federal complex.

This situation is especially frustrating outside the federal land managing agencies, where most cultural work is done by private-sector-based cultural resource contractors. In these settings, conflict of interest is inherent. Further, limited dollars obtained for cultural projects force competitive bidding, putting pressure on bids to be as low as possible to win the award. Two areas that consistently get cut are background research and consultation. Other negative aspects of the private contractor model are that investigators change from project to project, eliminating any hope of continuity and institutional memory. Individuals who have never worked in a community might show up one day ready to evaluate any number of resources for significance. Imagine the amount and quality of effort that goes into a project when no one knows who to talk to, where to go for information, and the background research has only been funded for a few days of labor. The amount of archaeological work performed is generally inadequate, but the situation is even more dire for historical and ethnographic research. It takes years, not days or weeks to learn about a place and the people, develop relationships, and learn about the needs of traditionally associated peoples. That time frame is not compatible with private sector heritage management.

If the United States is going to keep the private contractor model for heritage preservation work, and all indications are that it will, then the country also needs to support a strong stewardship model for federal agencies and local governments. If private contractors can only budget a few hours and days to complete complex historical and cultural research, then they need to have access to repositories and individuals who are the keepers of the knowledge. They need archives and people whom they can talk to and make sure that important sources of information are not ignored. The days of driving around and doing ad hoc checking until the budget runs dry have to end.

In conclusion, the NPS papers demonstrate that heritage preservation is an important part of the cultural perpetuation process, and that ethnographic research is critical to understanding the needs and concerns of traditionally associated peoples. Collectively, the papers show the con-
tributions that a sustained ethnographic research program can contribute to the parks, to the affected people, and to the public, which gains a greater understanding of the park and its resources. Finally, better information leads to better management.

Two questions arise: (1) what needs to be done from a policy perspective to aid the ethnography program for the National Park Service, and (2) what needs to be done to ensure that ethnographic consideration is given in other protective areas where it makes sense? Equally important, if not more so, what policy changes are needed to maintain the information that already has been collected and to continue the many relationships that have been started. The decade following 2000 was not good for heritage management in the United States, at least not in the federal sector; the description of the NPS Ethnography Program during this era is similar to what happened in many programs.

At Hanford, the U.S. Department of Energy managed to destroy a nationally recognized cultural program by installing managers who had no training, experience, or real interest in cultural resource management at Hanford or anywhere else for that matter. The department dumped half of the resources on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, knowing full well that the Fish and Wildlife Service did not have the budgets to perform the required activities. Staff with decades of professional experience in cultural resource management (CRM) were suddenly persona non grata, and any recommendations made by them were viewed with suspicion and contempt. Staff were instructed to no longer bring recommendations that conflicted with upper management’s vision to only spend money for clean-up. “If it’s not cleanup, we’re not doing it” was the mantra. The cultural resource organization that had worked for two decades learning about and fighting for Hanford’s resources was rewarded with budget cuts, forced reductions in staff, and orders that breeched professional ethics. Where there once was consistency in reviewing projects and making determinations based upon requirements, knowledge, and previous commitments, now the Department of Energy lets each cleanup contractor bring in people from out of the region to perform compliance activities. It is an interesting correlation that the less background research one conducts about a place proposed for development, the less significance it seems to have. By shortchanging the research and review process, cleanup projects can meet the schedules and the large cleanup firms can collect their so-called performance-based incentives. Low points included the day we were told in managerial terms to “give away the archaeological collections because we are not in the collection business,” and similarly the day we were told that historic sites were not archaeological sites, but rather “waste sites” exempted from national historic preservation laws.

While conditions have improved somewhat, the structural damage that has occurred cannot be fixed overnight. Professionals with decades of experience cannot be replaced by recent graduates from out of the region. It is a very real possibility that decades of data gathering and database development will be lost because new managers and new staff will not know why they need “all these records” to complete Hanford’s cleanup. Stewardship at Hanford means management of residual wastes, not protection of the cultural and natural environment for future generations. The situation at Hanford may be unique, but I think it is not.

Given the many changes that have occurred in heritage management in the last decade, and the challenges that we continue to face, it is time to think about the adjustments that need to occur in national and regional heritage policy. This set of papers, written mostly by full-time applied ethnographers, is an excellent step in the policy change process, as it broadens awareness of the problem and facilitates development of policy options that can lead to improvement. The actions that Jerry Rodgers identifies in his essay to help revitalize the heritage field in the United States provide an agenda that we should all support and assist in implementing. The authors are commended for taking the time out of their busy lives to publish their thoughts and experiences.

Darby C. Stapp’s Ph.D. is in American Civilization/Historical Archaeology from the University of Pennsylvania. He recently took early retirement from the Battelle Memorial Institute and began Northwest Anthropology LLC to conduct heritage resource impact assessments for tribes and agencies. He may be reached at 2754 Stonecreek Drive, Richland, Washington (WA) 99354-2149 USA, at 509-554-0441 and dstapp@bomberinet.com.

REVIEW

FREDERICK F. YORK

The George Wright Society was founded in 1980 and its journal, The George Wright Forum, in 1981 to promote “the protection, preservation, and management of cultural and natural parks and reserves through research and education” (George Wright Society 2010). This review focuses on the second of two issues of the Forum published in 2009 that deal with cultural resource management topics and the National Park Service of the United States Department of the Interior. The first focuses on “Traditional Cultural Properties: Putting Concept into Practice” (George Wright Society 2009a). The second is being reviewed here (George Wright Society 2009b). It concentrates on the nearly thirty-year history, present status, and future of the ethnography program of the National Park Service.
I am pleased to do this review and consider it a welcome opportunity to communicate with anthropologists outside of the National Park Service concerning a program that I have been involved with since the summer of 1991 when I was the first of three anthropologists hired to initiate programs in three out of ten regions that existed at the time. For the record, in July of 1978 Lawrence F. Van Horn Ph.D., was the first cultural anthropologist hired as such in the National Park Service. That was at the NPS Denver, Colorado, Service Center to work in park planning on general management plans (Van Horn 2003a and 2003b). Muriel “Miki” K. Crespi, Ph.D. became the second cultural anthropologist to be hired as such. That was in 1981 to work in the NPS Washington, D.C. Office (WASO) to develop what became the Applied Ethnography Program. Regional anthropologists were then hired in 1991. This hiring was accomplished under the GS (General Schedule) 190 (General Anthropology Series). There is no series in the General Schedule for ethnographer. The first three such regional anthropologists were George S. Esber, Ph.D. for the then Southwest Region; David E. Ruppert, Ph.D. for the then Rocky Mountain Region; and, Frederick F. York, Ph.D., for the then Pacific Northwest Region.

Ethnography in the National Park Service contains an initial piece by Jerry L. Rogers, a professional historian. Now retired, he is a 34-year NPS veteran who served for 14 years as the associate director for cultural resources management. His cultural resource duties covered the national park system. For historic preservation, he had duties both within and outside the system. This contribution is part of an ongoing National Park Service Centennial Essay Series (pages 6-13) being featured serially in The George Wright Forum.

Rogers enthusiastically advocates the need for “Ethnography in a National Park Service Second Century.” In the context of a brief history of the National Park Service developing its first ethnography program, he laments...

...losses in funding, staffing, professional capability, and especially leadership between 2001 and 2009 [that] had been so extensive that making progress meant starting over... Let’s skip the sugar coating about our task. Creating a sound NPS ethnography program by the time of the agency’s centennial [August 25, 2016] means starting over.

Here is how the NPS story of ethnography program growth began. In 1981, Doug Scovill, an archaeologist (B.A. California State University, Sacramento 1957), was the chief anthropologist of the National Park Service who hired Muriel “Miki” Crespi (Ph.D. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign 1968) (Van Horn 2003b). Crespi, according to Rogers, soon had the support of NPS officials, including the Mesa Verde National Park superintendent, the Rocky Mountain regional director, and the director of the National Park Service, to convene the First World Conference on Cultural Parks, which was held at Mesa Verde in 1984 (National Park Service 1989). The three themes of the conference were technology and preservation of cultural parks, tourism and use of cultural parks, and cultural parks and native peoples. The conference, Rogers says, “articulated a reason for the ethnography program and provided a beginning upon which to build” (page 7). Prior to the conference Rogers and Crespi had...

...developed a vision of at least one professional ethnographer in each [NPS regional office]...through a special committee from the Society for Applied Anthropology, with representation from the American Anthropological Association, New Mexico Senator Pete Dominici learned of our vision and arranged for a small appropriation to begin to carry it out (page 7).

With the cooperation of regional directors and cultural resource program managers in the Pacific Northwest Region (based in Seattle, Washington), the Rocky Mountain Region (based in Denver, Colorado), and the Southwest Region (based in Santa Fe, New Mexico) positions for the first regional Ph.D. level cultural anthropologists to initiate regional aspects of the Applied Ethnography Program were advertised, and three anthropologists were hired by those regions in the summer of 1991, as mentioned above. Although Rogers does not go into any detail on this program growth, he notes that “over time we were able to get the program up and running throughout most of the agency” (page 8). In the 1990s, the ethnography program grew with the hiring of cultural anthropologists in three additional regions (the Midwest, Northeast and Southeast Regions) for a total of six Ph.D.s based in six regions by 2000 and a staff of from one to three additional M.A. and Ph.D. level anthropologists working in the city of Washington with Crespi.

If the decade of the 1990s was one in which the relatively small ethnography program grew and prospered under the direction of Crespi, with the support of Rogers and Scovill, and later his successor, Francis P. “Frank” McManamon, Ph.D., the decade that began in 2000 was one in which the program declined. Reductions in budget and staff were exacerbated by less support from higher levels following Scovill’s departure from the NPS Washington Office in 1996, the retirement of Rogers in 2002, and the death of Crespi on April 25, 2003. As Rogers notes, the ethnography program has suffered not only because of Crespi’s passing and the failure to hire anyone to fill her
position, but also because of a lack of leadership at higher levels of the National Park Service in the last decade.

Rogers presents his support for the revival of the ethnography program in the context of a broad vision for the future of the National Park Service. He makes six points regarding the need for a strong ethnography program to understand and deal with new concentrations of ethnic populations:

1. To function within a National Park Service properly attuned to its second century, the ethnography program must envision itself in a similarly broad scope. Much remains to be done in positive interactions that benefit tribes, and such interaction must be a prominent part of the future.

2. Learning about and from other cultures is at the heart of the ethnography program.

3. Knowing how to do this right will require ethnographers along with a host of professionals from other disciplines.

4. The skills of ethnographers will be helpful in figuring out whether certain inholdings are or are not cultural resources that the Park Service should preserve.

5. The National Park Service must lead the change or else be led by it.

6. A strong ethnography program will be needed if the Park Service is to understand and deal with new concentrations of ethnic populations.

Rogers concludes that...

...A vision is best developed by those who will work to carry it out. The task therefore belongs to what remains of the ethnography cadre inside [the National Park Service] and to outside professionals who are closely associated with it...Eventually the process and its recommended vision must have the blessing of the National Leadership Council [NPS regional directors, the director of the Denver Service Center, the director of the Harpers Ferry Interpretive Center] and the director [of the National Park Service] (page 11).

In the foreword (pages 40 – 42), Jacilee Wray does an excellent job of briefly describing each of the ethnographic articles that follow. She sets the stage by quoting Crespi (page 40):

Two decades ago, the National Park Service established the Applied Ethnography Program. Since then, the concept, data, and strategies of cultural anthropology, or ethnography, as the NPS calls it [reviewer’s emphasis], have helped the agency hear and see what had been typically unheard and unseen. By giving voices to communities and indigenous people, and visibility to the resources they value, the discipline has enriched our understanding of heritage by illuminating the places and concerns that have been unknown, but [are] knowable (Crespi 2001).

Wray along with Alexa Roberts, Ph.D., Shirley J. Fiske, Ph.D., and Allison Pena, A.B.D., co-author the article on “Creating Policy for the National Park Service: Addressing Native Americans and Other Traditionally Associated Peoples” (pages 43 – 50). These authors provide some detail on the development of the ethnography program by drawing on an oral history interview of Crespi by Fiske that was conducted in 2002 and other sources. This contribution focuses on the NPS policy relating to Native Americans finalized by Crespi and others in 1987 and the incorporation of portions of that policy into the 1988 NPS Management Policies as a “catalyst for the...ethnography program” (page 43).

These authors summarize a series of types of anthropological studies that came to guide research and then became standard examples as products of the program: cultural affiliation studies, rapid ethnographic assessments, and ethnographic overviews and assessments (page 47). They then turn to discussions of two concepts: ethnographic resources and traditionally associated peoples. With reference to the former, they note that this term piggybacked on existing and familiar concepts such as archaeological resources, historic resources, and natural resources. It was intended to bring visibility to the human dimensions of historic sites, structures, objects, and landscapes (Crespi 2003:42). They later put this resource category in the context of a database named the Ethnographic Resources Inventory, and they conclude that because the database was discontinued “the ethnography program declined” (page 48).

These authors further note with reference to traditionally associated peoples that a new definition was included in the 2001 NPS Management Policies as...

...those cultural groups and people who have a connection to a park that predates the park’s establishment, whose association with the park has endured at least two generations, and to whom the park’s resources are essential for their continued identity as culturally distinct peoples (page 47).

The acting NPS director at the time, Dan Wenk, is quoted as giving the following guidance to park managers:

The creation of parks was influenced by Native Americans, African-Americans, Hispanic-Americans, and Asian-Americans. The stories of
[these] and other minorities already exist in national parks and need only to be discovered or told (page 49). About the forthcoming NPS centennial, these authors pose a series of questions that they then refer to as goals: How will the National Park Service discover these stories? What tools will we use to understand the deeply embedded cultural values attached to park lands and resources...? How will we steward resources with an informed knowledge of the many layers of cultural meaning they contain? How will we foster a connection between park lands and the complex cultural fabric of future generations (page 49)?

Their conclusion is a “re-energized, redesigned ethnography program is necessary to accomplish these goals.”

David Ruppert’s “Rethinking Ethnography in the National Park Service” spans pages 51 – 57. He, as mentioned above, was one of the first three anthropologists hired in 1991. He now serves as the assistant director for Indian affairs and American culture in the Intermountain Region of the National Park Service based in Denver, Colorado, with frequent details to the Washington Office. He says that the NPS...

...ethnography program (cultural anthropology) was established in 1981 primarily to consult with traditional and/or ethnically distinct communities and document park places and resources that are culturally significant... [with the National Park Service determination] that there was value in finding how others in an often overlooked diverse citizenry, viewed and valued the places and resources — views often different from those of the agency [and that] a better understanding of these NPS and community similarities and differences could lead to constructive resolutions to on-going and potential management conflicts (page 51).

Ruppert points out the importance of laws requiring federal agency compliance as well as that of the civil rights movement in the 1950s and 1960s. That includes the American Indian Movement specifically in terms of the need for the National Park Service in the 1970s and 1980s to examine its policies relative to the exercise of American Indian religious freedom and the conduct of traditional cultural practices, including access to places and resources within parks (page 52). Ruppert adds that changing demographics at present require the National Park Service to understand differing cultural perspectives and underscore the need to “revitalize the existing ethnography program” (pages 54 - 55). As an introduction to presenting a ten item list of suggested tasks he notes that cultural anthropology within the National Park Service...

...works with contemporary issues...[and]... traditional communities and their use of, and value they give to, places and natural resources...[with ethnography] as a social science methodology that...investigates links between community cultural values and park natural and cultural resources...[and that] resides in some limited space between the cultural and natural resource programs (page 55).

Walter R. Echo-Hawk, Jr., is a well-known and widely respected American Indian attorney who authors “Under Native American Skies” (pages 58 – 79). The central theme focuses on the need for the United States to develop a clear land ethic (page 58) to build upon seeds planted by Aldo Leopold in the mid-twentieth century (page 59) through the use of “the cosmology of Native peoples who reside in indigenous habitats embedded in the natural world” (page 58). Echo-Hawk states that the need for “a strong federal ethnography program is self-evident,” and he refers to a series of legal obligations. He cites Executive Order 13007 on Indian Sacred Sites and the following laws: the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA), the Alaska Native Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA), the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA), the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), the Native American Graves Protection and Rehabilitation Act (NAGPRA), and the Endangered Species Act (ESA). He sees the National Park Service as...

...a world leader in preserving the natural world and its cultural treasures [noting in addition that the development] of the ethnography program needed to comply with these laws... led land managers into the modern era as society began to change the way that it looks upon public lands [and] has laid the groundwork for developing a land ethic in the 21st century (page 61).

Echo-Hawk then calls upon federal agencies to do more than merely comply with such laws but to “help lead our nation toward a land ethic for the twenty-first century.” In his view, the challenge...

...requires more than a bare-bones ethnography program run by a room full of cultural anthropologists...Instead, the task requires a comprehensive interdisciplinary approach guided by comparative religion experts, Indian studies scholars, historians, ecologists, ethnobotanists, wildlife and fisheries biologists, traditional tribal religious leaders, and tribal...
Jenny Masur, Ph.D. is another Crespi-associated anthropologist as she was part of her staff before the first regional anthropologists /ethnographers were hired in 1991. Subsequently, Masur has worked as the regional anthropologist as she was part of her staff before the first regional anthropologists were hired. He actually was part of a team of anthropologists headed up by Richard Stoffle, Ph.D., now with the University of Arizona’s Bureau of Applied Research in Anthropology (BARA), when an initial workshop for the program was held near Santa Fe, New Mexico in August 1991. Subsequently, Evans worked with Crespi in the Washington Office and then moved to the NPS Midwest Region where he continues to work.

Evans refers to a variety of basic cultural anthropology studies conducted through his Midwest Applied Anthropology Program that researches traditional land use, ethnobotany, and ethnozoology. This effort includes “special ethnographic studies on peoples associated with specific parks” (page 80). This list adds to the list of studies presented earlier in the volume by Wray and her coauthors (see above and page 47 of the volume under review).

Evans describes two studies for Pipestone National Monument, Minnesota, that were done in 1995, shortly after his program took form in 1994 (page 81). One study is a preliminary documentation of federally recognized American Indian tribes culturally associated with the national monument. The second study documents the ownership of 200 pipes in the monument’s museum collections (page 81). Those two studies led to a third traditional use study conducted during 1996 and 1997. A general management plan (GMP) process involving visits to the national monument in 2000 (National Park Service 2008) likewise led to both a comprehensive ethnobotanical study and a more refined cultural affiliation study. In conclusion, Evans remarks that the studies have influenced the decision-making of the national monument’s everyday management (page 83).

Traditionally Associated Groups: A Form of Civic Engagement (pages 85 – 94).

Masur’s piece is very informative concerning the wide range of traditional associated peoples (TAPs) that the National Park Service needs to take into account in its planning for the future, its everyday operations, its research, and its interpretive programs to visitors. Masur makes two major points. The first is that the ethnography program is not simply a program about federally recognized American Indian tribes, including Alaska Natives, or other indigenous peoples associated with the United States (pages 86 – 91). Secondly, ethnographic studies can facilitate civic engagement and help parks distinguish between traditionally associated groups and other types of interest groups. This understanding applies to…

…especially larger, more generic groups who may also have legitimate reasons for lobbying for more attention from NPS managers and friends’ groups [concluding that]…the benefits of knowing the associated people means better sensitivity to these groups and will help park managers in decision-making. Knowledge about TAPs can encourage the preservation ethic, minimize park disputes with neighbors, maximize community support and cooperation with other agencies, and avoid complaints (pages 91, 93).

Barbara A. Cellarius, Ph.D., offers “Ethnographic Overviews and Assessments: An Example from Wrangell – St. Elias National Park and Preserve” (pages 95 – 100). She previously did research for the National Park Service in the southeastern United States but is now park-based in Alaska. In this regard, she is like Wray and Pena, referred to above, who are, respectively, park-based anthropologists in the states of Washington and Louisiana. Her park, by the way, consists of more than 13 million acres established through the Alaska National Interest Land Conservation Act in 1980 and is the single largest unit in the national park system.

Cellarius stresses the need for conducting more than one basic ethnographic overview and assessment in Wrangell – St. Elias because of both the size of the park and its cultural diversity. It is home to three distinct Alaska Native groups with distinctive languages and English-speaking European Americans. She concludes that the benefit of a complete ethnographic overview and assessment goes beyond the resulting report itself. Benefits include facilitating building upon existing partnerships and relationships for the park, creating opportunities for new partnerships, and increased interaction between park staff and the members, staff, and officials of local communities for mutual benefits (page 99).

Krupa begins with information about gathering oral histories and refers to the development of “Project Jukebox” at the University of Alaska – Fairbanks, which he characterizes as...

"...a pioneering project to digitize oral history interviews with added text, photographs, maps, and other material and make them available on computer and, later, via the Internet (page 102). He then describes efforts to document traditional ecological knowledge (TEK). He treats the process of preparing an ethnographic overview and assessment, the idea of intellectual property, the necessity of community consultation, and the formation of advisory groups under ANILCA.

Subsistence harvest research is discussed as well as the impact of climate change on Arctic communities and the involvement of park ethnographers with park managers. This topic concerns the impact of park policies and management actions on subsistence users (pages 102 – 107).

Krupa’s conclusion asks whether the National Park Service is fulfilling “ANILCA’s promise to its resident peoples” through protecting “a way of life” while protecting land and resources. His short answer is yes (page 108).

Erin McPherson and Kat Byerly cogitate on “The Challenge of Ethnography” (pages 110 – 119). McPherson holds a M.A. in public history and Byerly a B.A. in anthropology and M.Sc. in Islamic and Middle Eastern studies with an emphasis on indigenous peoples. They worked in association with the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA), which is an independent, nongovernmental organization (NGO). With the NPCA Center for the State of the Parks, they conducted assessments of the condition of all categories of cultural and natural resources according to a standardized methodology and research protocol. McPherson and Byerly provide NPCA background material:

The National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA), founded in 1919, is a private, non-profit, nonpartisan organization that advocates for the health and preservation of the national park system, with a mission to protect and enhance America’s national parks for present and future generations. In 2000, NPCA initiated the Center for the State of the Parks (CSOTP) program with a goal of developing the first complete, comprehensive, and informed understanding of natural and cultural resource conditions in our national parks (page 111).

McPherson and Byerly indicate that over the course of nine years some 70 assessments were completed at parks (page 112). However, the alphabetical list for completed State of the Parks Reports by park name according to the NPCA website as of May 3, 2010 shows only 56 park units. In any event, the lists of cultural resources in condition assessment reports for Redwood National and State Parks, California and San Juan Island National Historical Park, Washington, includes the following categories: Archeology, Cultural Landscapes, Ethnography, Historic Structures, History, and Museum Collection and Archives. The entry for ethnography in the Redwood report includes a parenthetical reference to “Peoples and Cultures” but the San Juan report does not (National Parks Conservation Association 2008 and 2007).

McPherson and Byerly begin with a definition of ethnographic resources taken from NPS-28: Cultural Resource Management Guideline 1998 (National Park Service 1998) to present the institutionalized perspective on this type of cultural resources. Their findings are based on a subset of parks, and they note that...

"...ethnography is a challenge for park managers because it can refer to a wide variety of resources and cultural groups, as well as require additional management, funding, and staff...30 percent [of parks assessed] did not have enough research or other information available with which to conduct an assessment of their ethnography programs... Overall, 66 percent of parks where an ethnography program existed or might apply had no ethnographic overview or assessment or any other research identifying traditional uses and significance to the park to traditionally associated populations (page 112).

The theme of ethnography as a challenge continues with the segue of McPherson and Byerly about their list of six research findings that outline some of the most pervasive challenges inherent in preserving, managing, and interpreting ethnographic resources in the national park system. They indicate that the ethnography program is often the least straightforward and the most challenging undertaking of all the cultural resource programs (page 112). Despite pervasive challenges, McPherson and Byerly conclude that...
…By preserving and interpreting ethnographic resources through an active ethnography program, national parks enrich the park experience for visitors and add another dimension to the intrinsic importance of preserving these resources for future generations (page 117).

Taken as a whole, it is clear that the contributors to this volume are sincere in their thoughts and desires to revive, revitalize, if not resurrect, a NPS ethnography program that clearly consists of NPS employees and contractors who have done important work in collaboration with park managers and a wide variety of traditionally associated groups during the last twenty to thirty years. The fact that so much excellent work has been done in the last decade is amazing given the relatively low funding for ethnography projects and the leadership gap that has been pervasive. We are now on the cusp of a new era in terms of having new NPS leadership at the national level, but we need to ask hard, if not frightening, questions about the utility of the concepts we have been using. That admonition applies to the structural and organizational setting for anthropology and related social sciences in the National Park Service. It recognizes constraints on multi- and inter-disciplinary approaches to addressing the needs of units of the national park system and the diverse communities that national park units should serve. And it involves opportunities for working together despite bureaucratic boundaries within the National Park Service and beyond.

I agree with Jerry Rogers that we need to start over (page 6) to renew a vision of the ethnography program. I further agree that a "vision is best developed by those who will carry it out . . . including what remains of the ethnography cadre within the" National Park Service (page 11). As I have consistently conversed for years with my fellow NPS anthropologists and those outside the National Park Service: We should critically discuss the discipline of anthropology as a social science and its past, present and future potential contributions to the National Park Service, peoples who are traditionally associated with the lands and resources managed by the agency, and to the public at large. In doing so, I would recommend discussions that might focus on the following questions:

Is ethnography anthropology?

Is ethnography a discipline?

Is ethnography a cultural resource?

Does ethnography as a cultural resource discipline need to have its own resource type to justify its existence in the NPS?

Now is the time to evaluate where we have been and where we want to go as anthropologists within the National Park Service.

Frederick F. Yorke’s Ph.D. in anthropology is from the State University of New York at Binghamton. His title in the National Park Service is that of regional anthropologist in the Pacific West Regional Office based in Seattle. He may be reached at the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, 909 First Avenue, Seattle, Washington (WA) 98104-1060 USA, at fred.york@nps.gov and at 206-220-4148.
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RESPONSE

JACILEE WRAY WITH JERRY ROGERS, BARBARA CELLARIUS, DAVID KRUPA, SHIRLEY FISKE, ALLISON PENA, MICHAEL EVANS, AND JENNY MASUR

Thank you Richard Badalamente, George Esber, Darby Stapp, and Frederick York for your insightful reviews.

One of the most important reasons for writing this special section of an issue of The George Wright Forum was to motivate people to begin a dialogue with others that can assist us in proceeding to a new and stronger vision for an applied ethnography program and therefore renew the program within the National Park Service (NPS). We are pleased to read these reviews and feel a sense of support and understanding of the program.

There was a bit of confusion with the articles that should be acknowledged. The two articles that appear after Jerry Rogers’ lead article were not part of our ethnography articles. One reviewer did review these, and noted that they were good articles, but was confused as to why they were there. They probably would have been better placed at the end of the Forum issue.

In response to the three specific reviews we found Badalamente’s description of himself as a young lad looking at what sounds like an ethnographic site to speak volumes about the reasons applied ethnographers or anthropologists are important in the National Park Service; that is, we document appropriate and accurate information about cultural sites and the associated people. I was excited to read his boyhood description as I had just driven on that same route the previous month. I wondered if he would find out how old the tools were, what they were used for, where the group that likely made them had lived, where they live today, when they stopped using obsidian for tools, and if there were a museum where he could learn more. I wanted him to learn more, and I wanted to learn more.

Badalamente likes the mystical aspects of parks that can be heard through Native American voices as expressed by Walter Echo-Hawk in the volume. I do as well when I visit a national park; I want to understand who was here before and how they felt about this location. That is the park experience I seek, and I know many others do as well. I wish the National Park Service would utilize more research on these aspects.

The sense from all of the reviewers is that the ethnography program has accomplished an impressive amount of work, especially given the great hardships we have endured. Some of our work may have ended on shelves, but ideally we have provided a legacy of research that should be used in interpretation to provide answers for park visitors and others. Esber’s question as to why “a loss of vision ever occurred” is best answered by Jerry Rogers:

Vision thrives when leaders look forward positively and inspire and enable their cadres.

Vision dies when leaders focus on restraining and inhibiting their cadres (Rogers 2010).

The NPS Washington Office’s cultural resource programs had been managed for almost eight years in a restraining way. By comparison, the associate director of natural resources continued to support the natural resources programs and received the benefit of a funding and staffing initiative called the Natural Resource Challenge, while the programs that should have been championed by the associate director for cultural resources suffered a 25% reduction in funding and staffing. The energy of the cultural resource programs and staff was sapped, with no support as important vacated positions in program leadership, such as the one the late Muriel “Miki” Crespi had held for ethnography as chief ethnographer, were not filled.

Another question that Esber asks is:

To what extent ethnographers will be amenable to engaging traditionally associated peoples (TAPs) in decision-making processes rather than to merely gather data, prior to and insular to decision-making?

One method at Olympic National Park was/is to work with the two successive superintendents on planning for the general management plan (GMP) with the eight associated tribes. Another method was to establish a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the tribes to improve communication and schedule yearly meetings to talk about key issues, before they became crisis issues.

However, park managers move on and new managers often do not understand the key role a NPS anthropologist can fill in an extremely effective way. So how do we get the National Park Service to understand the important work of the anthropologist? Anthropologists have the experience and skills that facilitate the engagement of TAPs in decision making, but broad support for doing so needs to come from the top down, as well as from the bottom up. In the case of subsistence management in Alaska, Congress recognized the importance of involving local residents in the management of subsistence resources and activities with the creation of Subsistence Resource Commissions (SRCs). These park-based commissions provide a meaningful forum for local input to park management, and they are empowered to make recommendations to the secretary of the interior regarding subsistence resources. The secretary, in turn, is directed by Section...
810 of ANILCA (the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act) to approve such recommendations unless: 1) the proposal violates principles of wildlife conservation, 2) threatens healthy populations of wildlife in parks or monuments, 3) is contrary to the purposes for which the park or monument is established, or 4) would be detrimental to the satisfaction of subsistence needs of local residents. Beyond their legal advisory mandate, the SRCS provide an important forum for local concerns to be brought to the attention of park managers, and park staff report on NPS activities at the biannual SRC meetings. Although ANILCA is a very specific law to Alaska, in the lower 48 we can work closely with NPS natural resource staff, park managers, and traditional groups to share knowledge in a similar biannual forum so together we can address specific natural and cultural resources issues, which often overlap. We need to honor and preserve the vast knowledge of the associated traditional groups.

Stapp’s review article was enlightening coming from the perspective of someone who really wants to learn about what an anthropologist does in the National Park Service and use it as a model for his work at Hanford Nuclear Reservation. In his career he has often seen examples where... …ethnographic research and consultation were typically conducted by archaeologists, communication staff, or someone else if they were conducted at all.

The reality is that the National Park Service still struggles with this same dilemma, partly because there are so few anthropologists, but also because our role is not widely understood.

Stapp also observes that we need a long-term commitment by anthropologists to develop relationships. This is very true. The anthropologist must establish and preserve relationships. It is a deep and significant commitment that often extends beyond the eight-hour schedule. However, changes in management can fracture those relationships very quickly, so the support we receive as a professional program is paramount.

Stapp provides us with three questions that we need to have our next chief ethnographer and the field anthropologists/ethnographers address as soon as possible:

1) What policy changes are needed to maintain the information that already exists and to continue to develop and maintain our relationships?
2) What policy changes generally need to be made?
3) What needs to be done to ensure that ethnographic consideration is given from now on?

These are questions that must be answered, developed, funded, and staffed in order for our vision to continue.

There are two final notes. First, the NPS Management Policies (2006) that address Native Americans, Traditionally Associated Peoples, and ethnography, were developed by our former Chief Anthropologist and the other NPS anthropologists. The policies have stood the test of three updated versions. They provide a wealth of guidance to managers and we highly recommend that they be referred to for guidance. Second, in 2011 the job opening for NPS chief (supervisory) ethnographer was at last officially posted.

Jacilee Wray’s M.A. in anthropology is from the University of Northern Arizona. She is the park anthropologist on the staff of Olympic National Park, 600 East Park Avenue, Port Angeles, Washington (WA) 98362-6798 USA. She may also be reached at 360-565-3051 and at jacilee_wray@nps.gov.

Jerry L. Rogers’ M.A. in history is from Texas Tech University. He is retired from the National Park Service in which he served as associate director for cultural resources. He may be reached at jrogers@grappawireless.com.

Barbara A. Cellarius took her Ph.D. in anthropology at the University of Kentucky. She is the park anthropologist at Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve, Alaska, and may be contacted at barbara_cellarius@nps.gov.

David J. Krupa is the park anthropologist for Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve and Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve, both in Alaska, and may be reached at david_krupa@nps.gov. His Ph.D. in anthropology comes from the University of Wisconsin at Madison.

Shirley J. Fiske earned her Ph.D. in anthropology at Stanford University. She is on the anthropology faculty at the University of Maryland at College Park and may be e-mailed at shirley.fiske@verizon.net.

Allison H. Pena is the park anthropologist at Jean Lafitte National Historical Park and Preserve, Louisiana. The University of Pittsburgh is the source of her A.B.D. in anthropology (all but dissertation). She serves as acting regional ethnographer for the Southeast Regions of the National Park Service. Her e-mail address is allison_pena@nps.gov.

Michael J. Evans’ Ph.D. in anthropology is from the University of Florida. He is based in Moscow, Idaho, but serves as the regional ethnographer for the Midwest Region of the National Park Service. E-mail will reach him at michael_evans@nps.gov.

Jenny Masur took her Ph.D. in anthropology at the University of Florida. She is the manager within the NPS National Capital Region of the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom, headquartered in Washington, District of Columbia. She may be contacted at jenny_masur@nps.gov.
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