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POINT-TO-POINT
Lucor Jordan

Ground Truthing and Futurisms

The theme of the 2021 issue of The Applied Anthropologist is “ground truthing and futurisms”. This theme highlights two central concerns of applied anthropologists in the field—coming to understand peoples’ lived experiences in a particular place at a particular time, and engaging in the process of considering, anticipating, and imagining possible futures that might emerge.

Ground truthing and futurisms exist within an iterative relationship of co-creation. As anthropologists, our visions of the future are grounded in our understandings or imaginings of people’s lived realities, and we often interpret the present through the lens of what could be in the future. Just as the lived experience of a particular present is shaped by the historical events which persist as systems of privilege, oppression, erasure, and marginalization, the futures that grow from these presents are shaped by our current realities and the meaning that we make from them.

Within applied anthropology in particular, we often use research as a means of trying to bring about the future that a community is working towards. When we engage in research within an advocacy or activism framework, the interplay between ground truth and futurism becomes even more central to how we approach our work. This is a particularly salient dynamic in action research, where an iterative relationship between defining and communicating ground truths is directly joined with social and culture change directed at the community level or at the systems level.

In exploring these topics, the oft-ignored specters of the researcher and research process have emerged as thematic guests-at-the-table beside more conventional conversations around the present as a liminal place of becoming. Anthropologists have become cognizant of the researcher as the lens that defines the present and frames the future. At the same time, we have moved towards collaborative modes of research that aim to center the voices of those we work with, and often work to co-create research outputs that reflect people’s ground truths, visions, and goals.

The articles and commentaries highlighted in this issue of The Applied Anthropologist engage with the theme of “ground truth and futurisms” from different angles. In our featured article McCabe, Briody, Schwede, Redding, and Van Arsdale share exciting insights that are deeply relevant to all practitioners of anthropology, as they reflect on how we might take lessons from our past experiences within the discipline and apply them towards our future work. Drawing from their own work, as well as the experiences of their colleagues in the National Association for the Practice of Anthropology (NAPA), the authors have compiled a set of best practices for applied anthropologists, covering three key areas of focus: building trust with stakeholders; enhancing operational, organizational, and management effectiveness; and protecting research participants, clients, and ourselves.

I provide a thoughtful book review of we are dancing for you’ by Cutcha Risling Baldy, a book that builds discourse around Hoopa futurisms by utilizing concepts such as “survivance” and “continuance” to explore the kinahldung (the flower dance) as a decolonial praxis.

Garrett’s commentary offers an exploration of the past, present, and future of the IRB, beginning with the problematic history of research on human subjects and transitioning into a discussion of the strengths and opportunities of both the IRB and subsequent discipline-specific ethical best practices such as those championed by the AAA’s, the SFAA’s and indeed, the featured article of this volume.

King’s commentary engages with the deeply important topic of female genital mutilation (FGM). King delves into the complex social and cultural dynamics surrounding this practice, discusses the implications of the pandemic on efforts to eradicate it, and calls for continued research, activism, and awareness surrounding FGM in order to ensure that the human rights of women and female children are protected in the future.

Engelmann’s commentary creates an engaging space of discourse around the non-physical wounds incurred during conflict. Without minimizing the importance of the social and historical factors which contextualize the conflicts, he demonstrates that it may be invaluable to consider the unique threads of the experience of warfare through a holistic lens—not only to bring insight into the lived experiences of soldiers following conflict, but also to bring a more nuanced understanding to future considerations.

I hope you enjoy “ground truthing and futurisms”, and that these thoughtful and engaging pieces encourage you to consider what the opportunities—and unforeseen impacts—are for applied social science to play an active role in answering the essential question of: where do we go from here?

*no capital letters appear in the book’s title
ABSTRACT
At the intersection of the sciences and the humanities, anthropological practitioners are found in occupations across multitudes of specializations. Is it possible, then, to derive a set of overarching and relevant “best practices”? Any set of standards or perspectives needs to cover a diverse group of activities, perspectives, and stakeholders. As just one example, with work involving research and/or evaluation, stakeholders can include participants and collaborators in our research, various types of respondents, clients and funders, organizational staff, policymakers and other decision-makers, colleagues, and the general public. Based upon the work of many colleagues, as well as their own, the five authors have organized a generalized set of best practices that cover a wide spectrum. This was done under the auspices of the National Association for the Practice of Anthropology (NAPA), a division of the American Anthropological Association. (The current Best Practices materials and resources can be found on the NAPA website at https://www.practicinganthropology.org/practice/best-practices/)
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This document’s goal is to offer a set of best practices or lessons learned to show how our discipline can be applied effectively in problem solving. While this information should be especially useful to anthropology faculty and instructors charged with teaching and advising students about anthropological practice and careers, anthropologists engaged in applied work or who have an interest in learning more about it will also find useful details.

How We Apply Anthropology
Anthropologists working in government, business, and non-profit settings apply their education and training in anthropology to understand people and the problems they face, and to help their organizations and communities develop solutions to those problems. Representing this perspective, the five authors primarily engage in professional anthropological practice for a living.

In addition to learning anthropological theory, methods, and the current literature, anthropologists typically need additional skills and competencies. We learn to work collaboratively in and with organizations, relying on our abilities to understand social relationships and connections to the world. We also learn to face social interactions with empathy, patience, and leadership. Empathy allows us to listen to others and explore the cultural assumptions that individuals and groups have about themselves, their roles, and how things are working within their respective spheres of life and work. In collaborative encounters, we act patiently as intermediaries, seeking to represent and communicate the perspectives of clients, customers, team members, employees, and other stakeholders involved in and affected by our work. When conflict and tension arise, we exhibit leadership abilities to challenge others as necessary, clarify issues and points of view, and work toward generating consensus.

By applying skills in ethnography and other qualitative and quantitative social science research methods, applied and practicing anthropologists gain insight into cultural practices and share that insight within the organizations that hire us. Such insights help organizations serve a broad range of situations, such as feeding families, enhancing health care, shaping strong communities, improving work environments, assisting in the development of new technologies, advocating for those at risk, and dealing with climate crises. We provide cultural analyses of the economic, political, and social factors underlying problems and suggest potential ways of resolving them. Whether working as employees, contractors, consultants, and/or advocates, we apply our knowledge and experience to assist in developing goals and strategies for change in the policies and programs of governmental, tribal, corporate, and non-profit organizations. In many instances, we work to test, implement, and evaluate changes in them.

Our knowledge, skills, and experience as anthropologists are tied to many specialized fields including business, contract archeology, education, endangered language revitalization, environmental conservation, forensics, human-centered design, immigration, law, medicine, military life, public health, technology, and tourism. Potential work roles include program manager, planner, archivist, curator, user experience researcher, design researcher, specialized research methodologist, consumer researcher, survey researcher, analyst, trainer, principal/founder, community organizer, forensic anthropologist, environmental advocate, compliance specialist, immigration consultant, human rights advocate, staff development coordinator, digital specialist, prevention services supervisor, tribal liaison, executive director, heritage manager, osteologist, and archaeologist. Relying on various aspects of the “anthropological toolkit” (see “NAPA 1997” on the separate Resources page), we try to make a positive difference in addressing human problems by working to create understanding, clarify issues, propose possibilities, and design, implement, and assess plans to effect change.

Best Practices for Anthropologists
A best practice is a method, technique, or procedure shown by research and experience to produce optimal results or a standard way of doing things based on evidence and common agreement. To date, anthropological best practices have mostly been implicit in our education and training. It is time to make them explicit.
These best practices represent a resource for conceptualizing issues, applying a problem-solving orientation, and identifying, testing, and implementing opportunities for change. Inspired by human rights and social justice along with scientific approaches, we should seek to serve the diversity of humanity and foster decisions benefitting organizations and groups equally and equitably. This effort is a “living document” that will evolve with changes in our perspectives on our work. NAPA welcomes your submission of ideas via its website, referenced in the abstract.

The best practices are divided into three sections, broadly covering the major activities in which most anthropologists are engaged. Many items are not exclusive to anthropology but are nonetheless fundamental to applying anthropology successfully. Also, the sections are not mutually exclusive due to the variation in scope of our duties and responsibilities. The first section, Building Trust with Stakeholders, covers most issues faced by anthropologists in most professional circumstances. The second section, Enhancing Operational, Organizational, and Management Effectiveness, is relevant for anthropologists who are working primarily in internal organizational roles. The third section, Protecting Research Participants, Clients, and Ourselves, is focused on anthropological research contexts. Following these three sections are References by different areas of practice and General Resources on practice.

Section 1: Building Trust with Stakeholders

1. Work for the common good. Although working for the common good is prominent in all anthropological ethical guidelines as well as implicit in anthropological work, it is important to reinforce it. Take an expansive view of work activities and/or potential efforts to prevent or mitigate any unwanted social, economic, or environmental consequences that might befall stakeholders, the community, minority populations, the society or culture at large, or you.

2. Learn, develop, and apply social skills. We learn to work collaboratively with others, relying on our abilities to understand social relationships and connections. Additional skills and competencies should be gained and used as needed, such as empathy, patience, and leadership. Employ empathy to listen to others and explore their cultural assumptions. Act patiently as an intermediary, seeking to represent and communicate the perspectives of all stakeholders. If conflict arises, use leadership skills to challenge others as necessary, clarify issues, and work toward generating consensus.

3. Attend to client/supervisor interactions. It is essential to maintain an attentive and respectful stance in our work-related interactions. Our client or supervisor brings knowledge and work-role experience from which we can learn. Listen to their requests and suggestions and work diligently to address them. Seeking their advice can be helpful both because of their connections within the organization and for our ability to be successful in it. Hear their advice and accomplish the stated goals, while being a team player. Keep clients/supervisors updated on work activities. Be mindful of organizational norms and rules, such as notifying our immediate client/supervisor if we expect to work activities.

4. Identify all potential stakeholders. Identify all possible stakeholders when developing and launching a project or activity. Take their views and objectives into account, whether as team members, advisers, persuaders, participants, naysayers, respondents, or decision makers. Learn from other persons or groups that could be affected by the project outcomes but may not have a voice.

5. Respect the perspectives of others. Ethnographic skills are indispensable in learning the views, practices, and language (e.g., concepts, phrases, idioms) of those working with us. Understanding the positions of relevant stakeholders helps to navigate the processes of planning, managing, and bringing projects and activities to completion. Be mindful of the impacts of ethnocentrism and bias, which may be either explicit or implicit.

6. Clarify goals and objectives. As appropriate, ensure that all stakeholders understand the rationale behind our efforts and strategies. Addressing disagreements and negotiating when various stakeholders are at odds help demonstrate openness to multiple perspectives, flexibility, and leadership capabilities. In some cases, it may come down to a client and project leader hammering out a viable decision. Or, if a resolution acceptable to all parties cannot be reached, a compromise would be required.

7. Identify potential risks. Risks can be obvious or subtle. Anticipate possible and plan for their mitigation. If one or more risks emerges, work together with others to take stock of what occurred and decide on a course of action. Communicate risk mitigation actions as clearly and transparently as possible. Lessons learned from these experiences form a part of any future planning.

8. Communicate openly and honestly. It is critical to engage all stakeholders as activities start, and to communicate with them frequently and broadly. Early and continuing dialogue can be wonderfully enlightening, or reveal disagreements, which when reconciled, may result in wide stakeholder engagement and at least some consensus on activities and decisions. In addition, sharing preliminary ideas in conversations or dry runs of presentations represent opportunities to exchange viewpoints, elicit feedback, and limit “surprises” that may be perceived poorly.

9. Provide transparent descriptions. Describe any plan of work clearly, accurately, and completely. The contents of any plan—goals, objectives, design, target group, methodology, limitations, likely outcomes, follow-up actions, timeframe, personnel, and budget—should clarify all phases of the process. Such information is the foundation for organizational or client decision making. For non-proprietary programs, projects, and other work-related activities, consider seeking internal review and approval so that these materials may be shared with the broader professional, trade, and/or scholarly communities.

10. Create an electronic paper trail. Circumstances may change as you go along. Document in writing any relevant changes in events, dates, times, participants, goals, methods, and the wider context, along with discussions and decisions. This material can help reveal obstacles, explain past decision making, and be useful in analysis and reporting. In addition, it may become the basis for lessons learned, retrospective clarification, and potential evidence, should any disputes (legal or otherwise) arise among the parties.

11. Recognize and address power dynamics. Know or determine in advance the appropriate chain of command in the work setting, including project leaders and the system of dispute resolution. Various stakeholders and project team members may disagree on what constitutes their prerogatives, areas of specialization and consultation, an appropriate hierarchy, and other related issues of power, status, and control. In our varied work settings, we are aware of, or quickly learn, our own status within the power dynamics, particularly with respect to stakeholders who feel or are disenfranchised. As anthropologists, we find it valuable to build and maintain rapport with all stakeholders, put them at ease, and share updates on activities and projects whenever possible.
Section 2: Enhancing Operational, Organizational, and Management Effectiveness

12. Respect agreements with employers or clients. Anthropologists engaged in practice usually discuss a new activity or project in detail with their supervisors or clients prior to initiation. Once an agreement is reached (sometimes resulting in a signed contract), carry out the agreement in good faith. If something is amiss or unexpected, there may be room for some negotiation even after the work gets underway. Focus on addressing any supervisor/client requests or issues. At times, conflict may emerge between the client/supervisor and other stakeholders (e.g., a leader with his/her team members, a brand manager with potential users). Sometimes agreement is not possible, and one party may prevail. At other times, the conflict may simmer, causing significant discomfort and perhaps damage among certain stakeholders. In both scenarios, ethical challenges may arise, forcing us to decide our next course of action (e.g., exit the project and/or organization; remain and rebuild).

13. Honor timelines. Once timelines are set in a realistic frame, they should be followed. Missing them may have serious ramifications for subsequent activities and projects, not to mention the current effort. Do not take congenial supervisor/client relationships for granted. Just as we listen to their ideas and concerns, we are also mindful of their time and agreed-upon deadlines. If an unforeseeable challenge arises, alert the supervisor/client and try to negotiate a mutually-agreed-upon alternative.

14. Employ strategic foresight. Organizational planning and decision making maximize the likelihood of success and may mitigate any unexpected effects or unintended consequences. When appropriate, challenge assumptions and identify potential factors and forces affecting desired outcomes. Then brainstorm “what if” scenarios in the work setting and how to address them over time. This approach can offer decision makers a broader set of options related to relevant issues, and suggestions for adapting more readily to unforeseen developments and unintended outcomes. This practice is routine in the corporate world; we believe it should be adopted in all organizational settings. The need for strategic foresight in addressing racial equality in health care is a case in point. During the coronavirus pandemic, stark differences became clear; many minority communities had high rates of infection and severe outcomes and yet were slower than others to get fully vaccinated. The pandemic revealed deep structural inequalities requiring new short- and long-term strategies.

15. Establish and nurture basic and applied research within organizations. Given that anthropologists hold an array of roles in organizational settings (e.g., employee, supervisor, manager, director, consultant), we can be involved directly or indirectly with research efforts and future planning. Propose new or follow-on research as appropriate within and across organizations as relevant. Internal communications about that research may promote inclusivity, improve employee engagement and retention, lead to additional lines of research, and possibly facilitate organizational change. Undertake external presentations, publications, and other communications when possible. Such practices can demonstrate transparency, improve reputation or standing within particular groups or communities, and enable organizations to gather input from outside sources.

16. Anticipate and address administrative and management issues. Plan ahead for such long-term considerations as staff capacity and turnover, emerging innovations, ongoing benchmarks and timelines, technology demands, appropriate analysis, implementation efforts (our own and others), and possible setbacks and problems. Anticipation can help prevent or lessen the effects of unforeseen events or unintended outcomes. It is also critical to plan for an appropriate chain of command (i.e., for projects, activities); key roles (e.g., program management, client liaison, reviewers); processes for recruiting and selecting participants, collaborators, or other stakeholders; adequate resources; timeframes; feedback loops; and other processes and actions that might affect a project or activity.

17. Be mindful of organizational privacy. Recognize and respect privacy considerations in the organization. As professional observers, we know or quickly learn how the internal structures and rules work, as well as the internal differentiation (e.g., across departments, functions, business units) and power dynamics. Exercise care when sharing information, data, or knowledge across organizational boundaries because of internal privacy and security concerns. Communicate in a way that highlights your work in relation to the interests of the group(s) engaged, while relying on the fluidity of the ethnographic approach to understand subsequent reactions.

18. Be aware of potential legal actions. We should bring to our work at least a cursory understanding of applicable employment, contract, and other types of law, as well as access to legal consultation and advice as needed. This awareness is especially important in international settings where laws and regulations may be quite different from Western or U.S. norms. Anthropological statements on ethics say very little about the legalities of our work, but a lawsuit or court challenge can have a devastating impact on careers, research participants, clients, and other stakeholders. In addition to fundamental legal issues, it is important to understand the regulatory and policy environment pertinent to our work. Such knowledge can prevent serious issues and challenges from arising.

Section 3: Protecting Research Participants, Clients, and Ourselves

19. Protect human subjects in research projects. Many of us engage in some form of research, whether foundational, exploratory, experimental, or evaluative. A synecdoche of protection, informed consent obtained from research participants, typically covers issues such as the voluntary nature of the project, potential risks and benefits, data protection and privacy, utilization of findings, and incentives. Some work environments include individuals considered “vulnerable” (e.g., those in schools, nursing homes, hospitals). Informed consent is an especially critical issue with children and youth, the elderly, undocumented immigrants, persons who are homeless, and others who may be in a position to be coerced. This issue is covered in human subjects training. Samples of informed consent forms can be found online, but they will always need to be adapted for the specific circumstances.

20. Obtain human subjects training. Online courses help to keep us current with key ethical issues of human subjects’ research along with the appropriate level of coursework and experience that provide grounding in how to protect subjects. They can create awareness about potential legal exposure regarding consent and taking needed steps up front to mitigate possible infringements on informed consent. Relevant training is offered through the National Institutes of Health course, “Human Subjects Protections Training” (https://humansubjects.nih.gov/resources). The Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) training also offers a program (https://about.citiprogram.org/en/homepage/). Employers of research anthropologists (e.g., federal government, sector-specific organizations) will typically require such training. Some employers may provide their own related training.
21. **Explore IRB compliance.** Most anthropologists understand the value of and generally support the Institutional Review Board (IRB) process available through an institution of higher learning (university) or other source. The IRB process often poses a challenge to project timelines and activities, but the extra measure of protection for research participants can be worthwhile for both them and the researchers. International IRB standards vary widely and must be assessed through this lens; thus, it is important to factor in sufficient time to ensure compliance. However, compliance is not mandated or supported by many employers/clients. In-house researchers would not necessarily be allowed by their employers to submit a research protocol through a university IRB process—particularly for research considered proprietary. Anthropologists without a primary university affiliation would be unable to submit a research project as the lead researcher. Consequently, the IRB process presents complexities that must be considered during research planning. At the very least, however, we should do our best to adhere to best practices in conducting research with study participants.

22. **Secure data protection, privacy, and preservation.** The informed consent process typically specifies data use and protections, as well as dissemination of findings. All data should be protected equally. In studies involving drug use, trauma, neglect, criminal behavior, undocumented immigrant status, and other sensitive areas, special care is required—particularly in conversations and presentations—so that individuals and groups, or the affiliations of those whose privacy has been assured are not inadvertently identified. Before conducting research, consider whether there is a need for long-term preservation of any documents created by the research and, if so, how to preserve them. Most organizations have a policy to address data storage.

23. **Establish ownership of intellectual property.** Contracts between employees and organizations, like those between consultants and clients, typically outline ownership of intellectual property. In employer/employee scenarios, or within team activities, negotiation of data ownership may be prohibited. Alternately, the fine lines may become blurred, such as what counts as proprietary information; who has access to the findings, analyses, and insights for what purposes; and who benefits financially from a patent. Consultants often have greater flexibility in negotiating data ownership compared with full-time employees. As a consultant, always negotiate data ownership clearly in writing—including analyses and results—with the client at the outset of a project or activity.

24. **Consider compensating research respondents and/or participants.** In the U.S., public willingness to complete questionnaires or participate in focus groups has declined for years. During the unprecedented 2020-21 pandemic shutdown, when many people stayed at home as much as possible, public willingness to participate in focus groups may have increased. However, the downward trend is likely to resume when the pandemic recedes. Many survey companies and federal agencies offer financial incentives or honoraria to compensate respondents for their contributions; organizations are sometimes motivated to improve data quality by increasing, or at least maintaining, response rates through incentives. Incentives also acknowledge the time and feedback that respondents provide. In any case, compensation may be especially welcomed by those who are low-income or somehow disadvantaged, or those who are distrustful of authority or unknown figures. For accounting and records, respondents should complete and sign voucher sheets to document incentive receipt (e.g., cash, gift card). However, be aware that in some public contexts, such as some universities, there are often constraints on such compensation.

25. **Uphold the integrity of the ethnographic process when clients and other stakeholders observe research activities.** Clients and stakeholders may wish to observe individual and group interviews. This opportunity enables them to learn directly from participants and experience open-ended questions and other features of the ethnographic process. However, it is important to provide clients and stakeholders with a brief introduction to ethnographic methods prior to any data gathering. Ask them to remain silent while you work with study participants, and reserve their questions until you have finished. This kind of observational experience for them can lead to fruitful discussion among researchers, clients, and stakeholders.

26. **Represent research participants carefully.** Project analyses of participants or groups of participants may carry significant weight in how decision makers proceed. It is important to think through and assess all conclusions carefully. Do not be rushed or arbitrary, particularly when working with specialized groups with no access to the findings and conclusions, and who may be unable to present alternative perspectives. Offset this potential issue by validating the results and recommendations with study participants and/or knowledgeable specialists. Validation enables us to have confidence in project findings, conclusions, recommendations, tools, interventions, and other deliverables.

27. **Understand how to protect yourself and negotiate protections with clients.** Be aware of and learn how to keep safe from potential physical, emotional, and mental harm. We deal with many types of people, not always in the best of circumstances. Think through all possible things that could go wrong: respondent violence, random street theft, flat tires in remote areas, being isolated on unfriendly turf, not to mention emotional and mental duress from hearing heart-breaking stories of others, having verbal abuse aimed at you, or learning about harm done to others. Anticipate as possible, and do not undertake risks without adequate planning and preparation. If you find yourself going into a situation that makes you feel under threat, consider seeking help through the following potential sources, depending on the specifics of your situation: your current boss, an HR process, grant program managers, consular or embassy officials, nearby colleagues, and/or powerful local leaders or groups. If you can find no way to resolve the situation, you may choose to exit the project before matters escalate further.

28. **Be firm with client payments.** Applied anthropologists working as consultants may occasionally come across a client who delays, disputes, or refuses payment for work done. Along with your contract, a paper trail as noted above gives you a record of what was agreed to when, and what was done. Always try to clarify expectations from the start and be aware of changes in client responses and attitudes. If you find yourself in such a situation, put messaging out to colleagues (while keeping client names private) to see how others have handled situations like yours. Try to go up the chain of command as possible but know that leadership will usually side with their employees and not an outsider. If matters cannot be resolved cordially or through compromise, consider the pros and cons of taking legal action.
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**APPENDICES**

* Foundational Approaches of Anthropological Practice
These foundational approaches and standards are the ideal for how we should apply anthropology in our work, no matter the sector(s). Some of these are rather unique to anthropology, while others could be applied in other disciplines just as easily. They will overlap at times, and not all will be relevant in all contexts. But generally, these are approaches that set our work apart.

**Ethnographic**
At the heart of anthropological work is the concept of culture. This can be the culture of a workplace, of a project, or a particular setting. In any case, overtly or covertly, we take nothing for granted, look beyond “face value,” and try to get below the surface to the underlying components and dynamics of why people behave the way they do, and how to most effectively navigate in that context.

**Cross cultural**
We recognize that different groups have different ways of behavior that make sense to them. When there is a conflict, we should be ready to serve as culture brokers to try to mediate misunderstandings.

**Emic/etic**
Ideally, these perspectives ultimately complement each other. Emic is understanding the way a group thinks and how they behave under a given set of accepted rules; we take into consideration and negotiate the views, experiences and perspectives of stakeholders. Etic is the outsider’s analysis and interpretation of the group’s behavior. It is the anthropologist’s role to combine these two perspectives accurately toward the most effective ends.

**Holistic**
It is very anthropological to look at all sides of an issue, and to consider all sources of information from all available sources, before rendering an analysis or interpretation. Individuals and issues are at the center of a web of connections, relationships, and influences, and we need to sort out all strands of the web.

**Interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary**
Given our frequent work across a broad arc of professional orientations, these two standards are understandable. In general, being interdisciplinary means integrating data, information, knowledge and/or methods from different disciplines, creating a synthesis of analysis. Multidisciplinary is learning about and working collaboratively with other approaches and professionals, understanding their points and taking into consideration different ways of achieving goals.

**Historical, contextual, comparative**
Take into account all available information, past and present, and use it in its proper context to compare options and insights. The end goal is to derive the best results based on all available information. This is systems thinking: viewing a situation, behavior, or action in context and history, rather than in isolation.

**Scientific approaches and methods**
Even in purely creative endeavors, there is a foundation of science to guide our decisions and actions. Knowable facts, observations, and logic guide our actions rather than gut feelings and hopeful interpretation.

**Self-awareness**
To be most accurate and effective, we need to know ourselves and our internal biases, and be transparent in our work. We must also keep in mind our effect on others, as well as relevant power dynamics, cultural blind spots, and other situational factors.

**Validity**
We should always match our programs or activities with the interests and needs of the funders or client/community. Similarly, we need to match the budgets with the programs or activities.
Win-win
Our orientation is to try to create situations in which all stakeholders benefit, without resulting advantages and disadvantages across individuals or groups. It does not always work, but that's the approach.

Findings and results
In many situations we work with stakeholders to rapidly synthesize and co-construct analysis, information, knowledge, and direction, and to understand the translation of information and knowledge into decisions leading to action. It is vital to pay attention to the policy implications of our work. We rarely work in a vacuum.

* Ethical Considerations
To set the stage for best practices, one should first be familiar with NAPA’s ethical guidelines for practice, which were subject to deep review and revision, and then approval of NAPA members in 2018. There are also ethical standards put forth by the AAA, SFAA, the Society for American Archaeology, and the Register of Professional Archaeologists.

Professional statements of ethics in anthropology

NAPA: https://www.practicinganthropology.org/practice/ethics/
AAA: http://ethics.americananthro.org/category/statement/
SFAA: https://www.appliedanthro.org/about (click “ethics”)
SAA: https://www.saa.org/career-practice/ethics-in-professional-archaeology
RPA: https://rpanet.org/code-and-standards

See also the AAA Ethics Forum

* Selected References by Topic Area
Below are key references to relevant online (in most cases) books, articles, and other resources. Most of these refer to or represent best practices.

Archeology


Biological Anthropology


Census Work
Redding, Terry, and Laurie Schwede. 2014. Terry Redding podcast interview with Laurie Schwede on her research at the U.S. Census Bureau on the NAPA website. https://www.practicinganthropology.org/blog/interviews/laurie-schwede/


Community Development


Consumer Research


Design Anthropology

The Applied Anthropologist

MCCABE ET AL.  Best Practices...

Economics and Capitalism


Education


Environmental/Ecological Practice


Health Care


Human Rights


Innovation and Implementation


Methodology


Migration


Organizations


Theory to Practice

**General Resources**

**Key anthropology organizations** (for anthropologists working in government, business, and non-profit settings)
- The National Association for the Practice of Anthropology (NAPA): [https://www.practicinganthropology.org](https://www.practicinganthropology.org)
- American Anthropological Association (AAA): [https://www.americananthro.org](https://www.americananthro.org)
- Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA): [https://www.appliedanthro.org](https://www.appliedanthro.org)
- The Washington Association of Professional Anthropologists (WAPA): [https://wapauc.org](https://wapauc.org)
- Business Anthropology Community: [https://www.businessanthro.com](https://www.businessanthro.com)
- Ethnographic Praxis in Industry Conference (EPIC): [https://www.epicpeople.org](https://www.epicpeople.org)
- Ethnobreakfast: A Bay Area Practitioners Group for Ethnographers in Industry: [https://sites.google.com/view/ethnobreakfast/home](https://sites.google.com/view/ethnobreakfast/home)
- EthnOrorel: Networking for Professional Ethnographers: [https://ethnoborrel.eu](https://ethnoborrel.eu)
- Canadian Anthropology Society/Société Canadienne d’Anthropologie (CASCA): [https://www.cos-sca.ca](https://www.cos-sca.ca)
- European Association of Social Anthropologists (EASA), including EASA Applied Anthropology Network: [https://www.easaoonline.org](https://www.easaoonline.org)
- Assistant Professor of Social Anthropologists of the UK (ASA), including the ASA Network of Applied Anthropologists: [https://www.thesoa.org](https://www.thesoa.org)
- Society for American Archaeology (SAA): [https://www.saa.org](https://www.saa.org)
- Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA): [https://rpanet.org/](https://rpanet.org/)

**Professional statements of ethics in anthropology**

- NAPA: [https://www.practicinganthropology.org/practice/ethics/](https://www.practicinganthropology.org/practice/ethics/)
- AAA: [https://ethics.americananthro.org/category/statement/](https://ethics.americananthro.org/category/statement/)
- SfAA: [https://www.appliedanthro.org/about](https://www.appliedanthro.org/about) - click “ethics”

**Books and materials on practice**

**Books**
- The Cultural Dimension of Global Business, Gary P. Ferraro and Elizabeth K. Briody, 2017 (8th ed.).

**Journals**
- Annals of Anthropological Practice, NAPA
- Practicing Anthropology, SfAA
- The Applied Anthropologist, High Plains Society for Applied Anthropology
- Journal of Business Anthropology

**AAA webinars**
- Applying Anthropology Outside the Academy, AAA Society for Medical Anthropology and the Society for Psychological Anthropology, May 21, 2021
- Grant Writing for Dissertations & Beyond, AAA Society for Medical Anthropology and the Society for Psychological Anthropology, April 29, 2021
- Anthropologists Building Careers in GIS (Geographic Information Systems), Gideon Singer and Kyle Jones, April 22, 2021
- Using Archaeological and Anthropological Skill Sets as Accessible Designers, Rachael Penfil and Cheryl Fogle-Hatch, April 15, 2021
- Careers in the Public Sector, Ariela Zycherman and Steven Thomson, April 8, 2021
- Contemplating a Career in Tech? Kevin Newton and Astrid Countee, April 1, 2021
- Doing Cultural Resource Management (CRM) Your Way, Dennis Griffin and Misty Jackson, March 25, 2021
- Anthropologists Working in Hospital Settings, Nadine Bendycki and Joshua Liggett, March 18, 2021
- User Experience (UX) Jobs from the Inside Out, Rachel Fleming and Lisanne Norman, March 11, 2021
- Career Pathways, Palmyra Jackson and Katie Patschke, March 4, 2021
- Deep Hanging Out...Digitally: Social Media Strategies for the Contemporary Job Market, Ingrid Ramón Parra and Adam Gamwell, September 24, 2020
- Demystifying the Fear around Job Searches, Beth Holland, Alison Davis, and Jeanne Baker, September 17, 2020
- The Art of Persuasion: Articulating Anthropology’s Value to a Prospective Employer, Robert Morris, David Fetterman, Shirley Fiske, Alexandra Jones, and Ken Erickson, September 10, 2020
- Facing the Interview Squad: Strategies that Impress, Jo Aiken, Gigi Taylor, and Cathleen CRAIN, July 30, 2020
- This is Not Your Parents’ Resume: New Ways to Tell Your Story, Dawn Lehman, Jo Aiken, Molly Rempe, Adam Gamwell, Ingrid Ramón Parra, July 23, 2020
5 Secrets for Building Networks that Lead to Jobs, Elizabeth K. Briody, Ann Reed, Elizabeth Wirtz, Beth Holland, and Keith Kellersohn, July 16, 2020
Get Hired! Showcase Your Unique Value: Using the Elevator Pitch, Sabrina Nichelle Scott, Sherylyn H. Briller, and Amy Goldmacher, July 9, 2020
More than Models: The Media and the Economy of a Time of COVID-19, Gillian Tett, April 9, 2019
COVID-19: Responses from Around the Globe, Davide Barbieri, Sala Missoni, and Gideon Lasco, April 2, 2020
Providing Expert Testimony: Promises and Pitfalls of Engaging in Immigration Proceedings, Aidin Castillo, Beatriz Reyes Foster, Lauren Heidbrink, and Leila Rodríguez, October 18, 2019
Charting Your Course: Developing a Personal Strategic Plan, Melissa Vogel, October 3, 2018
Protecting Immigrant and Undocumented Students, Gregory Chen, March 15, 2017
Understanding and Responding to the Zika Crisis from an Anthropological Perspective, Kristin Hedges, Craig Janes, Aradu Castro, and Juliet Bedford, April 29, 2016
Practicing Anthropology in User Experience, Design and Business, Amy Santee, January 6, 2016
Medical Anthropology in the 21st Century, Lenore Manderson, September 2, 2015
Doing “Consumer” Anthropology: Warnings and Advice, Ken C. Erickson, September 17, 2014
A Career in Practice: First Steps for Anthropologists, Riall Nolan, January 22, 2014

* Other Publications Selected Mainly from Journal and Encyclopedia Articles


* Other Resources

“We can’t prevent tomorrow’s catastrophes unless we imagine them today.” Scoblic, J. Peter. The Washington Post (online), March 18, 2021.

A COMMENTARY: MORAL INJURY

TED ENGELMANN

ABSTRACT

This commentary is based on my personal search for more than fifty years as a war veteran, to gain understanding as to how emotional wounds of war and moral injury affect veterans, of all nationalities. Over time, members of the High Plains Society for Applied Anthropology have influenced me to expand my inquiry and consider emotional wounds and moral injury as major parts of life also experienced by Indigenous populations and communities of color in America. It seems, especially these days, that moral injuries continue to burn throughout our society, and that anthropologists have skills that can help calm the fire.

KEY WORDS: PTSD, moral injury, veterans, Indigenous populations, communities of color

“We honor our veterans for their bravery and because by seeing death on the battlefield they truly know the greatness of life.” --Winnebago Elder

“...I cannot escape the suspicion that what we do as mental health professionals is not as good as the healing that in other cultures has been rooted in the native soil of the returning soldier’s community” (Shay 1994: 194).

It was fifty-two years ago that I returned to the “World” after serving a year in Viet Nam. Since then, I have been searching to understand the emotional wounds of war in veterans from four cultures: American; our two major allies, Korean and Australian; and Vietnamese. Participating in the American War in Viet Nam, and as a freelance embed photographer with the US Army in Iraq (2008) and Afghanistan (2009), it is my belief that emotional wounds of war are partially responsible for the 21 suicides every day among American active duty military (4), and our veteran population (17). Further, it is my belief that we must understand the meaning of the term “moral injury.”

Although my one and only anthropology class was in 1972, I believe that my work has embraced some key features of anthropological methodology. Through many years participating with the High Plains Society for Applied Anthropology (HSPSAA), I have come to appreciate that Indigenous populations and communities of color, “other than white,” have experienced emotional wounds from more than four-hundred years of denigrating treatment and genocide by a government of white European immigrants. For the record, I am “white.”

In 1980, five years after the end of the American War in Viet Nam, the term Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) was coined by the American Psychological Association (APA) in their mental-health “bible,” the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Health Disorders (DSM-III, 3rd edition). Although a great number of American Veterans had emotional wounds from the war in Viet Nam, emotional wounds of war were nothing new. The American Civil War had “Soldier’s Heart.” World War I had “Shell Shock.” World War II had “Combat Fatigue” and “n-p” (neuro-psychiatric) for the worst cases. During World War II, the U.S. military and the Veterans Administration built facilities nationwide to help combat veterans with their health care. Still, with all this thoughtful attention to the returning veterans, the psychological scars of war went unrecognized, and traumatic neuroses disappeared entirely from official psychiatric nomenclature. The last scientific writing on combat trauma after World War II appeared in 1947 (Van der Kolk 2014: 187).

As a result of PTSD being accepted as a service-connected diagnosis, the VA was forced to treat veterans at VA Mental Health Clinics (VAMHC). Walk-in “Vet Centers” were established for veterans who had negative experiences with the VA, which were quite a few.

In 2014, Jonathan Shay, who for twenty years was the sole psychiatrist counseling veterans at a Boston VA hospital, wrote, “The term moral injury has recently begun to circulate in the literature on psychological trauma. It has been used in two related, but distinct, senses; differing mainly in the ‘who’ of moral agency” (p. 182).

Shay’s initial concept stated moral injury occurred when there had been a betrayal of what’s right by a person in legitimate authority in a high stakes situation—meaning life and death.

A second form of moral injury occurs when an individual, such as a soldier, acts against their own moral code, i.e., they kill an innocent child. They realize, “I did it” (Litz, et al.,2009: 29).

Shay reflects, “Both forms of moral injury impair the capacity for trust and elevate despair, suicidality, and interpersonal violence. They deteriorate character” (2014: 182). Therefore, not only does moral injury address the current problems of emotional trauma among the military and veterans, I believe the concept can be applied to Native Americans and people of color reacting to the historic genocidal treatment of their ancestors and current repressions.

Out of the many Native American protests of the 1960s and 1970s, two garnered significant press and awareness. From November 1969 to February 1971, the defunct prison on Alcatraz Island in San Francisco Bay was occupied by “Indians of All Tribes.” At first, the event garnered considerable press and many Hollywood stars brought their glitter to the island, but in a few months the group broke into factions. After 19 months the occupation ended with less than a dozen people remaining on the island.

In protest to conditions on their reservation, in February 1973, members of the American Indian Movement (AIM) began the 71-day Siege of Wounded Knee, located on the Pine Ridge Reservation in southwestern South Dakota. On December 29, 1890, the U.S. 7th
Cavalry had massacred between 150 and 300 Lakota men, women, and children at Wounded Knee. In an effort to “…remove the stain from our nation’s history…” on November 2, 2021, Sen. Elizabeth Warren and 15 other Congressional members requested that President Joe Biden use his executive authority to rescind the twenty Medals of Honor awarded to soldiers who participated in the Wounded Knee Massacre (https://www.warren.senate.gov).

These were just two of many wide-spread uprisings against cultural encroachment by the government and industry. One result came about when the government passed the Indian Self-Determination and Educational Assistance Act of 1975. Currently, Deb Haaland (as the first Native American appointed Secretary of the Interior) is bringing hope to many.

It is my interpretation that World War II was the last American war declared by Congress. The American wars in Viet Nam, Iraq, and Afghanistan were foisted upon the American people and other nations by American presidents without a declaration of war. Contrary to popular belief, those of us who served in the American military were not fighting for “American freedoms.” Out of the Pentagon Papers (1971) and the Afghanistan Papers (2020), it appears we were in a (failed) racket to build nations.

As a result of the damaged bodies and souls of Americans (and others), it seems possible that the moral injury of soldiers, as well as our nation, is derived from the lies by presidents, the military, and politicians. The destruction of the land and human suffering (e.g., via Agent Orange chemicals and cluster bombs), is beyond understanding and repair.

In December 2008, I was a freelance embed photographer at a Combat OutPost (COP) in Baghdad, Iraq. Several weeks after leaving the COP, word came that the last young man I shook hands with, took his gun and went into a Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP). He died of a single gunshot wound. Although no one knows why, perhaps emotional wounds and/or moral injury played a part in this and other similar unfortunate, albeit too frequent, events.

“How does moral injury change someone?” Shay (as quoted by a peace-time veteran) further explains, “It deteriorates their character; their ideals, ambitions and attachments begin to change and shrink. Both flavors of moral injury impair and sometimes destroy the capacity for trust. When social trust is destroyed, it is replaced by the settled expectancy of harm, exploitation and humiliation from others” (Newhouse 2015: 5, https://www.psychologytoday.com).

For years I have felt moral injury might be one of the reasons for the high rate of suicide among active-duty service members (including Reserves and National Guard), and our veteran population (daily, 4 and 17 respectively, as noted earlier).

Recently, an insidious form of governmental repression has been unearthed, literally. Several hundred unmarked burial sites of Indian children have been located in Canada and the U.S. In British Columbia, “…from 1863 to as recently as 1998 – more than 130 residential schools such as Kamloops, Marieval, St. Eugene’s and Kuper Island were funded by the Canadian government, and until 1969 many of the schools were operated by Christian churches. These schools forcibly separated Indigenous children from their families and isolated them from their communities and cultures, according to Indigenous Foundations, a website for the First Nations Studies Program at the University of British Columbia. To date, more than 1,000 unmarked children’s graves and remains have been identified at former Indigenous residential boarding schools in Canada” (Weisberger, 2021, https://www.livescience.com).

Canada’s seven-year Truth and Reconciliation Commission “…ultimately determined that at least 3,200 children died while a student at a Residential School; one in every 50 students enrolled during the program’s nearly 120-year existence” (Hopper 2021, https://nationalpost.com).

In the U.S., for more than 140 years, Indigenous children, like First Nations in Canada, and Aborigines in Australia, were torn from their families (sound familiar?) and sent to government schools where they would shed their native hairstyles, clothes, languages and customs, and be forced to assimilate into so-called white culture.

Lt. Col. Richard Henry Pratt, founder of the Carlisle Indian School, Carlisle, PA (1879-1918), one of the 357 U.S. government-run schools for Native American children, had a motto: “Kill the Indian, save the man.”

In present-day terms, “The impact of boarding schools, as detailed by the National Native American Healing Coalition, accounts for much of the intergenerational trauma experienced by Indigenous communities, including loss of identity, low self-esteem, no sense of safety, institutionalization, and difficulty forming healthy relationships” (Kunze, 2021, https://nativenewsonline.net).

Over the past twenty months, more than 750,000 Americans have died from COVID-19. It seems many thousands of these deaths were preventable. Native Americans and communities of color have been especially hit hard.

The previous president apparently lied when he denied the virus existed. After fifteen cases were identified, he quipped, “one day, it will go away, like a miracle.” On 13 March 2020, the president stated “I am not responsible.” He abdicated his role as commander-in-chief and protector of the people of our nation, telling every state to fend for themselves. The result: chaos and death.

On January 6, 2021, the nation watched the same president encourage and support an attack on our nation’s capital. The result: several deaths, hundreds of police injured, and four police eventually dying by suicide.

In a Congressional hearing, a number of the officers told lawmakers that they suffered both lingering physical and psychological pain – including PTSD – as a result of the attack. Some police testified that they feared for their lives during the attack. Others lambasted Republican lawmakers who have tried to downplay the unprecedented assault on the halls of Congress.

“You know, if you didn’t know the TV footage was a video from Jan. 6, you would actually think it was a normal tourist visit.” While there were “some rioters,” Rep. Andrew Clyde (R-Ga.) said it was a “bald-faced lie” to call it an insurrection (https://www.huffpost.com).

Under these conditions, it feels as though America is facing its own moral injury. Apparently many Republicans are hoping Americans will develop a form of PTSD: Post Traumatic Stress Denial.

In simple, but profound terms, I believe moral injury can occur when a person, a community, or a nation, is betrayed by a leader or an institution. This can occur over centuries of systematic cultural abuse and genocide, when one is sent to fight illegal wars, or protecting the lives of Congressional members, then abused and denied recognition by Congressional seditionists. It appears there is an on-going moral
injury to all Indigenous people, communities of color, immigrants, and now our American nation at-large.

Finally, on a positive note, applied anthropologists follow a code of ethics in their work, supporting the development of the communities with which they work and serve. Some of those considerations include the application of ethics and issue-specific knowledge as effective problem-solvers, and the ability to understand social relationships and context within the larger world. With empathy, anthropologists evaluate and identify a myriad of issues involving social, economic, and political conditions that impact the final recommendations leading to policies and organizational directives; similar conditions can be identified that comprise our nation. Demonstrating relevant behaviors in the public arena can provide examples for others to emulate, and therefore potentially reduce moral injury in the future.

Recently I was reminded how Peter Van Arsdale, one of the co-founders of the HPSfAA, described the work of anthropologists: “It’s not what we do, it’s not who we are, it’s how we live.” Those prescient words seem to be a positive model for the present world, as well as for our future.

Ted Engelmann received his M.A. from the Graduate School of International Studies at the University of Denver (1990). Ted is a war veteran, international educator, and photographer. He is also a member of the High Plains board. He can be reached at: mail@tedengelmann.com.
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Female genital mutilation or FGM is an ancient practice. FGM is rarely acknowledged or widely discussed in advanced societies or in developing countries. Looking to the future increases the importance of assessing current forms of FGM. The pandemic now affecting the economies of families everywhere may increase the custom of arranging early marriages for girls and younger women. An example of this is the 2021 research by UNICEF on the relationship between child marriage and FGM. My commentary goes on to look at who currently practices FGM across the world and how this issue can arise in U.S. schools or communities in the UK. The complexity of FGM as a socially sensitive issue is brought out. As well, the efforts of African families to put an end to the FGM custom are noted. This article concludes with the significance of continuing research on FGM and the hope that others will take up studies to expand awareness of this complicated social and cultural tradition.

**Key Words:** FGM: female genital mutilation, human rights, future society, culturally sensitive issues

The theme of “ground truthing and futurisms” is highlighted in this issue of *The Applied Anthropologist*. We speak of “looking to the future” when unprecedented situations are to be examined. This is crucial when we ask, “whose future?” Futurisms can provide new and unique insights into circumstances, concerns, and seldom recognized conditions. Ground truthing and futurisms are pertinent and timely for bringing attention to the practice of female genital mutilation (FGM). It is generally understood that FGM is the procedure of cutting or removing all or part of the female genitalia. The procedure of FGM is an ancient ritual hardly talked about or brought up in developed, “advanced” societies like the United States or the European Union.

In this article I bring out the need for a re-examination of FGM. The present and the future for coping with FGM is influenced by the COVID-19 pandemic as it reaches into customs, lifeways and traditions. Of these is the custom of early marriages for young girls. We are recognizing that the pandemic has brought on a downturn of the global economy affecting many nations. It is possible that conditions will drive a lot of adolescent girls into marriage before the age of 18 as more families turn to early marriages for financial survival. Generally when child marriages increase so does the practice of FGM. In some parts of the world, particularly in nations of Africa and Southeast Asia, there is concern over the chastity of the proposed bride affecting the bride-price or the family’s reputation. Those involved recognize that child marriage and FGM could be the situation facing vast numbers of girls and young women all over the world. UNICEF has launched an important and wide-ranging research study on these conditions. Published in early 2021, the study is titled “Understanding the Relationship between Child Marriage and Female Genital Mutilation: A Statistical Overview.” Covering 28 countries in Africa and Southeast Asia, this report seeks to identify the extent to which child marriage and FGM co-exist and appear to be increasing or lessening in the countries surveyed. However, it is beyond the scope of my commentary to discuss the national situations presented in the study.

Now FGM is surfacing even in elementary (primary) schools as refugee families from the African and Asian continents flee wars and political unrest. These families are migrating to Western Europe and the United States. Articles and accounts in newspapers and journals reveal the growing global awareness of FGM of young girls and teenage girls. There have been recent movements in African nations to provide grassroots action to end the practice of FGM. The Inter-African Committee on Harmful Traditional Practices called for zero tolerance for FGM. Yet today, this widely condemned practice is deeply embedded in the ethnic identity of some traditional cultures. While female circumcision practices are common in some Muslim countries and cultures it is totally absent from others.

**Who Practices FGM?**

Families that have migrated to Western Europe, Britain and the United States from the following nations may insist that various forms of FGM be performed on their girl-children. They may be from: Somalia, Senegal, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Egypt, Mali, Sudan, Sierra Leone, Burkina Faso, the Gambia, Ivory Coast, Guinea-Bissau, Nigeria, Kenya, Mauritius, Chad, Benin, Togo, Ghana, Tanzania, Uganda, India, Pakistan, Indonesia, and Malaysia. The reasons parents and members of these ethnic communities give for practicing FGM are to guarantee virginity in their girls, to control women’s sexual activity, and to promote cleanliness. Religious reasons may be used to condone these practices although none of the major faiths refer to FGM explicitly and many leading theologians condemn FGM. Social services and health workers have learned that often parents of girl-children, now residing in Western societies, may deeply want to resist having their young girls mutilated. However, they can be severely ostracized by their ethnic community as a result.

**Why should we in the developed nations be aware of the little known or discussed rites of FGM?** Why for the future should these practices, once considered a cultural or an individual family matter, be interpreted as abuses of child and human rights? A recent report from the U.S. State Department noted that women’s rights, including sexual and reproductive rights, are human rights (Schwikowski 2021). Furthermore, policies for these efforts are planned in federal funding. Awareness of FGM affecting girls, as young as those in elementary school, has reached into our public schools. An experienced teacher shared the following disturbing incident in her classroom of 8- to 9-year-olds. This teacher explained:
Enrolled was a nine-year-old girl from a family who recently emigrated from Ethiopia. She was a lively child succeeding well, enjoying her school and classmates, achieving in reading and mathematics especially, above grade level. Then suddenly one day her father came to my classroom and told me that the girl would be absent for several weeks because they were returning for a visit to Ethiopia, so this young girl and her siblings could be re-acquainted with her grandparents.

When the girl returned to my class after about a month, I saw a drastic change in her demeanor. She was pale, very quiet, and withdrawn. After about a week in class, I noticed a pool of blood underneath the chair where she was sitting. I summoned the school nurse at once. During the ensuing investigation we discovered that she had undergone a total excision including infibulation while in Ethiopia. The clitoral removal along with her labials being sewn shut had created such pain for her during urination that it caused extensive bleeding. We reported the situation to the district’s Social Services immediately because we were worried not only about her condition, but also about her younger sisters. I was deeply troubled by this situation and spent many sleepless nights worrying about this lovely child and her younger sisters. (King 2009)

In our schools, the number of incidents being reported is growing. Information about FGM is found in the scholarly papers of international feminist writers, anthropologists, and women’s health advocates. I was surprised to find excellent coverage and discussion of FGM on, of all places, Wikipedia! Wikipedia covers events, happenings, and the people involved in FGM actions based on more than 200 references. These FGM topics include history; terminology; procedures (including illustrations); human rights basis of concerns; international data; statistics on who practices FGM; and coverage of personalities, social scientists, and women’s rights advocates of many nations working globally to end practices of FGM.

During the late 1990s articles and accounts in leading American and British newspapers began featuring reports about FGM. It was becoming apparent to health workers and lawmakers that the practice of FGM was rising. Immigrants from several of the 40 or more countries in Africa and the Middle East (where mutilation is an accepted custom and practice), took up residence in what they deemed as safer havens. The circumstances in the account of the American teacher above appear almost identical to those in the following report describing the childhood experiences of a woman from Somalia that has undergone FGM:

When I had the operation, I was eight years old. I was taken back to Somalia and I had the operation performed. Because I was very young, I did not know what was happening to me, what they were doing to me. They strip you. They open your legs apart and they have ladies holding every part of your body, even holding your mouth to prevent you from screaming. I still remember the pain to this day. My sister was circumcised first and straight after she was done, I was done. In terms of what has happened to us, we just use the term being ‘sewn up’, having the clitoris cut off and having been sewn up for us not have any sexual intercourse or anything! (King 2009)

This testimony was given by a 25-year-old British woman from the Somali community to encourage preventative action on FGM. She was threatened by members of her community for being so candid about her mutilation.

What Constitutes Female Genital Mutilation?
Information about what these procedures entail is much needed for most people have little knowledge of this cultural practice. Health consultant and educator Efua Dorkenoo wrote the authoritative book Cutting the Rose: Female Genital Mutilation, The Practice and Its Prevention for such a purpose (1994). In her book she details the following degrees of FGM, as opposed to what has been euphemistically termed “female circumcision”:

- **Circumcision:** or the removal of the prepuce or hood of the clitoris. Circumcision is the mildest type of mutilation and affects only a small proportion of the millions of women concerned.

- **Excision:** meaning partial or totally cutting of the clitoris and all or part of the labia minora. In some cases, the labia majora are removed but with no stitching. Excision is the most widespread type of mutilation. Approximately 80 percent of those affected undergo excision.

- **Infibulation:** the cutting of the clitoris, labia minora and at least the anterior two-thirds and often the whole of the medial part of the labia majora. The two sides of the vulva are then pinned together by silk or catgut sutures, or thorns, thus obliterating the vaginal introitus except for a small opening, preserved by the insertion of a tiny piece of wood or reed for the passage of urine or menstrual blood. The girl’s legs are then bound together from hip to ankle, and she is kept immobile for up to forty days to permit the formation of scar tissue. (Dorkenoo 1994)

Efua Dorkenoo, widely known globally for her work to end female genital mutilation, died in October 2014. In an impressive obituary The Guardian stated that Dorkenoo was instrumental in putting FGM on the agenda of ministries of health while working at the World Health Organization from 1995-2000. During her lifetime Efua Dorkenoo was recognized and awarded many times by national organizations and governments for her campaigning to end FGM practices.

Complexity of a Culturally Sensitive Issue

Now and into the future this culturally sensitive issue can be intertwined with accusations of racism and sexism on the part of parents, government officials, and educational authorities. Educators and health workers taking up the cause of protecting young schoolgirls can be labeled as racist. But failure to act to protect girl children at risk of mutilation would be a perverse sort of racism. Child protection is essential. We can no longer close our minds and turn our backs on what, in the 21st Century, is recognized as an unmitigated violation of human rights. Despite the accusations of cultural insensitivity, racism, and interference with family preference, postmodern societies are now putting into legislation measures to end female genital mutilation. FGM is not a disease per se but a complex social practice. Currently and in the future society needs to understand why people practice FGM despite its numerous health consequences, and develop policies, strategies, and skills to prevent it.

The Custom Is Changing

However, in some places changing attitudes about FGM have mothers saying to their daughters “You will not be cut!” The actions numerous African mothers called for in the last decade of the 20th century are now oc-
currying. An example is villages in Senegal, representing approximately 220,000 people, that have stopped the practice of FGM. These people did not end female genital cutting in response to outside pressure or national laws. Instead, it was a grassroots movement that put an end to the practice. Strategies for encouraging and supporting women, men, mothers, and fathers who want to eradicate FGM in the communities and nations that have traditionally practiced these cultural and social rites are now being strongly advocated everywhere. Women’s rights advocates have pointed out these encouraging trends. Governmental and human rights organizations, especially in the West, are mounting campaigns to implement women’s rights and end practices such as FGM. However, various excuses are offered by powerful agencies. These hold that issues relating to FGM, while regrettable, are actually cultural and are not political matters appropriate for broad governmental actions.

FGM has become a sensationalized and confrontational topic, embedded as it is in cultural, religious, racial, and sexual practices. But this does not mean it should be avoided in educational settings or in the wider public milieu because of the ancient origins that make it so difficult to eradicate. Young girls and teenagers are the victims of this cultural practice abrogating their human rights. Currently, 15 African countries have passed legislation that specifically bans FGM. Other nations are under pressure to do the same. Human rights principles can be employed as a lens through which to assess cultural practices and values.

**Researching FGM**

Indeed, there is a need for more attention and research on FGM. It deserves further investigation and monitoring to expand awareness of this act. Futurisms and ground truthing can bring insights and information for investigating changes or new developments affecting the practice of FGM. As I noted at the beginning of this commentary, the COVID-19 pandemic continues to push girls and younger women into early marriage. So the practice of early marriage can be considered as a human rights issue. Sensitive matters, such as FGM, may be difficult to investigate especially since this category of research does not lend itself to measurement, graphs, and scales. Hard-to-study topics often are best approached through open-ended, explorative qualitative methods. When wrestling with emotionally charged topics like FGM, the researcher needs to be prepared and aware of their personal attitudes and beliefs before attempting to talk with others about such concerns. Although FGM poses some difficult issues it can be addressed through thoughtful, open-ended inquiry. For the future of FGM investigations, I hope others will find my efforts here to be useful.
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ABSTRACT
Rules were put into place to protect people from unethical research practices and have been developed by government agencies and implemented by IRBs, Institutional Review Boards. This commentary discusses some of the history, need and development of IRBs and their important role in continuing human-based research. IRBs exist to protect people from being harmed or exploited in any way. However, unintended consequences can come from good decisions. While their intentions are good, the IRBs’ rules when concerning anthropological research can be overly cautious and impede the work of thoughtful, highly trained and experienced researchers dedicated to the protection and betterment of their human subjects. Anthropological and ethnographic research have at the heart of their idealism the protection, understanding and wellbeing of the people impacted. This hasn’t always been the case, but contemporary researchers are held to high standards of ethical codes of conduct and best practices. The standards of ethical treatment of human subjects are at the center of both IRBs’ and anthropologists’ ideologies, however through the use of IRBs and their unique structure, approval of anthropological research can sometimes be complicated and denied due to a lack of others’ professional understanding of the ethical standards commonly practiced by anthropologists. Due to these conditions, alternate methods might be considered when conducting research that appropriately circumnavigates the need for an IRB’s approval. An IRB’s lack of understanding should not become a hindrance when considering otherwise ethically conducted research that should be done to benefit a better understanding of the human condition.

KEY WORDS: Institutional Review Boards, anthropology research, ethnographic research, ethics

What is the Institutional Review Board
The Institutional Review Board (IRB) is an entity that exists within nearly every higher educational institution as well as hospitals, research facilities, non-profits and other institutions that engage in human-based research. The FDA (U.S. Food and Drug Administration) and the HHS (Department of Health and Human Services, specifically the Office for Human Research Protections) are the governing entities that have established the guidelines which inform how IRBs are constructed and implemented:

Under FDA regulations, an IRB is an appropriately constituted group that has been formally designated to review and monitor biomedical research involving human subjects. In accordance with FDA regulations, an IRB has the authority to approve, require modifications in (to secure approval), or disapprove research. This group review serves an important role in the protection of the rights and welfare of human research subjects. (U.S. Food and Drug Administration 1998)

The Need for Protection Against Unethical Research
The basic idea behind the IRB is that it is supposed to protect human subjects that are being targeted for research. While the FDA website specifically calls out “biomedical research” as the main concern for human research subjects, IRBs have also been used to consider cultural research as well. This is where we are going to be looking at some of the issues dealing a system that was originally designed for a specific research paradigm, but doesn’t always translate to a very different and complex area of research, specifically cultural studies.

Dealing with cultures presents a different set of problems. While medical research can be involved, it is not always one of the main concerns for anthropological or sociological projects. Cultural impacts from researchers can have an effect on a community, but that impact may present in different ways and have different consequences. There are also going to be concerns about how members of different cultures are going to react to being researched, not everyone has the same experiences or ideologies as many western cultures do and people will react in different ways. Cultural relativity should be a major consideration when contemplating doing research and how it will impact the targeted community. A problem that we will explore is how cultural idealism and bias can impact a research project and an IRB’s ability to comprehend the actual and theoretical concerns of dealing with said cultures.

While keeping participants physical health as a concern, the concept of IRBs originated around unethical practices that were being conducted on human subjects. A large part of this history stems from the results around the Nuremberg Code that was created at the end of World War II. Nazi experiments on human subjects were so horrendous that a new set of ethical codes needed to be created. Along with the Nazi war crimes, other unethical research had been conducted within the United States:

The Willowbrook study of hepatitis transmission in a hospital for mentally impaired children, Tuskegee Syphilis Study, Fernald State School trials using radioactive minerals in impaired children, and Jewish Chronic Disease Hospital case in which chronically ill patients were injected with cancer cells to monitor rejection, are infamous examples of egregiously unethical research designed and conducted long after the Nuremberg Code was in
The United States also has the dubious honor of championing some of the Eugenics Programs of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. These programs were designed to create the ideal human specimen through breeding and heavily focused on what they considered the negative attributes to be and how to eliminate them. Adolf Hitler himself reached out to states like California which had encouraged extensive research on Eugenics. His interest in American-conducted research helped inform some of the decisions he is said to have made and ultimately the war crimes, unethical research and horrific accounts of human torture that were conducted by the Nazi regime.

After years of unethical research being conducted, a process was needed to create and to oversee the ethical and moral use of human subjects within research. The creation of the IRB process was needed to make sure that these standards were regulated and upheld:

The National Research Act of 1974, passed in response to growing concern about the ethics violations in research, created the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. The Belmont Report of 1974 was the commission's summary of the ethical principles that form the basis of acceptable human-subjects research, and the three foundational Belmont principles were:

- Respect for persons: This principle includes both respect for the autonomy of human subjects and the importance of protecting vulnerable individuals.
- Beneficence: More than just promotion of well-being, the duty of beneficence requires that research maximize the benefit-to-harm ratio for individual subjects and for the research program as a whole.
- Justice: Justice in research focuses on the duty to assign the burden and benefits of research fairly.¹ (Moon 2009, 311)

IRBs can be formed and have some variation in membership depending on the institution or resources available. At a minimum, an IRB must include at least 5 members, a "scientist," a "non-scientist" and someone who is not affiliated with the institution:

- The IRB, as a group, must be sufficiently qualified through the experience, expertise, and diversity of its members to be able to review the research activities commonly conducted by the institution. Relevant considerations may include training and education, race, gender, cultural background, and sensitivity to community attitudes. (Hhs.gov 2021)

The IRB may have more members and/or alternate members who will fill in for members who might not be able to participate or are barred from participation due to their own inclusion in the research or other ethical conflicts. Those selected should be thoughtfully considered for their diversity of knowledge and experience. This allows a much greater basis of knowledge to be used in consideration of research projects.

**Design vs. Function: Conflict Between Ethnographic and Biological Research Paradigms**

The need for IRBs is obvious. The ability to approve or disapprove and periodically observe and regulate a research project seems like an invaluable function of an institution to ensure the safety and health of a body of people who are involved in the research. There have been too many times in which the researcher thought that the means justified the ends and in the process created human suffering.

However, modern approaches to anthropological and sociological research have many of the checks and balances included in their research designs. With many applied anthropological techniques, the health and welfare of the community in question is often at the heart of the research paradigm.

There are, however, complications to how IRBs may interact with ethnographic research conducted by anthropologists. IRBs were created around research participants being in a clinical setting, often having to do more with medical procedures than cultural research. When the roles governing the study of human subjects were decided, they did not take into consideration the activities of anthropologists and other social scientists that cannot predict the risks of doing fieldwork as compared to research being conducted in a clinic.

IRBs are often concerned about creating a balance between risk and reward when considering authorizing human-based research. Ethnographic research on the other hand rarely looks for rewards in its research. Applied ethnographic research is often looking for solutions to problems within a cultural group, but these rarely result in what might be considered tangible outcomes. Rather, they result in analysis and recommendations that the culture in question can implement on their own or with the help of outside institutions.

Engaging in ethnographic fieldwork has some inherent dangers, depending on the environment and/or location in which it is being conducted. However, many of those dangers may be unknown at the time of planning the fieldwork. Fieldwork itself is often unpredictable since sometimes it may last from days to even years of being in the field and environmental or cultural events may take place that create situations that can become dangerous. This can create a dynamic issue when considering how an IRB may look at the research project in general.

Issues and concerns with conducting ethnographic research generally deal with cultural exploitation or exposing individuals who might experience harm based on information they share, which could lead to a number of different issues including reprisals or exclusion from the community. However, none of these can be predictable when engaging in ethnographic research as each culture and instance is going to be unique. Because of the uniqueness of cultures, their dynamic nature, anticipating is impossible, the only thing you can do is implement best practices and be prepared for when something could, and if you work in the field long enough, will happen.

**Anthropology and IRBs Need a Marriage Counselor**

Ethnographic researchers are going to come into increasingly dynamic situations as they conduct fieldwork. The increase in the use of technology, cameras, recorders, video cameras, drones and the use of social media and the internet, combined often with the digital footprint of those who might be engaged as the subject of research, make it impossible to determine all of the unintended consequences that might result from conducting field research. Some of these events will be unforeseen, as is what a lot of conducting fieldwork often entails. Anthropologists know this and part of their training is to under-

---

stand the dynamic nature of research and how to deal with the various issues they will encounter. Extensive training takes place to ensure that they have a firm grasp on ethical behavior needed to conduct research with human subjects. This knowledge has developed over a long period of time and through some very difficult lessons learned, as the history of anthropological research has not always been perfect or ethical. Modern anthropologists take a very serious stance on what are considered ethical practices, and because their field of study is based on humans and acknowledging their individual agency, these become one of their top priorities.

Ethnographic research itself is an exploration into the unknown. Instead of the biological realm or space as the final frontier, culture is an ever changing and dynamic human realm that can be just as rewarding or dangerous depending on the given circumstances. Each research project can be as unique and dynamic as the next and should be treated as independently constructed.

Anthropology itself covers the whole of humanity as its area of interest. As such, those who practice anthropology have very diverse interests and concerns, often focusing on specific cultures or practices that interest them. This presents a problem as IRBs are often focused on a more narrow aspect of research and due to their limited purview, they can pause or prevent research without understanding the depth of the field or project being considered.

An example of this was brought up during the 2021 Fall Conference for the High Plains Society for Applied Anthropology. One of the necessities for IRB approval is Informed Consent; each participant has to have an understanding of the part that they play in the research being conducted and have it confirmed in writing. However, not all cultures are literate or have a method of writing. Even the concept of “Informed Consent” might be a completely foreign idea (Marshall 2003). Western culture has long established means of recording information, however anthropologists often work within cultures that don’t have the same means or needs to record or consider informed consent to be a necessary practice. How would an IRB deal with a situation in which the participants of the study can’t sign a form for consent (Marshall, 2003), because they have never written anything in their entire lives? They could give verbal consent, but what if they don’t understand the need to have it or why one of our institutions desires it?

What if you are dealing with what you might consider a modern culture, one that has access to the internet, social media, all of the modern comforts and extravagancies. You gain informed consent, but are denied IRB approval because your participants are captured on film or in photographs which exposes their identity even when you otherwise maintain strict adherence to practicing anonymity. It is possible, even likely, that the participant has a digital footprint, one that could contain their views on the subject you are researching. This being the case, the public knowledge of the participant and their knowledge would not necessarily endanger them, however there is always a risk depending on the nature of their information.

This leads us to making a couple of comparisons to other means of conducting research and disseminating the findings. Consider the creation of documentary films, which is not regulated by the FDA or the HHS and is usually not considered to be conducting human-based research even though the case can certainly be made that it is. A documentary film may be overseen by an IRB, but it is not federally mandated that it be. The case for this might be that documentary films are not seen as being held to strict scientific methodology in which you must conduct a certain procedure in order to be considered legitimate. This is the case even though many documentarians spend years conducting research before publishing. The caveat to this is that anyone can make a documentary and call it factual; for example the History Channel’s Ancient Aliens is such a series in which even the producers admitted to it being a mockumentary. If a documentary is created, you can also have associated texts that go along with it that support the information expressed in the film and the extended details of the research conducted. Concerning informed consent, in general all that is required is a “Model Release” form to be filled out and as a participant, you are keenly aware that your visage is going to be on film. Even then, there are ways of maintaining anonymity by changing the tone of voice or blurring out the face of the people on screen.

Another comparison is to journalism. Cultural and applied anthropology often deal with trying to find answers to questions journalist also have; the difference is that anthropologists generally use the scientific method rather than typical journalistic means. Journalism, while certainly dealing with human research and concerns, is also not under the control of any sort of IRB restrictions. Even if they might be interested in some of the very subjects that anthropologists might be concerned with. The difference of course is the fact that the practice of anthropology is often conducted through an academic, federal or state institution, projects being funded often by federal dollars and under the auspices of federal regulators.

IRB and Ethnographic Research Methodology Overlap

IRBs can be problematic for anthropologists; there have been many times when a project has been denied or postponed because someone on the IRB has questions that don’t generally need to be asked due to the practice of anthropological and ethnographic study standards. The wellbeing of a culture is generally central to the anthropological paradigm, but because of its methodology, it cannot predict the outcome due to the nature of fieldwork and the often dynamic arenas in which researchers find themselves. The risk is often seen as too great for the reward, even when the risk and reward are rarely fully understood at the beginning of any ethnographic study. Anthropological research often engages in the same standards as IRBs intend, however researchers are often more flexible to the needs of the research group or to the methods being used, yet maintain a high level of ethical conduct.

What to Do When an IRB is Obstructive and Uncooperative

Changing how the research is conducted or disseminated might be the work-around that some anthropologists take when confronted with an IRB unwilling to move forward. When conducting a research project with students, turn it into an internship program that is designed to help communities and provide job experience for the students. This will sidestep the research paradigm, yet allow students and faculty to continue to do research but through a different lens. You could also create a program around making a documentary film, allowing you to continue to do research yet not be under the direct control of an IRB. This has the added bonus of being a product that is easily disseminated and can become an asset to the institution.

While IRBs are needed, another concern might be the composition of an IRB and who is placed on it. IRBs are typically designed to have a diverse group of individuals who can view the project proposal with a wide variety of experience, however I would suggest that an IRB should include more experts and fewer members who are less informed as to how anthropologists conduct their research (Marshall 2003). Creating more specified IRBs, ones that are more centered around each division of research rather than a randomized group with a diverse knowledge base and lack of understanding, could go a long way towards making the process of gaining support of the IRB
possible. Ultimately, IRBs are there for a reason, to safeguard the
health and safety of a population or community.

My final thoughts on IRBs and anthropological research are, at
times, not to engage IRBs. IRBs are necessary but when they become
a hindrance to engaging in ethically conducted research due to a lack
of understanding on their part, find another way. While I generally
don’t recommend looking for loopholes, there comes a time when the
apparatus designed to protect, actually becomes a hinderance. This
should not stop quality research that is otherwise steeped in ethical
practices designed to help and protect the research subject’s lives
and identities.
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ABSTRACT
We are dancing for you by Cutcha Risling Baldy challenges the 19th and 20th century rhetoric of Indigeneity as being irrevocably interrupted by settler colonialism. While the *kinahldung*—Flower Dance—was not practiced by the Hoopa of California for nearly 80 years, it cannot be seen as a “modern” version of a “historic” ceremony. A deep and critical answer to the salvage ethnographies that are often held as a definitive history which is also deeply set upon by settler moralities, Baldy point by point intersects an Indigenous feminist perspective across many of the central assertions and assumptions which anthropologist Alfred Kroebber imposed upon the Hoopa. Framed by concepts such as “survivance” and “continuance”, Baldy shows that the *kinahldung* is a decolonial praxis involving (re)writing, (re)righting, and (re)writing. Rather than an idea of returning from a place of lacking, (re)writing, (re)righting, and (re)writing are operationalized with parenthesis to interrupt an insinuation of the ceremony being of the past and having been reoriented into the present and future. In the telling of this story, an essential theme is that the Hoopa had at every point been visioning an Indigenous futurism—*hoyah-noon’tik*, meaning the “story extends to there” or “it reaches so far”.

KEY WORDS: Indigenous studies, Indigenous Feminism(s), Hoopa, menstruation, Flower Dance

In 2018 Cutcha Risling Baldy made a significant personal and academic contribution to the body of literature within Indigenous Feminism(s) with her book we are dancing for you (2018). Staying true to one of the central ideological assertions within the field, she does not take the position that the Hoopa experience represents any sort of universal decoloniial/Indigenous Feminism(s) maintain that decolonization must be uniquely bound to a people and their history. Accordingly, Baldy foregrounds the experiences of her own Hoopa community in her analysis by sharing the story of how they chose to begin holding the Flower Dance after an 80-year hiatus. The *kinahldung*, or Flower Dance, celebrates the girls in the community as they become women.

Baldy establishes her credibility within this work by placing herself as an active part of the unfolding narrative through kin and community relationships, and draws from her own lived experiences of negotiating the continued specter of settler colonialism’s dual armed structure of hetero-paternalism and hetero-patriarchy. Throughout the book Baldy weaves a combination of reflection, feeling, and imaginings/futurisms into the discussion.

The author takes time and great care to acknowledge the work of the Native scholars whose prior literature we are dancing with you exists in conversation with, in order to deprivilege the ethic voice within the scholarly canon. The scholarship Baldy acknowledges includes Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s book Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples (1999), and Tonawanda Band of Seneca scholar Mishuana Goeman’s book Mark My Words: Native Women Mapping Our Nations (2013). These two authors are credited with providing significant conceptual threads which are woven throughout Baldy’s work—particularly the use of parentheses to create a new tool for communication which presses the reader to consider familiar words as being representative of non-Western ideas. Smith offers (re)writing and (re)righting as important to the processes of decolonizing research. From Goeman, Baldy borrows nuance within the use of “re” within parentheses. Goeman states that she uses “the parentheses in (re)mapping deliberately to avoid the pitfalls of recovery or a seeming return of the past to the present” (Goeman 2013 cited in Baldy 2018, 7). Slowly the reader is pressed to see “( )” as conferring deeply nuanced and contextual meanings to the words it is applied to.

These concepts place the cycle of knowledge creation outside of the implicit Western linear relationship to time, memory and history. “Re” transformed into (re) creates a complex processual space where values, histories, and sacredness are presented as relational concepts instead of discrete ones. In doing so Baldy calls for Indigenous culture to be wrest from the shelves of historic ethnology to the living space of Indigenous agency.

In asserting Native Feminism(s) as having a place within decolonizing praxis, Baldy speaks to Michelle Jacob (Yakama), who connects the goals of attending to displaced cultural practices and taking apart the structures which are the source of continued harm to “our people, land and culture” (Jacob 2012 cited in Baldy 2018, 12). According to Jacob the first goal addresses the second. Dian Million (Athabaskan) and Jacobs state that understanding what the settler states have worked so hard to erase is the key to undermining the settler structure, and argue that Native Feminism(s) provide a means to reach this understanding. Lisa Kahaleole Hall brings attention to the idea that the “intellectual, political, artistic, and spiritual, and the reclamation of the colonized body is at the center of the work” and that it is precisely Native Feminism(s) which occupy the ideal place to do this (Hall 2008 cited in Baldy 2018, 10). A quote that Bald selects from Kim Anderson (Cree/Metis), Native Feminist scholar and author of A Recognition of Being: Reconstruction of Native Womanhood, encapsulates Native Feminism(s) potential to engage communities beyond the scope of theory and discourse, working as a tool to unseat colonial structures which masquerade as tradition:

“I wonder how different our communities might look if we honored all young girls for their sacredness and potential, and if we granted the wise ‘old ladies’ the role they once had in governing their families and communities” (Anderson 2000 cited in Baldy 2018, 173).
Baldy places firmly Native Feminist critique as part of a complex methodological system expressing survivance. Survivance is a term that Gerald Vizenor is credited for, meaning “an active sense of presence over absence, deracination, and oblivion; survivance is the continuance of stories, not a mere reaction, however pertinent”; “Survivance stories are renunciations of dominance, detractions, obstructions, the unbearables of sentiments of tragedy, and the legacy of victimry” (Vizenor 2008, 1). Paula Gunn Allen, a Laguna Pueblo scholar and author of The Sacred Hoop: Recovering the Feminine in American Indian Traditions, sees the feminist approach as an ideal tool for uncovering the oppression which colonialism has embedded within Indigenous communities (1986).

Baldy draws from Native Feminist theory to situate the Hoopa coming of age ceremony within the realm of decolonizing methodology as an expression of survivance. She then uses the tools introduced above to engage the context which the Flower Dance moves within. In accomplishing this Baldy takes on the tasks of (re)writing, (re)righting, and (re)riteing the history, position, and context of Hoopa women within their community and culture.

Throughout the process of (re)writing, (re)righting, and (re)riteing, Baldy confronts the work of anthropologist Alfred Kroeber, who perhaps more than anyone else has been privileged as the etic authority on the Hoopa. Baldy provides a careful critique of Kroeber’s failure to accurately explore the social and individual impact of the state-sanctioned genocide carried out in what is currently known as California. She also demonstrates how his personal patriarchal biases and insecurities toward menstruation led him to falsely place the kinahldung ceremony on the margins of Hoopa society. Baldy’s critique also helps the reader understand the necessity of nuanced the meaning of the 80-year space between kinahldung ceremonies.

Through her specific critique of Kroeber’s salvage ethnographies, Baldy creates a larger discourse around the reality that far from being objective, researchers are inherently biased by their socialization, and limited in access by their positionality. Kroeber was an anthropologist of his times: he thought little of keeping the man he would call lishi in a museum for the last five years of his life in order to further his own research, he curated an exhibit in the human zoos which were popular at the time, and he let his belief in cultural evolution and desire to place tribes along a spectrum approaching western civilization as the pinnacle filter his findings and methodologies.

Who Kroeber was as a researcher comes to bear in understanding what he recorded and didn’t record about the Hoopa tribe. Kroeber had a strong preference to avoid asking his informants about the genocide because it made him feel uncomfortable, and with regard to a girl’s coming of age ceremonies his capacity as a researcher was deeply limited by his unwillingness to openly talk about menstruation. His aversion to discussing menstruation went farther than mere prudishness, he also inexorably linked the act of hiding a woman’s “periodic illness” with the attainment of his sense of “civilization” (Baldy 2018, 83). Furthermore, in his 17 years of interviews and conversations, Kroeber focused primarily on older men. Because of these simple aspects of his positionality and how that effected his sampling, inquiries, and interpretations, Kroeber fails to provide an accurate snapshot of the central social role of the Flower Dance and the strategic reasons for hiding the ceremony during and following the genocide. Drawing from Kroeber’s salvage ethnography, one would assume that the ceremony existed, ended, received renewed interest, and would now be practiced in a new way; Baldy carefully deconstructs this narrative and instead brings forward one of survivance and continuance—and helps the reader to understand why it is important to see the difference. In the telling of this story, an essential theme is that the Hoopa had at every point been visioning an Indigenous futurism—hayah-no.nl’ik, meaning the “story extends to there” or “it reaches so far”.

In her work of (re)writing, Baldy acknowledges herself reflexively historicizing the Flower Dance. Bridging this personal reflection to an awareness that placing Indigenous people in the past is a central part of the settler strategy for “inheriting” land, she from there sets out to interrogate the version of “history” which places the culture of the Hoopa in the past. (Re)writing this history involves contextualizing the settler accounts against Hoopa oral histories and more broadly scrutinized written stories of the period of the (state-supported) California genocide. Baldy does not attempt to offer a comprehensive account of the history of settler incursions into Hoopa territory. Instead, she presents the stories that need to be understood in order to see the continuity of agency and cultural vibrance which places the Hoopa people here and now despite settler efforts to the contrary. That Kroeber chose to avoid touching upon the experience of the genocide because he “could not stand all the tears…” (Buckley 1989, 19) creates a powerful call for (re)writing the settler history with multivocal narration.

Through these historical accounts Baldy demonstrates that “women especially, once centrally important to many Native societies, were targeted for gender violence because of how important they were to culture and politics in their communities” (Baldy 2018, 54). The difference between seeing the Flower Dance as “ending” and the need to “hide” the ceremony to protect young women is tied to the shift from viewing this as a revival of lost cultural practices, to seeing this as continuance.

Shifting to considering the Flower Dance within the framework of (re)righting builds upon the illumination of colonial suppression of Hoopa womanhood, and the attempts to normalize “heteropatriarchy by making women and their bodies ‘taboo’” (Gunn 2008, 6). Placing women as being “right”, menstruation as “right”, and Hoopa communities as “right” challenges settler biopolitics and settler sexuality. (Re)righting, as Michelle Jacob asserts within her work, simultaneously creates a space for Indigenous practice and perspective while excluding a space for hetero-paternalism and the construct of settler colonialism (2012).

As touched on earlier in this review, Baldy gives attention to the role of anthropology in the writing of inaccuracies into the “record” of Indigenous knowledge. With regards specifically to Kroeber’s documentations of menstrual taboo among the Hoopa, Baldy emphasizes Kroeber’s own unwillingness to speak openly on menstruation—even to the point of refusing to use the word when speaking to the older male informants who were the body of his sample when exploring “women’s periodic illness” (Kroeber 1925, 862). Baldy points our attention to the fact that Kroeber’s firm belief that menstruation was universally held in contempt did specific harm to the entire Hoopa community. Understanding that the Hoopa had to hide their culture due to the threats extended not just from settlers and miners, but from social scientists who were mining and misrepresenting Hoopa culture allows the reader to critically consider what stories still remain hidden behind salvage anthropology.

Settler colonial narratives frame science as a means for purportedly emancipating women from menstrual taboos, exemplified in assertions by settler scholars such as Stein and Kim, who state that “we can all breathe a collective sigh of relief that the more drastic theories and treatments of the ancient world disappeared like the morning dew in the past century as scientific discovery rendered them obsolete” (2009, 107). In response to this false narrative, Baldy brings light to hetero-paternalistic knowledge production and its suc-
cess in manufacturing the myth of universal taboos around menstruation, and dispels the illusion of the “modern” settler state as liberating women from these so-called “taboos”.

Cutcha Risling Baldy takes the reader finally to the resolution of the processes of (re)writing, and (re)righting, to engaging the sacred literally (re)riteing the Flower Dance. Offering reflective narrative excerpts from participants and community members Baldy establishes that for many people, the Flower Dance filled a hole. The benefit while being acknowledged as being spiritual, was also placed as being significant for family and community cohesiveness. Impacts upon boys and men are also highlighted showing that (re)righting through Native Feminisms doesn’t only impact women’s lives. While this book provides the reader with a single cultural and historical context, by so thoroughly placing the Hoopa experience within the literature and experiences of other Native Feminist scholars, Baldy shows a growing critical consciousness being spread through Native Feminism(s).

The non-linear cognitive processes established by the use of the parentheses around the prefix “re” carries the promise that you will find yourself revisiting and returning to the pages of this book during reflective moments in your life. This is certainly not the type of book to read only once and when you begin it again, reflect on the words which the author begins the introduction with: ‘A:diniw A’ydyaw ‘A:dit’e:n (We Do It, We Did It, We Are Doing It).
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