Message from the Co-Chairs

We had a productive business meeting at the 2010 AAA meetings in New Orleans. There was a good turn-out (including several new people) and spirited discussions of several issues of concern to FOSAP. See the minutes, (in this issue) provided by Sarah Hautzinger, that cover what was a full and vigorous hour-and-a-half meeting.

As this issue of ANTHRO-AT-LARGE goes to press one of the necessary matters raised at our business meeting is still being worked out—the FOSAP session at the 2011 AAA meetings in Montreal. Several interesting suggestions were put forth, but it takes someone to organize the session and thus we encourage you to look for opportunities to participate and thus respond to session ideas on our FOSAP listserv.

Last year, at our FOSAP business meeting in Philadelphia, the idea that came was “Got Anthropology.” The resulting session came close to achieving the status of an AAA Executive Invited Session, but was at least a GAD Invited Session status. I think we can produce excellent sessions every time, but we have to have people step up and be willing to participate.

If you are interested in any of the other issues raised at the meeting, use the listserv to voice your ideas and suggestions.

John Rhoades
ml_stover@msn.com

Merrily Stover

Inside this issue:

- New Officers and Editors!
- Minutes of 2010 Business meeting in NOLA
- FOSAP Website Updates! Introducing Amber Clifford – Napolenone, Webmaster

109th Annual AAA meeting in New Orleans

November 16-21, 2011: We called it home, New Orleans, for a few days this fall, as the population of anthropologists bloomed to nearly six thousand. For members of FOSAP, our highlight occurred on Saturday morning when our sponsored session, “Got Anthropology?,” saw both outstanding papers and outstanding attendance.

(Cont. Page 7)
FOSAP Business Meeting at the 109th American Anthropological Association Annual Meeting

New Orleans

11/20/10, Saturday, over a catered pizza lunch John Rhoades kindly provided

14 attendees: John Rhoades, Merrily Stover, Amber Clifford-Napoleone, Christina Beard-Moose, Carol Morrow, Bruce Stokes, Julie David, Darlene Smucny, Tom Love, Bob Myers, Frank Salamone, Kate Gillogly, Sarah Hautzinger [and one other attendee]

I. General Anthropology Division; should we be part of, and what are implications for Anthro-at-Large?
   - As with all GAD publications, Wiley-Blackwell [W-B] would own Anthro-at-large; what would this mean?
   - Amber edits the Central States Anthropological Society’s bulletin; they’ve gone around about joining with W-B and ultimately did not go to it, bulletins up to ‘91 when we pulled out; refused to change unless we sign on. It’s unclear if they just publish, or also assume aspects of editorial control? W-B scans themselves for “editing marks”; CSAS exploring listing with EBSCO;  [Note: see also John’s email on legal responsibilities with W-B]
   - For now, we’re just now exploring rules and repercussions; wouldn’t be permanent or relinquish editing control.
   - Choices? Individual libraries can debundle, going to depts. to select journals. Anthro-at-Large is online now anyway so one can Google and it comes up.
   - John—W-B charges hefty “editing” fees; GAD pays cost for our webpage work. Survey last year showed that people liked getting it on-line.
   - Chris Furlow is the incoming head of GAD, doing Open Anthropology, people talking about careers etc. W-B could also have control, working this out currently, but not Chris’s idea.
   - If we went on Anthro Source we’d get $ for fees. Not clear who gets what, # of articles, hits, what determines how much. There is a formula that figures this.

II. John: do we want Anthro-at-Large to be peer-reviewed? Questionnaire and modest cost gets us listed on on-line database of peer-reviewed journals; would make count more for tenure reviews etc.  [Note: see John’s email on Ulrich’s journal listing]
   A. Bob: votes for avoiding Anthro Source and moving toward peer review.
   B. Christina and Merrily: peer review wouldn’t have to mean writing/publishing “bs”; could be our own peers.
      - Would be an extra responsibility for editors; maybe have 3 rather than 2 editors.
      - List for peer reviewed has guidelines, probably at least 2 reviewers.
      - We have 400-ish members to comprise pool
      - Christina’s reformatting; will look different; 3 columns;
      - Reviewing might promote stake-holding and other content ideas such as:
         - book and movie reviews? More visual material?
         - Bad anthropology films, “Cannibal Women in the Avocado Jungle of Death”; Rob Corruccini could help.
         - Humor “would make us unique in anthropological world”
         - Anthro Notes has cartoons; good to have in Anthro-at-Large too
      - This year shooting for Anthro-at-Large in Jan & Sept; spread out over the year
      - Why title ANTHRO-at-Large? Oxymoron misleading suggesting large institutions? Free-floating, unaffiliated sense, also teaching across whole discipline/sub-disciplines
We’re at a good place for new involvements and opportunities. List-serve runs hot and cold but nice to have a place to discuss when most of us have few or no colleagues. Go to website; good stuff there!

III. Session/s at AAA
   A. This morning’s FOASP Session didn’t list FOSAP, just GAD. We “don’t exist by AAA standards.” We’re now listed as an interest group, but most of those conceive themselves as on the way to becoming a section, so they can get named as session sponsors. [Note: I later noticed interest sections “branding” sessions by including the name of the interest section in the session title; e.g. see 5-0045 in 2010 program.

IV. Ideas for 2011 AAA session
   A. Bob tried for executive session by AAA this year but didn’t get, got invited instead. We have customary, “kind of promised” rights to an invited session through GAD.
   B. Deadline for executive session to Sarah Green Jan 31 2011AAAprgramchair@gmail.com
   C. For GAD session March 15, program chair is Hillary Kuhn.
   D. Theme will be “Traces, Tidemarks and Legacies” – description was read and found meaningless. But for Exec Session have to understand and use key terms;
   E. GAD isn’t overly concerned about theme (as long as session is good);
   F. Bob interested in heroic anthropologist, or forensic testimonies for peyote use, or fictional; Cathy Reichs could participate, someone writing detective fiction. Actual anthropologists Ellis Peters, Indiana Jones movie, Avatar effect; Dartmouth president who’s an anthropologist? GAD has a distinguished lecturer, could be him, too.
   G. 110th year of AAA, could do something historical
   H. Lots of work to organize need someone to step up
   I. Session about Canadian-US linkages, small programs in Canada? Julie Peltier in Winnipeg
   J. Getting anthropology out to stakeholders—“taking it to the streets.” Better as a workshop? Workshops require fees, pay AAA doing big public outreach session. Tried to do one about assessment and couldn’t get people to pay fees or get space.
   K. Assessment now—how to fight off bs and close circle so actually useful?
   L. Bob’s making strange familiar and familiar strange; part of public discourse.
   M. AAA mission to get anthropology out, vs support anthropologists

V. FOSAP Website and List-Serve
   ● List-serve can stay at SEMO (South-East MO State) with Carol, she sustains goddess stature
   ● Amber is planning on overhauling website in June so it can run faster and better, look cleaner sharper and be easier to find things; cosmetic away from fuzzy logo with rotating.
   ● Content won’t change much, except tab for “member news” with photos, PowerPoint presentations, can include “targeted key wording” for individual pieces of content.
   ● Requests for papers from today’s session, could publish papers in newsletter with link to slides on web site. Not to overlap but to improve our web presence. Can hotlink to email addresses etc.
   ● Currently we have copyright but it’s first-time; we don’t retain rights that would prevent you from publishing an expanded version elsewhere.
   ● If you know of functionality you like on other websites, like blogs, etc. let Amber know.
   ● AAA is cut out of loop for posting. Before, it was laborious. We can put things up more quickly.

Meeting adjourned by 1:30.
Respectfully submitted,
Sarah Hautzinger, Colorado College
Liberating Development: Religious Transformations of Developmental Discourse. By: Lauri Occhipinti

American Anthropological Association Annual Meeting, 2010
Presented as part of the session “Can We Talk? Theorizing “Religion” and “Development” Together in Faith-Based Non-Governmental Organizations”

As one of the most important sets of institutions globally, non-governmental organizations – NGOs – create and implement programs of economic development and social welfare. The term NGO describes an amazingly heterogeneous collection of organizations, with a correspondingly wide range of theories, ideologies, practices, and strategies aimed at mitigating conditions of poverty. “In an obvious way, the development apparatus is fragmented; not only is there a great diversity in the types of organisation, but the ways they work, the motivations of individuals within them, and their political context vary greatly” (Harrison 2003: 103). A richly diverse category of religious organizations makes up a substantial, and growing, part of the development community. Like their secular counterparts, religious NGOs range from barely organized charity efforts to global institutions. There are innumerable agencies that can be divided into dozens of categories: some are churches that engage directly in charity, while other NGOs are sponsored by churches and parishes. There are intermediary donor organizations that are directly tied to churches, as well as intermediary and local organizations that have no direct ties to particular churches but who have religious roots and/or institutional ties to religious funding organizations.

In an effort to begin to understand the ways in which such organizations differ from their secular counterparts, I have conducted ethnographic fieldwork on Catholic development agencies in Argentina. Such religious NGOs operate within a larger development discourse, but they may also represent a distinct subset of development organizations. For religious organizations, the motivation to engage in development work is not based on economic maximization, or improved living conditions, or growth. To the extent that a secular development organization’s raison d’être is economic, or educational, or any single issue or set of issues, the driving force of religious NGOs is social justice, interpreted broadly and inclusively. They are interested in improving the material conditions of the communities as a necessary step — but only a step — towards social justice. This paper explores the work of these NGOs and the ways in which they are reformulating notions of development to fit it into a more moral framework.

At times, they offer a popular, or perhaps populist, counter to neoliberalism and unchecked global capitalism, becoming a highly legitimizing voice of opposition. At other times these NGOs have broadened the central ideas of liberation theology to include the ethics of cultural autonomy and self-sufficiency. The focus has shifted to protecting the inherent value of local culture against rationalizing global forces. Often they emphasize values that resonate with Christian beliefs, rather than with market capitalism.

The notion of a discourse of development is one which has been explored by many anthropologists in the last fifteen years (see, for example, Escobar 1995, Shaw 1995, Pigg 1992, Little 1992, Ferguson 1994). According to this persuasive analysis, development agencies create a vision of the problems of poverty as fixable, subject to apolitical, technical, bureaucratic intervention. On a global scale, large agencies, the interests of donor governments, international conferences, economic theory, and measurable trends in the global economy are some of the factors that form a base for shared ideas about the nature of development. The discourse functions to disguise the inherently political question of access to resources (Ferguson 1994), diverting attention from what are in fact the deeply moral questions of poverty and power. The discourse of development operates to “shape... the nature of development practice, the interpretive community of development agents, and the facts they emphasize” (Porter 1995: 84).

Religious organizations work within this framework, and share many of its symbolic underpinnings, yet their discourse may differ in significant ways. In some contexts it offers an alternative vision and understanding of both the ends and the means of development work. As one might expect, the extent to which any organization has an explicit theory of development underlying its initiatives varies as much as the organizations themselves.

Lauri Occhipinti is Assoc. Professor of Anthropology in the Anthropology, Geography, and Earth Science Department at Clarion University, Clarion, PA. Her e-mail address is: locchipint@clarion.edu, for comments and discussions on her paper.
Some may not even regard themselves as “doing development”; charitable giving has long been a part of Christian practice. Others have a highly complex economic and social agenda, with a highly self-conscious and reflexive philosophy and theology of their decision to engage in development work. In an era in which the forces of globalization are increasingly contested by local voices, religious organizations that base their work on notions of social justice may offer an alternative model for development.

A religious idiom of development is distinguished by a different flow of information. The ideas that percolate through religious NGOs do not represent a north-to-south model of “developed” and “underdeveloped” peoples. They may originate or resonate in the developing world. There is an increased willingness to understand nonwestern “underdeveloped” peoples as a model for how society should be organized. This notion of local agents having a more powerful grasp of “what’s important” or a deeper spirituality, whether represented as an understanding of nature or a sense of community, comes into play. Although some of this may be romanticized or stereotyped, this is part of what makes this in essence a counter-discourse of development, simply though introducing a new question: What, really, is the goal of “development”?

**Religious development**

We regard all people as created and loved by God. We give priority to people before money, structure, systems, and other institutional machinery.

- World Vision International

Christian development organizations emphasize a “holistic” approach to development that goes beyond material needs and considerations. The Mennonite development agency, as one example, notes, “Physical survival needs must be met, but the ethical and aesthetic are also vital for strengthening human dignity and identity” (Yoder, Redekop and Jantzi 2004: 296).

Dignity, in turn, is understood as rooted in culture, building on local values and practices (Irarrázaval 2000). The end of development is not material prosperity, but the quality of life for the individual, a notion which includes human rights and self-fulfillment. Poverty itself, however, is an impediment to self-fulfillment, and anti-poverty programs take a center place for religious organizations just as in their secular counterparts. The links between material and spiritual poverty are often actively theorized (Bornstein 2003: 46). In a conservative Protestant organization studied by Erica Bornstein (2003), bringing development to the poor is understood as a Christian act. In this view, economic development has two purposes: to introduce Christian beliefs to individuals, and to restore their God-given potential (Bornstein 2003: 48).

Development projects affect a community on two distinct levels. Most obviously, development programs seek to change the material conditions of production, primarily through reallocating resources (for example, land, technology, information, access to markets, or credit). This reallocation of various resources may change the social relations of production: by expanding access to the means of production, by changing the productive roles of women, or by changing the strategies that may be employed within or outside the community, such as seeking more education for children.

On another level, development organizations may play a central role in changing the symbolic relations of production – the beliefs that people hold about the “rightness” or justice in the distribution of resources. In this process, NGOs may have an important role in negotiating between the “local” and the “global” visions of “development,” in the definition of poverty, the strategies chosen, and the cultural (sub)text of local projects.

The ways in which “poverty” is defined by a development organization has clear ramifications for the kinds of programs it implements, its own methodology, and, just as importantly, the arenas of local life that it defines as outside the scope of its interests. Such definitions are not always fully articulated, but nevertheless inform the program’s actions and philosophy. They are created in a process of dialogue with ideas of development gleaned from larger institutions and trends in global development, from an organization’s own ideological background, and from conversations with local people, who are also involved in a separate but interrelated process of definition and discourse.

During the last twenty five years, the Christian religious discourse and praxis in Latin America, and perhaps globally, has changed considerably. As one way to attract followers, both Catholic and Protestant churches have become increasingly involved in development projects. In some parts of Argentina, for example, Catholics, Pentecostals, Jehovah’s Witnesses, Mormons, Baptists, Congregationalists, and Seventh Day Adventists, to name a few, compete with one another through their charity work (Ruggiero 1988: 80-84). Missionary work by most mainline denominations has shifted its ideological focus, reframing its efforts to as an attempt at dialogue rather than conversion, offering “an” answer instead of “the” answer (Tennekes 1988: 39). In this dialogue, the religious movement that started in Latin America in the 1960s often referred to as liberation theology has been enormously influential. Liberation theology did not merely pose theological or ecclesiastical questions, but offered a far-reaching social and political critique of Western society, capitalism, and the marginalization of the poor. This movement emphasized the need to understand poverty as a theological problem and the duty of Christians to work against unjust social conditions, an understanding that spawned a number of religious NGOs as a direct response.

(Continued on Page 8)
Hello FOSAP members! I am your new webmaster, Amber Clifford-Napoleone. I teach cultural and applied anthropology at the University of Central Missouri, where I also serve as curator of collections at the McClure Archives and University Museum. As your webmaster, I am in charge of maintaining the FOSAP website, and making sure that it contains all the information, access and material that our small anthropology programs can use.

This summer, I am going to undertake an overhaul of the FOSAP website. Not only will I be updating the graphics, but I will also be adding material and technology to make our site more useful and user friendly. These changes will include links pages, RSS feeds, and more images than our current site. Right now, I am seeking your assistance and suggestions. What would you like to see on the FOSAP website? What types of information would be most helpful to both professionals and students in small programs? Send me your suggestions, or links to pages that you like and use, at Clifford@ucmo.edu. I will work hard to respond to all suggestions, and make our webpage a useful tool for small-program networking, professionalism, and disciplinary attention.

Why Anthropology?
Ask a Student
A Potential New Column
By: Constance DeRoche

Years ago, an anthropology professor told me about an encounter he had, as a young man, with an uncle – clearly not his family favorite. Uncle “Joe,” a successful businessman, questioned the wisdom of anthropology as a career choice: “It’s not good for anything!” To which my teacher replied, “Exactly.” If worldliness was ever anything more than a marginal attraction, it is hardly so today. Most of us would be ready, willing, and able to take on an Uncle Joe – and they still exist, of course, despite the demonstration value of applied and practicing anthropologists. It is ever more important to do so, as long-in-the-tooth neo-liberalism (ironically re-energized by recent crises of capitalism) keeps liberal education on the defensive.

Small anthropology programs are especially vulnerable. Their institutions’ budgets are often tight; the programs tend to be relatively undeveloped; and, anthropologists, not uncommonly, form a minority (in both senses) in joint departments. And, since numbers count to the administrators, departmental competitiveness is a real issue. The sole anthropologist, and more recently with two assistants by contacting me at cderoche@eastlink.ca. Please feel free to ask questions or discuss proposals with me.

It not only reveals the relevance of an anthropological imagination in the “real world” – of commerce, no less! – but it also gives voice to an alumna. We can and should profess about the matter – and colleagues are invited to submit to Anthro-at-Large their strategies for promoting the discipline. But it seems to me that senior students and recent alumni are an especially important asset when it comes to “plugging” the discipline. It is easier for students to identify with peers, whose experience is more recent and thus more relevant to contemporary conditions. Peers also have less at stake; they are evidently more disinterested. Moreover, their hopes and dreams are more varied than those of professors, who can be dismissed as atypical “eggheads.”

Listening to students’ perceptions of the discipline makes sense in other ways. The better we know these views, the easier it should be to incorporate them into classes and curricula. And how do anthropologists characteristically investigate quotidian thought? We go to the source, speak to the grounded experts. FOSAP members are eminently suited to the task. Teaching loads large in the duties of faculty in small departments. With no graduate assistants, student/faculty relations are more direct and informal, making it easier to identify especially astute opinions, and to foster and promote student entry into the discourse.

With your support, ANTHRO-AT-LARGE can serve as a forum through which our students share the ideas and experiences that have validated their encounters with anthropology, and advise us about improvements. Please encourage your upper-level students and recent graduates to offer their reflections to the bulletin. In doing so, they will help the membership provide more varied, useful, and concrete answers to novices who ask: what can anthropology do for me? (They might, at the same time, provide themselves an opportunity to clarify their own thinking, and add an item to their resumes).

To get started, potential contributors might ask themselves questions such as these: What has anthropology meant to me? What role has it played in my intellectual development? How has it helped with job performance, or might it in future? What could I say about its value if asked in a job interview? Am I happy to have studied the discipline, and why? What modifications might improve its personal, social, and career value? Examples are, also, available on the website of Cape Breton University’s Department of Anthropology and Sociology – where I taught for three decades, originally as the sole anthropologist, and more recently with two or three others. To find them go to <www.cbu.ca/academic/anthropology-sociology/careers/> and cursor down to “Alumni Bios.”
Let’s Review Peer-Review

By Constance DeRoche

Peer-review was one of the topics that commanded attention at FOSAP’s business meeting in New Orleans last fall. Specifically, the group considered – assuming that the bulletin will continue to publish news, reports, pictures, etc. – whether articles submitted to ATHRO-AT-LARGE should undergo peer review.

The sentiment expressed by attendees was largely positive (see the minutes in this issue), but further discussion is in order, given the magnitude of the change. Below are some points to ponder as you consider your feedback on the matter.

1. In career terms, it is important to publish peer-reviewed articles – irrespective of the imperfections of the process, which are easily forgotten in promotion and tenure deliberations. However, administrators and committees often take into account the status of the publication venue when evaluating a peer-reviewed piece. How much weight will the bulletin of a small group carry? Heft also varies with career stage; standards are raised at each step of the career ladder.

   In short, the advantage of moving to peer-review will likely accrue only to junior faculty and in some of institutions, depending on their prevailing evaluation methods. However, it may help novices in another respect, that is, by providing a relatively nontaxing introduction to the review process.

2. Accessibility is another consideration. As co-chair John Rhoades noted, it would be neither costly nor time-consuming to have Anthro-at-Large listed in an on-line database, such as Ulrich’s. This may broaden the pool of interested readers, beyond colleagues who are already familiar with the publication through the AAA. Alternatively, the bulletin could become included in AnthroSource, but this would entail publishing through Wiley-Blackwell, which would almost certainly slow down the process.

3. Certain resources would be required in order to forge ahead. Referees need an explicit set of guidelines. In addition to requesting general commentaries, many journals also send each referee a short questionnaire to focus reviews and derive a “bottom-line” conclusion. It should not be difficult to design these (and models should be readily available) but it would call for some decision making.

4. The number of reviews solicited for each submission varies from one to another publication venue. It is not uncommon for a journal to seek only two; many others require three. Since Anthro-at-Large is a semiannual that includes differentiated contents, the number of submissions needing review would be fairly small. FOSAP has about four-hundred members; nonmembers could be recruited if called for. By the same token, we need not assume that a third editor would be required, but some thought should be given to the matter.

5. One disadvantage of the review process is its duration. Although computerized communication has improved turnaround time, it does not actually abbreviate the referee's task. Lead-time is especially problematic in a publication that comes out relatively infrequently. Many authors may prefer to get some work into print quickly, while investing wait-time in articles for larger, high-status journals. This would likely be a factor where any potential submission began as presentation at a refereed conference, since some institutions consider these refereed publications.

   In sum, the bulletin most likely could appear peer-reviewed; FOSAP needs to decide if it wants to make it so. Please provide your feedback. Perhaps we can get a lively discussion going on the listserv at <FOSAP@cstl.semo.edu>.

109th Annual AAA Meeting in New Orleans

With such anthropological luminaries on board as Conrad Kottak and James Peacock, the assembled crowd was treated to splendid stories and thought-provoking inquiries on a range of standpoints on how many first came to “get” anthropology. One of the kernels that came from these papers was the remembrance, for me and others in attendance, of that “A-Ha” moment. It was in college, remember? When the pieces fell into place and you knew you “got Anthropology.” Anthropology has the potential to build bridges and to fill holes left behind other disciplines. Speaking from the issues of anthropology in the curriculum with Darlene Smucny and Merrily Stover’s Got Anthropology in Your Curriculum? to traversing the four-fields, Peter Peregrine’s Got Archaeology? Prehistory and Climate Change; Julie Pelletier’s Got Anthropology as Decolonization; Peter Brown’s Got a Shot of Anthropology for this Global Health Project? and back to some basic questions and perceptions of our discipline with Robert Myers’ Got the Familiar Strange and the Strange Familiar?, this session was well done from beginning to end.

As a result of his paper, Got Any Heroic Anthropologists? The Depiction of Anthropologists in Popular Culture, Frank Salamone is looking to put together a panel for the 2011 meetings in Montréal, Quebec to extend a discussion into how anthropologists are depicted in movies, TV, books, and short stories, among others. The overall question is: why have anthropologists become familiar fictional figures? Interested? For more information, you can get in touch with Frank: Fsalamone@iona.edu.

There’s much more to discuss about the panel, too. In the Fall 2011 issue of ANTHRO-AT-LARGE, we’ll be bringing you some of these great papers for your perusal. Keep on writing!
Although liberation theology itself may have petered out as a religious and a social movement, its influence is still felt, not only in the Catholic church where it originated but also in mainline Protestant churches (Yoder, Redekop and Jantzi 2004), evangelical organizations (Sider 1982, Bornstein 2003), and even in the Pentecostal movement (Kamsteeg 1998). A religious idiom of development emerged in conversation with liberation theology and with the dominant development discourse. Although the emphasis may vary from organization to organization, within and between faith traditions, it shares some themes that distinguish it from mainstream or secular frameworks for development.

Religious NGOs are still influenced by trends and changes in the larger sphere of mainstream development. As an Anglican missionary commented to me,

Development has followed certain global trends. The church also follows these trends in development. The danger is that we swing from one thing to the next thing, with no continuity... . The thinking [of religious funding agencies] is largely in line with secular thinking. Now they want short-term projects, things that have to be funded for three years or so and then turned over to the community... . It just isn’t realistic... . The problem is that the church’s efforts at development are in line with these trends (field notes September 1997).

Following funding trends does not coincide well with the long-term strategies of the NGOs I worked with, which have an ongoing relationship with the community and a good sense of the chronic problems and needs in the region.

Recent trends in development funding have included a professionalization of the nonprofit sector based on managerial models from business. “Government departments, NGOs, and private organizations active in the domains of development are required to operate as if they are businesses” (Quarles van Ufford et al, 2003: 5). In “shopping around” for funding, the NGO is often limited to the kinds of projects and programs that are popular or current in mainstream development circles. This allows organizations to take advantage of the options that may be available and provide flexibility in the short term in order to find new sources of financing. However, it also leaves gaps in budgeting for long-term strategies and planning.

Studies of religion and of religious NGOs have been particularly interested in the ways in which actors produce and enact meaning within such frameworks (see for example Kamsteeg 1998, Ortner 1989). I would like to turn to a specific example, a case study of two Catholic NGOs in northern Argentina, in order to explore some of the ways in which a religious idiom of development is created and enacted in a specific local context.

Building blocks

The faith of the poor, the religious dimension that allows them to maintain their traditions, their ancient customs of respect for the land, solidarity, [and] openness to others, knowledge which is often forgotten, are the riches that the poor offer to a society that is bleeding to death from having forgotten these values.

OCLADE (Yareta 1996: 1)

In 1997-98, I conducted field research with two religious NGOs in northern Argentina called OCLADE and Fundapaz. Both agencies had their origins in the Catholic Church, stemming from a progressive Catholic concern with poverty and social justice, and both worked primarily with indigenous populations, who make up a small percentage of the Argentine population.

The two organizations work in very different cultural regions and ecological zones. In the province of Salta, where I conducted research, Fundapaz works with the Wichí, a lowland indigenous people, whose economy was based on hunting and gathering until the middle part of the twentieth century. Fundapaz promotes different kinds of projects in the Wichí and the surrounding criollo (white) communities, according to local needs and preferences as well as to practical project considerations. The NGO has also had a long-term commitment to help local communities gain legal rights to the land that they occupy, a struggle which took over fifteen years (see Occhipinti 2005). In its promotion of development projects in the Wichí communities, Fundapaz faces formidable challenges. The material standard of living of the Wichí is much lower than elsewhere in the province or in the nation. Wichí communities generally have neither electricity nor a reliable supply of potable water. Public services such as health care and education are inadequate throughout the region. Household cash incomes range from virtually nothing to about $150 per month. The economy of these Wichí communities is based on a precarious combination of wage labor, subsistence agriculture, and foraging. The organization portrays its work as that of a “bridge” between poor rural populations and the dominant society -- a bridge upon which ideas are allowed to travel in both directions (Fundapaz 1988). As a private non-profit organization, Fundapaz is not officially affiliated with the Catholic Church, but sees itself as having “Christian inspiration” and maintains close ties with the church. Most of its funding comes from non-profit European development agencies, many of which are religious in nature. Other funding comes from government sources and large international agencies such as the World Bank.

OCLADE is a non-profit NGO established and run by the Catholic church of the Prelature of Humahuaca.
It runs programs throughout the Prelature, which encompasses most of the puna (altiplano) of northwest Argentina, as well as the sub-Andean valleys directly to the east (including the departments of Santa Victoria Oeste and Iruya). This area may well represent one of the poorest geographical regions in Argentina, with high indexes of illiteracy, infant and child malnutrition, and unemployment. Iruya, where I conducted research, is a scenic town in the high Andean valleys, a land of dramatic cliffs and swift rivers. The people of Iruya are known as Kolla. The local economy is based primarily on subsistence agriculture, supplemented by meager sales of produce on the regional market and migrant labor to plantations in the lowlands. The average household has a cash income of perhaps $600 a year, and holds less than a half of a hectare of land.

OCLADE’s major programs focus on community organizing, economic development projects (mostly in subsistence agriculture), and various projects aimed at improving health and education for women and children. OCLADE has also acted as an important conduit of material resources into the community; projects have provided materials to construct systems for drinking water and for irrigation and to build health posts. There have also been several attempts to create productive associations and cooperatives for both agriculture and crafts. Funding comes from various religious intermediary organizations, both Catholic and Protestant, from non-religious development organizations, and from several government programs. About 25% of total funding comes from some level of the government; the rest from NGO sources and direct support from the Catholic Church.

Like most small NGOs, both organizations have an array of projects underway at any one time, including child feeding centers, agricultural training, infrastructure improvements such as building community centers and systems for delivering potable water, education, and health care. The diversity in their programming is intentional. Both organizations share a long term commitment to the communities where they work. The goal is not to create one project, or to fulfill a single criteria, but to seek out projects that meet specific local needs. To a large extent, however, each NGO is limited because of its dependence on outside funding. Current trends in the non-profit sector dictate that programs and spending are directed at short-term projects with narrowly focused goals aimed at the poorest sectors of society, resulting at times in ineffective programs which lack long-term strategies and links between different types of efforts. In “shopping around” for funding, the NGO is often limited to the kinds of projects and programs that are popular or current in mainstream development circles. This allows organizations to take advantage of the options that may be available and providing flexibility in the short-term, in order to find new or existing sources of funding. However, it also leaves gaps in budgeting for long-term strategies and planning. For both Fundapaz and OCLADE, these long term strategies and planning have included projects and issues which are not part of the mainstream development discourse, most notably land reform and issues of indigenous rights.

Despite the significant differences between both the organizations and their “client” populations (Occhipinti 2005), the two organizations share a common understanding of the larger project of development. In both cases, the NGO rarely explicitly discusses the root causes of poverty. However, poverty is often implied to stem from the cultural divide between the indigenous cultures and the dominant society. Often this is framed in terms of the physical and social isolation of the indigenous group, the failure of the wealth of the dominant society to reach into these remote areas, or the lack of resources. Occasionally it is blamed on historical patterns of domination, especially dispossession of land, but this theme is treated cautiously. Implicitly, creating economic autonomy is one of the underlying goals of development programs.

Development projects that increase capitalist economic structures or that create strong ties to the market economy are frequently depicted as inappropriate or even impossible for the indigenous population. Both NGOs view participation in the larger capitalist economy – through commercial agriculture, herding, or wage labor – as culturally alienating for the indigenous groups. The indigenous societies are almost invariably understood as being outside of capitalism (not as integrated at lowest level). The focus tends to be on subsistence practices – whether or not they are adequate at dealing with poverty in these contexts – rather than on “enterprise.” Both organizations respect and value traditional subsistence practices – small scale agriculture in the highlands and hunting and gathering in the lowlands. They schedule projects around the needs and schedules of traditional subsistence, while other projects are aimed directly at improving traditional economic activities. In both cases, there is an effort to reduce risk and ensure the reliability of subsistence in communities which are seen as having a precarious economy. In OCLADE’s case this shows in an emphasis on nutrition, through child feeding centers which are a major focus of its programming, and on meeting other basic needs, such as potable water and access to basic health care. For Fundapaz it has been channeled mainly through land claims, which are seen to provide a secure base. The emphasis on subsistence accords well with the theme that the indigenous societies are culturally vulnerable. The focus of projects is not on more integration with the capitalist economy, but on less.

Both Fundapaz and OCLADE draw impetus and inspiration from liberation theology, and this perspective shapes the work that they do and the role that they see themselves playing in the community. They share the perspective that I discussed in the previous section, that human dignity, not wealth, is the end goal of development. Development strategies of reducing poverty are a means to that end. There is an implicit (and sometimes explicit) critique of the structures of capitalism, and particularly of the neoliberal policies that shaped the Argentine economy throughout the 1990s. This moral economic philosophy critiques Western capitalism, with
with its long history of exploitation and oppression. In a practical sense, this critique is played out in the form of an emphasis on economic self-sufficiency and autonomy. These NGOs have also expanded on the central ideas of liberation theology to understand that cultural autonomy is key to human dignity. The ways in which the NGOs conceive of the cultures that they work in has a tremendous impact on their work. This conception shapes how the organization understands the causes of poverty and its roots as well as its visions of the future. It influences not only the personal relationships between NGO staff and community members, but the kinds of programs that the NGO implements. It is in their conceptions of the indigenous cultures that the two NGOs are most divergent. OCLADE tends to romanticize an idealized “traditional” Kolla culture, an image which at times stands in the way of programs. Fundapaz, while very culturally sensitive, grapples with the question of what kind of economy is compatible with Wichí culture (even as the Wichí grapple with the same issue), while putting a great deal of emphasis on ecological sustainability.

In both cases, the indigenous cultures that the organizations work with are seen as having a high intrinsic worth. Foremost in the literature and thinking of each is the uniqueness of the indigenous culture and the idea that these cultures are threatened or endangered. As each NGO theorizes economic development, the indigenous cultures’ traditional lifestyle themselves represent an alternative model to global capitalism. Features of indigenous culture such as reciprocity, community labor, and even poverty are seen to model Christian ideals.

Yet given the very real concerns of poverty in both communities, the traditional economy is seen inadequate, so that there needs to be economic change in a way that is sensitive to cultural difference. Without economic change, in the forecast of each NGO, the indigenous culture cannot survive, beset by an array of difficulties: young people will leave their native communities in search of work; family ties and kinship networks will break down; norms of sharing and cooperativism will be lost as each household struggles to survive. Eventually, in the worst case scenarios, under the flood of media images that glamorize Western culture, the scant attention paid to indigenous cultures by the educational systems or the dominant society, and the increasing ease of transportation and communication, the cultures will disappear, subsumed into the underclass of Argentina. The survival of the indigenous culture is linked with the ability of its communities to be self-sufficient. Neither organization proposes that a whole hearted adoption of capitalism and the market will do – in part because of the economic and social marginality of both groups, and in part because of cultural issues. The market economy is seen at its base to be incompatible with the cultural values of the indigenous population, and to be intrinsically threatening to their way of life.

**Conclusions**

Imagining a different kind of society based on the common good; a new concept of development that is sustainable and equitable and not limited to economic growth; participatory democracy and sound and credible institutions.

Latin America Council of Churches (CLAI)

Religious NGOs have an alternative discourse and praxis, one which is rooted in a particular vision of how the world is and how it ought to be. The religious NGOs that I have studied are not merely interested in economic development. They see economic development as an essential element of human dignity, one which makes it possible for individuals to lead more fulfilling lives. The projects that they implement are therefore in a sense means to an end, rather than an end in themselves. While many secular agencies may also have an idea that economic development can be understood as part of a “whole life project”, this is a view that is fundamental to religious NGOs. “At heart, religion is transformational, not simply transitional. It looks upon the individual as a sacred being with the right to a life of dignity and worth. When religion informs social change, the effects of development transcend the material by reaching what is important to people” (Mayotte 1998: 69).

Religious organizations themselves are highly cognizant of the differences between themselves and their secular counterparts. Deciding to engage in development work is often a step taken by religious organizations in order to effect change in the world based on a “reflection on the reasons for change in the world based on a “reflection on the reasons for Christian involvement in development, the method of involvement, and the goal of involvement from a Christian and biblical perspective” (Samuel and Sugden 1982: 19, italics in original). A statement by Mennonite development analysts propose[s] that members of the Ana-baptist/Mennonite tradition – of which we are a part – have a peculiar perspective and ethic regarding how the common good can be promoted and that this will result in a particular approach to development. We do not claim that it is the best approach, or that our tradition – and what flows from it – has a corner on development theory and practice. But we believe it has integrity and staying power and is worth offering as part of the larger development conversation (Yoder et al 2004: 7).

The dominant, secular discourse of development emphasizes technical solutions to issues that are defined in highly limited and circumscribed ways. It tends to confine projects to specific ends and means. In the last five or ten years, there has been an increased shift towards universal, narrow development goals (such as reducing infant mortality by two thirds). “Since James Ferguson first used the phrase, international development has become an ever more sophisticated ‘anti-politics machine’” (Quarles van Ufford et al 2003: 7). Religious NGOs such as OCLADE and Fundapaz, however, do not limit their sphere of interest. As their involvement in land claims and indigenous rights issues illustrate, a holistic approach allows them to go beyond the narrow confines of specific projects. A religious idiom of development may permit each organization to be more creative in its approach to projects as well as to take on projects that are simply not part of the agenda for other institutions.
Religious organizations are in a position to bring a moral voice into the work of development, especially in their work in marginalized communities. The two NGOs that I worked with in Argentina have proven tremendously successful in influencing the government, in conjunction with other NGOs in the region—the institutional power and moral force of the church has been brought to bear on land issues and rights issues more generally. The fact that these were religious organizations helped tremendously, lending them credibility, legitimacy, and longevity. The voice of religious NGOs takes “a distinctly moral tone, charged with notions of ‘Right’ and ‘Wrong’”—culturally resonant with large portions of the world’s population (Berger 2003: 35). The NGOs themselves have the advantage of committed staff, a willingness to engage with indigenous culture, respect it and learn from it, and a desire to help the communities become more self-directed in terms of economic issues.

Although there are both liberal and conservative religious NGOs, religious development organizations tend, on the whole, to be critical of global culture and global capitalism and to understand it as a model among many possible models of how the world can be organized.

Our world, which is becoming a global village, needs models that counter the imperialist impulse embedded in the globalization process. The development and missiological [sic] models that are currently most dominant emphasize conversion to Western culture and Christianity. In so doing, they mirror one of the most objectionable aspects of globalization, rather than offer an alternative (Yoder et al 2004: 312).

Both liberal and conservative Christian organizations share a critique of modernism, capitalism, and development, and development models based on them that base “progress” on measuring science, technology, and net worth. Instead, religious NGOs encourage a movement towards evaluating the total well being of persons and communities. It is this aspect of religious development agencies that distinguish them from mere missionary efforts to offering a genuinely different discourse of development.
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Is Genocide Still at Work Against First Nation Peoples?
Debates over U.S. and Canadian Indian Policy
Brian McKenna
University of Michigan-Dearborn

In his Foreword to The Politics of Genocide (2010), political theorist Noam Chomsky writes that denial of the Indian holocaust is a potent force in the United States. He argues that “the most unambiguous cases of genocide” are often “acknowledged by the perpetrators, and passed over as insignificant or even denied in retrospect by the beneficiaries, right to the present.” He states that:

Settler colonialism, commonly the most vicious form of imperial conquest, provides striking illustrations. . . Revolutionary War hero General Henry Knox, the first Secretary of War in the newly liberated American colonies, described "the utter extirpation of all the Indians in most populous parts of the Union" by means "more destructive to the Indian natives than the conduct of the conquerors of Mexico and Peru," which would have been no small achievement.

Canada has not been much better. Kevin Annett’s important new book Hidden No Longer: Genocide in Canada, Past and Present (2010) provides important evidence. The book is based, in part, “on the living testimonies of nearly three hundred survivors of thirty eight separate Indian residential schools or hospitals across Canada.” Annett, a former church minister, was fired and then defrocked for his investigations into the deaths of native children at his church’s residential schools. He was blacklisted and socially outcast for his continual efforts to bring these stories to light. Noam Chomsky said that “Kevin is more deserving of the Nobel Peace Prize than many who have received it in the past.” (in Hidden From History)

Historical U.S. and Canadian genocide is well established (Biolsi 2004; Oswalt 2009). But are these countries still committing genocide against American Indians? Gail Small thinks so. Small is featured in the Bullfrog film “Homeland: Four Portraits of Native Resistance” (2005). She is a member of the Northern Cheyenne Indian Tribe in Lame Deer, Montana, and serves as the Executive Director of the non-profit Indian organization Native Action. In the film she uses the harshest word one can use to describe U.S. Indian policy: genocide. She says that, "Genocide is the destruction of a people and their culture. And unless we face up to the fact that destruction of these tribes is at a point where they may not be able to survive much longer. We are at that point here. You put in 75,000 methane gas wells around our reservation, you take our ground water, pollute our air, destroy our rivers, the Cheyenne here will probably not be able to survive. We’ll have a wasteland here. That’s what’s at stake here. Where will the Cheyenne go?"

Sandy Grande, a Quechua scholar/activist, concur. She is the author of Red Pedagogy, Native American Social and Political Thought (2004). Grande well describes “the ongoing project of cultural genocide” (p. 103). The book is the result of hard won gnosiological investigation by a critical public pedagogue who “came to know through transgressing the disciplinary boundaries and ossified borders of academia – between fact and fiction, teacher and activist, spirit and reason, theory and practice – [that are] highly guarded by the sentinels of the ivory tower” (p. 4).

In addition to several important books on this question (Churchill 2002, Hermann and Peterson 2010), there is an important peer-reviewed Journal of Genocide Research that investigates these issues. In their classroom teaching, anthropologists must become familiar with these debates and take seriously questions of definition, perspective, and history (Glauner 2002). This dialogue in and of itself will provide a fundamental pedagogy of the oppressed, setting the stage for the civic-engagement actions to follow.

Major Victory in the United Nations

In 2007, the United Nations passed “The United Nation’s Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples” (United Nations 2007). This was a momentous achievement, with 143 Member states voting in favor. Ironically, the four opposing countries included Australia, New Zealand, Canada and the United States. In December 2010, following acceptance by the other three countries, President Obama announced that the U.S. would formally support the declaration. Notably, however its acceptance is legally non-binding. These developments are important for teachers and students to monitor, debate, and act on.

There appear to be three key possibilities in current U.S. American Indian policy and relationships. The first is continued exploitation, environmental destruction, and “ethnocide” (LaDuke 1999; Grande 2004). A second is the establishment of dramatically increased tribal autonomy and state-to-state relationships between the U.S. federal government and federally recognized tribes (as well as the federal recognition of scores of other tribes that are valiantly seeking this designation). The U.N. Declaration of 2007 is a fundamental tool in this effort, affording a base for significant educational and legal action, both for American Indians and the estimated 370 million indigenous peoples around the world. Importantly, the U.N. Declaration also provides a political opportunity for Indian tribes to finally win recognition as member nations in the United Nations. Associated with this trajectory are calls for decolonization.

Such developments are likely to be strongly resisted by the United States and Canadian governments. Therefore, a third possibility, promoted by the U.S. federal government will be a continued public policy of so-called peaceful coexistence. This liberal approach will find adherents on all sides of the movement, Indians included, but we must be very careful to scrutinize the manner by which such a policy, by omission and neglect, will discourage educational action and petition for redress of grievances. All of these possibilities exist within the larger culture of neoliberalism that speaks very loudly.
The dominant pedagogy, which informs the hidden curriculum found in schools today, enforces continued denial and repression against all those who raise questions about history, genocide, ethnoicide, and injustice (Zinn 2009). Self-censorship will continue to be a prominent feature in such a culture. However, in North American countries desperately in need of democracy and social justice, these questions must be vigorously debated and pursued.

Debate over terms like “ethnocide,” “genocide,” “proto-fascism,” and “inverted totalitarianism” are very important. But just as important are creating forms of educational struggle that can effectively shatter the culture of illusion and assist citizens in becoming involved in the struggles of indigenous people for social justice.

Here is my question: How do we best approach these developments as anthropologists and radical educators?
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Excuse me, can you tell us when, exactly, do the little Cherokee boys start growing in their feathers?

The Tourons, Cherokee, NC. By M. Taylor 2007
FOSAP is a membership committee of the General Anthropology Division (GAD) of the American Anthropological Association (AAA). It is designed to further the needs of faculty and students in small programs in Universities, Colleges, and Community Colleges, as well as public or private agencies, consulting firms, and any other small groups with interests in anthropology. Members are welcome who work with, or care about, such organizations. In practice, our interests have centered around coping with instability for small departments in times of academic downsizing and in the challenges and opportunities for teaching anthropology in such small departments. We are open to any other contributions and interests from our members and, in particular, in fostering interactions among members from different institutional backgrounds.
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