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A Note on the Structure of the Report

The report includes the following sections in two volumes. In Volume I, Part I, in addition to this overview note, there are:
1) A statement of the charge to the El Dorado Task Force
2) The Task Force's interpretation of the charge
3) Membership and procedures of the Task Force

In Volume I, Part II, we present three introductory statements under the collective authorship of the members of the Task Force.

In Volume II, we include the following sections:

Part III offers some background materials on
1) The role of the American Anthropological Association in issues related to the Yanomami
2) Background information on the Yanomami
3) Yanomami Updates

In Part IV, we present a set of interviews with and statements by Yanomami, collected, transcribed, and translated by Janet Chernela.

In Part V there are 10 case studies. The case studies vary in length and represent the results of research conducted into the issues indicated by members of the Task Force. Many of the case studies are individually authored by members of the Task Force, who have undertaken the research necessary to complete the case study. Where a case study has only one or two authors, other members felt that they simply did not have the expertise to either confirm or deny the results reported in the case study.

In Part VI, there are two reports and four essays. The Task Force decided to use this section to provide opportunities for members to advance minority opinions (especially in the essays) or develop details that are outside the main charge of the Task Force, but that became part of its deliberations (see the reports).

Part VII enumerates the references cited in Parts I-V.

A preliminary report under the title "Working Papers of the AAA El Dorado Task Force" was posted on the AAA Web Site from February 10 until the date of posting of the final report on May 1, with an invitation for comments open between February 10 and April 19. We incorporate as appendices, with the permission of their authors, comments by anthropologists that bore on issues within the scope of the charge of the task force. Many of these include useful citations of reference materials. These appendices will permit readers to have immediate access to important dimensions of the remarkable dialogue that took place during the period when comments were posted. All of the comments received, and comments received in future, will continue to be accessible on the AAA web site. Members of the Task Force thank all those who submitted comments. We assume that comments and discussion will continue. This "final" report is simply one contribution to an ongoing dialogue that the AAA will facilitate.
PART I. BACKGROUND ON THE TASK FORCE AND THE INQUIRY

1.1. The Charge to the Task Force.

The AAA El Dorado Task Force was constituted by the Executive Board of the AAA at its meeting of February 3 & 4 2001 (see http://www.aaanet.org/press/eldoradoupdate.htm). The motion was as follows:

**Motion on setting up an Inquiry**

At the February 3 & 4 2001 Meeting of the American Anthropological Association Executive Board the following motion was passed.

1) The AAA Executive Board will establish a task force of five members of the American Anthropological Association, four to be appointed by the AAA President, to conduct an inquiry on the allegations contained in *Darkness in El Dorado* by Patrick Tierney. The El Dorado Task Force will be chaired by AAA past President Jane Hill and will make its report to the Executive Board at its November 2001 meeting. The Task Force inquiry is intended to contribute to the Committee on Ethics’ efforts to extend guidelines and create materials concerning field research conducted wherever anthropologists work.

2) Using the report of the Task Force chaired by Jim Peacock as background, the El Dorado Task Force will consider the allegations concerning (1) fieldwork practices of anthropologists, (2) representations and portrayals of the Yanomami that may have had a negative impact, (3) efforts to create organizations to represent the interests of Yanomami or efforts to contribute to Yanomami welfare that may have actually undermined their well-being, (4) activities that may have resulted in personal gain to scientists, anthropologists and journalists while contributing harm to the Yanomami, and (5) activities by anthropologists, scientists and journalists that may have contributed to malnutrition, disease and disorganization.

3) The El Dorado Task Force may wish to consider allegations relating to medical research and medical emergencies among the Yanomami (e.g. the measles epidemic of 1968, research using radioactive iodine in the 1960’s) The Task Force should note earlier findings in their report where they feel that there is already sufficient evidence to refute such allegations, unless new information or questions emerge.

4) The El Dorado Task Force should be mindful of the evolution of various codes of ethics and ethical guidelines existing during the time a particular set of actions occurred. It is expected that the Task Force will seek information from AAA members, the author, and key anthropologists mentioned in the book. The Task Force should also contact anthropologists and others in Brazil and Venezuela in order to share information and become apprised of parallel investigations. The Task Force may also utilize the expertise of outside experts (medical researchers, epidemiologists) where necessary.
1.2. Interpreting the Charge.

In taking *Darkness in El Dorado* as a framework, one of the first tasks for the group was to develop a set of priorities for inquiry. The book includes hundreds of specific allegations, and the Peacock Committee found that many of them deserved attention. Following the Board resolution referenced above, the Task Force grouped the allegations into five major sets, and has focussed on a few instances in each set that seemed most amenable to inquiry. The sets are (1) fieldwork practices of anthropologists, (2) representations and portrayals of the Yanomami that may have had a negative impact (3) efforts to create organizations to represent the interests of Yanomami or efforts to contribute to Yanomami welfare that may have actually undermined their well-being, (4) activities that may have resulted in personal gain to scientists, anthropologists and journalists while contributing harm to the Yanomami, and (5) activities by anthropologists, scientists and journalists that may have contributed to malnutrition, disease, and disorganization. In addition, we have considered allegations relating to medical research and medical emergencies among the Yanomami.

We have used several types of reports on our inquiries. The first are the introductory statements under the authorship of the entire task force. These are found in Part II of Volume I. In Volume II, Part III develops background material, on previous actions of the AAA on matters related to the Yanomami. A section with geographical, historical, ethnographic, and human rights background on the Yanomami is included in order to assist those who are not closely familiar with these people. Supplemental to these background materials, Janet Chernela provides updated information on human rights and related issues that arose while the work of the Task Force was under way.

Part IV presents several interviews and statements by Yanomami collected by Janet Chernela. These are referenced in the introductory statements and in the case studies in Part V, as well as in the essays in Part VI. Part V consists of case studies under the authorship of one or more members of the Task Force. These report research into a specific topic. Task force members assigned as researcher/authors lay out the relevant texts and other information, such as personal communication information, that were collected, and summarize the results of their inquiry and the lessons that might be learned from it. In Part VI are found reports and essays. Like the case studies, these have authors. They develop lines of inquiry that may be tangential to the main charge, and also permit the presentation of minority opinions. In the case of the reports, the focus is on data, while the essays are more wide-ranging.

The final papers of the Task Force were compiled in the context of an unprecedented dialogue about the preliminary working papers, conducted on the AAA web site between February 10 and April 19, 2002, and involving both anthropologists and their students, not only from the U.S., but from other countries as well. Some of the comments submitted on the working papers of the Task Force were very substantial research papers compiled by specialists in the field. It was impossible for the Task Force to respond in point-by-point detail to all of these comments. Some, but not all, are referenced directly in various sections of the final report. However, this dialogic character of our work became very important to the Task Force, and permitted us to present our collective and individual views as part of an ongoing exchange with one another and with our critics.

In interpreting the charge, members of the Task Force had to reflect on the central place in our inquiry of Patrick Tierney’s *Darkness in El Dorado* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2000). Tierney’s book provided the impetus for the Association to set up a Task Force for the unprecedented purpose of inquiry into the conduct of anthropology in a specific field.
situation over more than 30 years. We regard the work with profound ambivalence, finding the book deeply flawed, but nevertheless highlighting ethical issues that we must confront.

Many reviews of the work have been published. Among the major reviews are Arvelo-Jiménez 2001, Geertz 2001, Grandin 2000, Proctor 2000, Sahlins 2000, Stoll 2001, Tooby 2000, Van Arsdale 2001, to mention only a few. One very detailed critique of the book can be found at the website of the University of California at Santa Barbara (“Preliminary Report”, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Santa Barbara” [http://www.anth.ucsb.edu/chagnon.html]; see also http://www.psych.ucsb.edu/research/cep/eldorado. Extensive discussions of the book can also be found at http://www.publicanthropology.org.

An exceptionally complete collection of documents regarding the book and debates about it was for a time found at http://www.anth.uconn.edu/gradstudents/dhume/Dark/darkness; a good deal of work cites papers on the site. Much of the site was inaccessible at the time of completion of the final report.

We concur with the findings of the AAA Executive Board, based on the report of the Peacock Committee, that the allegations in Darkness in El Dorado must be taken seriously. Darkness in El Dorado has served anthropology well in that it has opened a space for reflection and stocktaking about what we do and our relationships with those among whom we are privileged to study. But the required reflection goes beyond these matters. For instance, we must attend carefully to the responses of colleagues internationally, who have asked why American anthropologists are moved to action by an attack from outside the profession, but not by the collegial inquiry and concerns of our fellow anthropologists in other countries. We are aware that many of the allegations raised by Tierney’s book have been raised before by other scholars and journalists, including Brazilian and Venezuelan colleagues. We are thus moved to reflection about our relationships with our colleagues around the world and especially in Venezuela and Brazil.

The charge to the El Dorado Task Force to conduct an “inquiry” is unprecedented in the history of the Association, so that the Task Force had to think about what an “inquiry” might be. The term implies reflection on the truth or falsity of allegations -- and also of reflection of a moral and theoretical kind as well. In no sense did we consider our work to be an "investigation." Nor did we consider the materials that we developed to be "evidence." Where we found that it was possible to suggest something about the truth or falsity of allegations (or of the approximate location of an allegation in the large zone that exists between these two poles) we have done so. However, we present the various points of view that our interlocutors shared with us as important in their own right, as worthy of attention and reflection, but not as "evidence" revealing that some event did or did not occur.

We have had to reflect, not simply on the implications of some specific moments of anthropological work among the Yanomami, but on anthropological practice more generally. Both historically and today anthropology retains a central location in those relatively enduring regimes of knowledge and power which we can refer to in shorthand as the confrontation of Western elites with “others” whose presence requires classification, explanation, and incorporation into the systems of knowledge through which that power is in part constituted. These regimes do more than merely shape anthropological practice; they make it possible. However, at the same time, it is possible to use anthropology to interrupt these very regimes, to expose their contradictions, and to open within them spaces within which new voices can be heard. By locating the work of our Task Force partly in the space of reflection, we hope to accomplish such an interruption. But at the very minimum we hope to inspire a movement in anthropological exchange beyond the relatively narrow zones in
which debate over the meaning of *Darkness in El Dorado* has too often been restricted: Beyond a spurious distinction between value-free “science” and value-involved “humanities”, and, especially, beyond individuals and personalities. All anthropological practice is implicated in what went wrong in research conducted among the Yanomami – and members of the Task Force believe that things did go wrong. Some of these involved styles of anthropological investigation that are taken for granted or even explicitly advocated by many colleagues.

Members of the Task Force wish to be clear that they do not wish to rule out any kind of anthropological research. Our goal is rather to urge, consistent with developing international rules governing research with human subjects, that the use of any method or style of research be accompanied by careful reflection on its potential costs and benefits to the people under study. Should the kinds of specific conjunctions of politics and personalities that developed around Yanomami anthropology take shape around other challenging field situations, the AAA may have to commission new task forces. However, we believe that such discussions should not take place only at moments when our discipline is threatened by scandal. Instead, “inquiry” – on the history of practice in our discipline and on our own current practices -- should be part of the everyday work of all anthropologists. To make such reflection possible, we urge the use, at every level of every anthropological practice, of forms of presentation that will make that practice relatively transparent to ourselves, to those among whom we study, and to those who come after us, so that our own practices, as much, at least, as the lives of our subjects, can be targets of inquiry. We hope that the work of the Task Force and, especially, the open debate and dialogue that has taken place on the AAA web site during its work, will provide an exemplary framework for such reflection in the future.

1.3.1. Meetings and Procedures

The AAA El Dorado Task Force was constituted by the Executive Board of the AAA at its meeting of February 3 & 4 2001 (see http://www.aaanet.org/press/eldoradoupdate.htm). The Task Force has held five face-to-face meetings; four at the AAA offices in Arlington, Virginia (April 20-21, 2001, October 26-28, 2001, February 8-10, 2002, and April 12-14, 2002), and one at the Annual Meeting in Washington, DC Friday, Nov. 30, 2001. The Task Force held a final conference call April 30, 2002. Members have also conducted exchanges by e-mail and telephone (many of these did not involve all members of the group). The meetings and other work of the Task Force were staffed by Kim Guthrie, Executive Secretary of the Association, to whom the Task Force is greatly indebted.

Each member of the Task Force has had specific tasks and obligations. To the extent possible, members have tried to become acquainted with the anthropological literature on the Yanomami in the specific area that they were assigned. Especially those members who were not previously experts in the field apologize for the many gaps in our knowledge and understanding that must remain. In addition to the anthropological literature, we have consulted other materials including newspapers, films, grant proposals, and correspondence. Members have conducted a number of interviews, emphasizing interviews of persons with first-hand knowledge of the Yanomami fieldwork that is the object of the major allegations in Darkness in El Dorado, and with Yanomami themselves. Hill has held conversations with Ernesto Migliazza, Ryk Ward, and Jesus Cardozo. Chernela has conducted interviews with Davi Kopenawa Yanomami in Demini Village, Amazonas State, Brazil, with Jose Seripino, a representative of the Yanomami from Venezuela, at the Latin American Studies Association meetings in Washington DC, with Julio Wichato, a Yanomami nurse of Platanal, Upper Orinoco, Venezuela. Chernela has also held conversations with medical professionals, Venezuelan anthropologists, state officials, human rights workers, and other representatives at the First Yanomami Conference at Shakita (Upper Bisaasi-teri), Venezuela. In addition Chernela has interviewed leaders of COIAB and CIR, indigenous organizations that represent the Yanomami; and with members and leaders of CCPY and URIHI, NGOs that bring services to the Yanomami and work on behalf of Yanomami defense. Chernela was one of two representatives of the Task Force during the meetings with the Yanomami held November 20-23 in Shakita (Upper Bisaasi-Teri), Upper Orinoco, Venezuela. Fernando Coronil served as liason to the Venezuelan anthropological community and to the Yanomami Commission, a Venezuelan government commission established to investigate the allegations in Darkness in El Dorado. Coronil made two visits to Venezuela for this purpose and conducted many conversations with government officials and anthropologists at IVIC (Instituto Venezolano de Investigaciones Cientificas), the Universidad Central, and the Venezuelan Yanomami Commission. Coronil was one of two Task Force representatives at the meetings November 20-23 in Shakita, and there conducted discussions with José Seripino and with other representatives of the Yanomami, as well as with with government officials, activists, medical doctors, and representatives of indigenous organizations. Trudy Turner undertook interviews and correspondence with 16 anthropologists and biologists who have undertaken research that involved the collection of biological samples in indigenous populations. Turner surveyed literature on research ethics and informed consent, and conducted research in the James V. Neel Archives at the American Philosophical Society, and located and reviewed James V. Neel's grant proposals to the Atomic Energy Commission and other funding agencies from the relevant period. Hill's work has primarily been to
organize and chair Task Force meetings, and to coordinate the work of the members, but she also undertook several primary research tasks.

All interviews, both with Yanomami and non-Yanomami, were made in the name of the Association. Members explained the work of the Task Force to the interviewees, and received explicit authorization from the interviewees for dissemination as contributions to the task of inquiry. Most of the Yanomami statements presented in Section IV are by Yanomami who are public figures, who have spoken out on the issues touched on in many venues. The statements from Jose Seripino and Toto Yanomami were made in public meetings in the United States. We have accompanied all transcriptions with relevant contextual information, to ensure that the interviews are not considered “evidentiary” of “events” but rather of a “point of view.” So that the exact circumstances of the collection of the Yanomami statements will be understood, Janet Chernela has provided the following materials.
1.3.1.1 The Interview Process  (Janet Chernela)  I met with and interviewed three Yanomami spokespersons: Davi Kopenawa (Demini village, Brazil, June 7, 2001); José Seripino, (Washington DC, October 2001); and Julio Wichato (Shakita, Venezuela, November 22, 2001). I also attended, taped, and transcribed public addresses by Toto Yanomami (Ithaca, N.Y., April 6) and José Seripino (Washington D.C., October 2001).

Here I describe the conditions of each transcription:

**Davi Kopenawa** is a prominent Yanomami spokesperson who has presented the case of the Yanomami internationally for over twenty years. I have met with Davi Kopenawa 4 times, once at an international conference in New York, twice in the city of Boa Vista, and once in his village, Demini, in the Parima highlands of Brazil. I arranged the interview through contacts at CCPY, an NGO with offices in Boa Vista and radio contact with Davi. CCPY acted as intermediaries in obtaining Davi’s permission to interview him on behalf of the Task Force of the American Anthropological Association.

In addition to being a prominent spokesperson, Davi was relevant to the charge of the Task Force insofar as he was raised near Toototobi, where he lost his mother and other relatives to the measles epidemic and where he and his family were among those whose blood was collected by the Neel/Chagnon expedition.

I invited Davi to participate in what I call "reciprocal" interviewing -- that is, he could interview me as I could interview him. He understood that he was invited to speak to the AAA in this interview, and refers to the Association in the course of his talk. He also knew that this interview would be widely disseminated.

A number of anthropologists had discussed the Tierney book with Davi before my arrival. Among these were Bruce Albert, Leda Martins, and a third anthropologist whose name Davi could not recall. Davi and I spoke in Portuguese. The interview was recorded on audio and video-tape, and later translated from tapes into English.

**José Seripino** is a Yanomami spokesperson who works closely with the Venezuelan Commission charged with examining allegations raised in Tierney's book *Darkness in El Dorado*. In October of 2001 José visited the United States with Jesus Ignacio Cardozo Hernandez, head of the Venezuelan Commission, in order to participate in a meeting of the Latin American Studies Association. (I was a discussant in the same session.) While in Washington DC, José made a separate public address at George Washington University. It is the latter that is translated and transcribed here.

Unlike Davi Kopenawa, who is Brazilian, José Seripino is a leader of the Venezuelan village, Koparima, in the Upper Orinoco. He represents his village in SUYAO (Shabonos Unidos de los Yanomami del Alto Orinoco) and the Yanomami people in the Venezuelan National Indian Council, CONIVE. He was appointed Commissioner for the Upper Orinoco by the governor of Amazonas state. I was pleased to have the opportunity to record, translate and transcribe the comments of a key figure among the Venezuelan Yanomami.

**Julio Wichato.** The interviews and presentations of Davi Kopenawa and José Seripino showed strong concerns regarding the state of blood samples collected during the Neel expeditions and currently stored in the United States. When I attended the November meetings in Shakita, Venezuela, I brought statements to the Yanomami from US physical anthropologists Ken Weiss and Andy Merriwether, regarding the full status of Yanomami bodily samples in their curation (see Case Study 5.3, "Collection of Bodily Samples").

I was given no opportunity to present these statements. In part this was due to the concern among Venezuelan medical personnel that the mention of the bloods might create problems in blood extraction used in diagnosing diseases such as malaria.
At Shakita I met with a number of health practitioners working among the Yanomami. Among these was José Antonio Kelly, a Venezuelan medical anthropologist from Cambridge University. Kelly had worked in the area for over 18 months and appeared to be well acquainted with both Yanomami and non-Yanomami health workers and practices. Thinking to obtain an opinion from a Yanomami health practitioner regarding the medical uses of blood sampling, I asked Kelly to introduce me to a Yanomami nurse who, I specified, had no partisan position in the Tierney debate. Kelly introduced me to the elderly nurse from Platanal, Julio Wichato. To my surprise Wichato, who collects blood samples routinely, maintains and stores blood for diagnosis, and is familiar with the exercise of medical research, took a position regarding the US samples similar to those of the previous spokespersons. When I realized this, I asked Wichato if I might formally interview him with taperecorder. He agreed. We were forced to await a recording device. During the waiting period Wichato, Kelly, and I discussed the Task Force, its role, and the uses of the taped interview. I believe that Julio Wichato fully consented to this interview, when, at last, we were provided with a video camera by Fernando Coronil.

**Toto Yanomami** was an invited speaker at the conference, "Tragedy in the Amazon: Yanomami Voices, Academic Controversy, and the Ethics of Research," at Cornell University, April 5-7, 2002. I translated and transcribed one of several public addresses he made at that conference.

Toto's views are relevant to the charge of the Task Force since he is headman of Toototobi, a community that, under his father's leadership, was one of the main sites where the research team headed by James Neel and Napoleon Chagnon collected blood. Toto is a known Yanomami spokesperson in his own right. In April 2001 he acted as representative of the Yanomami communities of Toototobi, Patawaio, and Demini, at the Third Conference on Indigenous Health that took place in Boa Vista and Brasilia. Still in 2001 he was nominated to the Special Council of Yanomami Health Districts. Toto's presentation was delivered in Yanomami, then translated into Portuguese by Davi Kopenawa and into English by Gale Goodwin Gomez. My transcription represents my own translation from Mr. Kopenawa's Portuguese with some bracketed commentary derived from Goodwin's translation.

**Attempts to Obtain Additional Interviews**

The meeting at Shakita took place between Nov. 20-23, 2001. According to the Venezuelan Commission, this was the first-ever all Yanomami meeting in the Upper Orinoco of Venezuela. Terence Turner (an independent visitor), Fernando Coronil, and myself may have been the only representatives of non-Venezuelan institutions at the meeting. Events were tightly scheduled and divided between plenary sessions, with various speakers, and workshops. We three were invited to briefly introduce ourselves. My explanation that I represented the North American association of anthropologists, and would be happy to transmit any comments to them, drew no would-be interviewees. My methods were quite obvious, involving a tripod, a video camera, and an audio tape recorder. I never turned away any Yanomami or non-Yanomami wishing to speak to me. If my colleagues were approached by Yanomami speakers, I am not aware of it.

Approximately six weeks after the Shakita meeting, I was contacted through e-mail by the missionary, Mike Dawson, who served as Yanomami translator at the meeting. Dawson reported a meeting among Venezuelan Yanomami in which they elected to request compensation in the form of collective health benefits (correspondence, Jan. 2002). Dawson writes that he was asked to transmit this decision to the Association. Although I asked for details on this meeting, I have not yet received them.
1.3.1.2. The Preliminary Report

The charge to the Task Force required the posting of a preliminary report in time for the meeting of the Executive Board November 29, 2001. This deadline coincided with the attendance of Chernela and Coronil at the Yanomami Conference at Shakita, Alto Orinoco. The final language of some documents reached Chernela and Coronil after their departure for the conference, so that they were not able to read it before it was posted to the AAA web site. They disagreed with the wording of some of the posted documents, and declined to sign the preliminary report. The Society for Latin American Anthropology at its business meeting November 31, 2001 resolved to ask that the document be removed from the AAA web site because it was not approved by all members of the Task Force. Coronil, building on this resolution, proposed that the document be withdrawn as such, and be replaced by working papers, indicating authorship, with comments invited on the documents. This proposal was approved by the Task Force at its meeting of November 31, 2001. Prior to the reposting some editing was done on the documents. At its meeting of February 8-10, 2002, members consulted with the AAA webmaster, Lorie Van Olst, about how to post the preliminary report so that people could submit comments on the report and post them on the AAA web site. Under the title "Working Papers of the AAA El Dorado Task Force", the preliminary was reposted immediately after the meeting, with a deadline for comments of April 19, 2002. Task Force members have from time to time posted additional documents on the site. At its meeting of April 12-14, 2002, members determined that the very useful dialogue on the site should continue indefinitely, although responses to comments could not be incorporated into the final report after April 19. The second volume of the final report was submitted to the Executive Board of the AAA May 1, 2002, for consideration at their meeting of May 17-19. It incorporates much of the preliminary report, some of it considerably revised, and adds new materials. The first volume, which includes collectively authored materials requiring exacting revision, was submitted May 7, 2002 for consideration by the Executive Board.
1.3.2. Membership

Louise Lamphere, President of the Association, originally named 5 members to the Task Force, following the text of the Board motion. These are Jane H. Hill (Chair), Janet Chernela (Chair, AAA Committee for Human Rights and liaison to that committee), Fernando Coronil, Trudy Turner, and Joe Watkins (Chair, AAA Committee on Ethics and liaison to that committee).

The expertise that led to these appointments is as follows: Fernando Coronil is a specialist on the Venezuelan state. Coronil, as Director of the Doctoral Program in Anthropology and History, helped organize a three-part colloquium series entitled "Science/Ethics/Power: Controversy over the Production of Knowledge and Indigenous Peoples", held at the University of Michigan during March and April, 2001. He participated in a Current Anthropology forum on the Darkness in El Dorado (Coronil 2001). Janet Chernela is a specialist on Amazonian fieldwork and peoples with a primary research interest in Tukanoan speakers (located, like the Yanomami, in the Upper Rio Negro area of Brazil). In 2000 Chernela worked among the Brazilian Yanomami in developing a proposal (with the NGOs TNC and CCPY) to restore lands devastated by goldminers. Her 2001 article, "Fractured Lands", analyzes the struggle for demarcation of Yanomami lands in Brazil; an earlier article (1998) reviews recent Yanomami literature and considers the English gloss 'fierce' in historic context. Chernela has worked for over 20 years with Brazilian indigenous organizations and advocacy NGOs. Joe Watkins is an archaeologist with extensive publication on relationships between anthropologists and indigenous peoples. Trudy Turner is a biological anthropologist specializing in population genetics, who has also worked on research ethics. Jane Hill, a linguist specializing in Native American languages, was appointed to lead the group as a former president of AAA. In addition, both Chernela and Watkins were members of the Peacock Committee and so provided continuity between the Committee and the Task Force. Chernela was a member (and is now chair) of the AAA Committee for Human Rights, and Watkins is chair of the Committee on Ethics; in addition to their immediate Task Force duties, they served as liaisons to those committees.

Ray Hames was appointed to the Task Force in August 2001, and resigned in March 2002. Hames is an evolutionary ecologist specializing in the Yanomami and nearby Venezuelan indigenous groups.

No member of the Task Force has received compensation from the AAA, or release time from their home institution, for service on the Task Force. We have received reimbursement for the expense of travel to meetings in Arlington, and, in the case of Chernela and Coronil, for travel to Brazil and Venezuela. A research assistant for Turner, Jeffrey Nelson, was funded for a fractional-time appointment.

We find it necessary to address fully and frankly, according to our understanding, the appointment to, service on, and resignation from the Task Force of Ray Hames.

Throughout the period between the initial appointment of members and the middle of the summer of 2001, President Lamphere told Jane Hill and Fernando Coronil that she was under pressure from supporters of Neel and Chagnon to appoint a sixth member to the Task Force. President Lamphere assured members of the Task Force that she would not succumb to this pressure. As the pressure intensified, she came to feel that a sixth member had to be added. Lamphere discussed this matter with Coronil, who offered his resignation to solve the problem. She did not accept it. We believe that President Lamphere felt that she was acting with the best interests of the discipline in mind when, in August 2001, she appointed Raymond Hames as a sixth member.
Coronil had told Lamphere that he would stay on the Task Force under two conditions. First, Coronil insisted that the sixth member not be directly identified with the Chagnon faction, for this would change the nature of the Task Force and would transform him into a representative of a faction. Second, he asked to be informed of the choice beforehand (see his e-mail of 26 June 2001 in Note 1). These conditions were not met. Coronil decided not to resign because it would undermine the Task Force, but requested that the recomposition of the Task Force be discussed in its next meeting. In that meeting he raised objections about Hames’s inclusion on both formal and substantial grounds (see his e-mail of 29 August 2001 in Note 1). Facing a difficult dilemma, the Task Force decided to continue as reconstituted, with the commitment by Hames that he would be willing to engage in a critical evaluation of the allegations against Chagnon despite his personal links to him.

The Task Force was concerned that the appointment of Hames, a student and long-time professional associate and defender of Napoleon Chagnon, would give rise to a perception that its membership consisted of representatives of purported factions. The Task Force has consistently rejected accusations that Fernando Coronil represented a “faction” led by Professor Terence Turner; while Coronil did his dissertation under Turner’s direction, his work is quite unrelated to Turner’s. Before accepting an appointment, Coronil did require assurance that the Task Force would not be inquiring into allegations against Turner’s participation in the e-mail warning sent to President Lamphere the summer before the publication of *Darkness in El Dorado*. This has never been part of the charge to the Task Force, so Coronil was willing to be a member. The Task Force also rejects accusations that Trudy Turner somehow represents a faction. Trudy Turner held a post-doctoral appointment in the Department of Human Genetics at the University of Michigan Medical School in 1981-82, while James V. Neel was head of the department. She informed President Lamphere and Jane Hill of this before accepting the appointment. During Turner's post-doctoral years she seldom even saw Neel, and was not under his direct supervision at any time, except in the loose sense that he was Principal Investigator on grants to the department that funded some of the work of Turner and other postdocs. She worked under the supervision of Prof. Harvey Mohrenweiser and Prof. Miriam Meisler.

Hames resigned from the Task Force in March 2002, having attended two meetings. He did not consult with any member of the Task Force before submitting his letter of resignation, which came as a great surprise to the other members. The Task Force has missed his specific expertise about the Yanomami, which prevents the Task Force from completing its work in at least one important area, an inquiry into the allegations that Napoleon Chagnon instigated violence among the Yanomami; there was not enough time between Hames’ resignation and our deadline for another member to undertake research on this matter. Since Hames participated in a great deal of the work of the Task Force, attending two of its four meetings and undertaking research and drafting several case studies and contributing to the background section of the report (3.2), the Task Force does not believe that his resignation will have the effect, as his resignation letter suggests, of reassuring those who have opposed his membership. Instead, we are aware that speculation about the reasons for his resignation run very high. Hames was not pushed from the Task Force by any member or by the chair. While Hames was a member of the Task Force he participated in several vigorous verbal exchanges, but every member has so participated.

Hames indicated in his letter of resignation that he does not wish his name to remain on any of its documents. Unfortunately we cannot accept this request. Our commitment to openness about our procedures and operations requires that we make his contribution clear. Thus, where Hames contributed to documents, his contribution is indicated as part of the
history of a document. All of the documents to which Hames contributed have been revised since his resignation. Of course, he did not participate in these revisions.

NOTES
1. The following e-mails were sent by Fernando Coronil to members of the Task Force regarding the appointment of an additional member (e-mail of 26 June 2001) and, specifically, of Hames (e-mail of 29 August 2001).

---------- Forwarded message ----------
Date: Tue, 26 Jun 2001 09:50:23 -0400 (EDT)
From: Fernando Coronil <coronil@umich.edu>
To: Jane H. Hill <jhill@azstarnet.com>
Cc: bdavis@aaanet.org, kguthrie@aaanet.org, chernela@solix.fiu.edu, trudy@uwm.edu, jwatkins@telepath.com, lamphere@unm.edu
Subject: Re: Who wants to go to the Upper Orinoco?

Dear Jane and members of El Dorado task force,
(In the first paragraph of the message, Coronil volunteers to check his schedule to see if he can represent the Task Force at a proposed meeting with the Yanomami in Venezuela).

Concerning the inclusion of a new member, I totally share Jane's position ("I feel strongly that bowing to this group is almost like an admission of imbalance and I personally resent it, but I think also that Louise has the broader interest of the discipline very much in mind and I support her in this effort."). This means that I feel ambivalent; I don't want to to do anything that could be interpreted as an admission that there was "imbalance" and resent to have to make efforts to create the appearance of "balance," since I think we are balanced and have proceeded with integrity. On the other hand, given the politics of the situation (I had a long phone talk with Louise before she left to Brazil), it seems to me that it may be wise, as much as we may dislike to have to do so, to include a new person in order to give our report wider acceptance. I just want to make sure that a) the inclusion of this person would serve this purpose; b) it would not undermine our work. My understanding from our conversation is that Louise would let me (I assume us) know about this new member before making a final decision and that this person would accept the work we have already done. I am particularly concerned about this since the issue of "balance" came up in part because according to some folks my presence in the commission does not ensure its impartiality (since I was a student of Terry Turner). In my phone talk with Louise we contemplated various options, among them my resignation, which I offered, but she did not accept. My original understanding was that the members of El Dorado were chosen because of their scholarly competence and personal integrity as well as because of their ability to contribute to the task at hand. It is my understanding that the same criteria would be applied now, and the issue of "balance" responds not to affiliations concerning the various positions in this debate, but to subdisciplinary orientations within anthropology. In this respect, the inclusion of someone who represents the "Evolutionary Ecology end of anthropology" may make sense, given the situation we face.

Best,
Fernando
Dear Louise and Jane,

I wish time had changed my mind, but my visit to Venezuela has only confirmed my concern about the decision to include Raymond Hames as a member of the El Dorado Task Force.

It is not just that his inclusion violates the agreement we had reached about procedural and, arguably, substantive matters concerning the inclusion of a sixth member. I may leave this behind. What is important is that this person is recognized as a close collaborator of Chagnon's and as a researcher whose research is criticized by Tierney. I believe that it is inappropriate for a person to be, as I was told in Venezuela by members of the Yanomami Governmental Commission, "juez y parte," that is, judge and judged.

His inclusion in the El Dorado Task Force has placed our Venezuelans counterparts in a very difficult position, and has already affected our ability to do our work in Venezuela. I understand that our task is not to "judge" but to carry out an inquiry into the allegations presented in Tierney's book. But evaluators should seek to avoid a direct conflict of interest. Hames is implicated in the book through his own research among the Yanomami and his close collaboration with Chagnon. Moreover, his review of the book totally condemns it. According to him, the book is "comparable to a legal brief prepared by a rogue district attorney prosecuting scientists for alleged crimes against humanity." Since for Hames the central claims of the book are false, the only reason to bother with the rest of the book, according to him, is "that anthropology as objective witness and supporter of indigenous rights is threatened." I don't think this is the position of the Peacock Report or of El Dorado Task Force, or is it? It is my understanding that we are concerned with evaluating a book that raises issues that may concern not only the reputation of anthropology, but also the lives of the Yanomami.

I'm afraid that his inclusion places not just me, but, most importantly, the El Dorado Task Force in a very difficult position. Intentions aside, the goals of the commission may not be furthered, but undermined by this decision. I don't think we have an easy solution, but a possible solution may be to go back to our original agreement, perhaps with Hames's help and consent. Feel free to call me if you wish to talk about this (phone number).

Yours,
Fernando

In addition to this constituting motion, Task Force members were provided with a copy of a preliminary report prepared by a committee headed by James Peacock, former
President of the AAA, and for that reason called "The Peacock Report." The Peacock Report was intended strictly for internal distribution; it is a summary of the allegations in Tierney's book that singles out those which the members of the Peacock Committee found to be most significant. Even these "most significant" allegations were numerous, and the Task Force has not been able to inquire into all of them. The members apologize for the gaps that remain.
PART II. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENTS BY THE ENTIRE TASK FORCE

2.1. REFLECTIONS ON INFORMED CONSENT, RESEARCH, AND THE 1968 NEEL EXPEDITION

This introductory statement constitutes a general reflection drawn from the various case studies, reports from outside contributors, and our many discussions as a Task Force. In recognition of the complexity of the issues discussed, of the benefits of having multiple perspectives on them, and to encourage the dialogical character of our inquiry, we decided to produce a comprehensive report that includes not just the work produced by the Task Force as a whole or by its members, but by outside contributors as well. This report also incorporates material originally posted in essays and reports by members of the Task Force (especially case studies, reports and essays submitted by Turner (5.1, 5.2, 6.1.1) and Chernela (5.3, 6.2.1, 6.2.3)), and in comments submitted on the posting of the preliminary working papers. Attached as part of the appendix to this volume following the introductory statements, is a comment on Yanomami views submitted to the Task Force May 1, 2002 by José Antonio Kelly, a post-graduate student at Cambridge University currently working on Yanomami medical care. The comment was invited by Janet Chernela. We recommend that readers consult papers by Task Force members as well as the contributions of commentators to this report, because they explore in greater depth many of the subjects touched briefly in this statement, and offer other perspectives on some issues.
2.1.1. Consent, Research and Humanitarianism: James V. Neel and the Yanomami Then and Now

In the case study entitled "Informed consent on the 1968 Neel Expedition", authored by Trudy Turner, we have attempted to detail the contexts of the development of Neel's consent procedures. These contexts include codes in force at the time, Neel's own international leadership role in work on consent, the practices of other researchers collecting biological samples from indigenous populations during the same time period, and the exact details of what was told the Yanomami on the 1968 expedition, as described by Yanomami-speaking members of the expedition who presented the information and requested consent. Chernela's case study 4.3, "Collection of bodily samples and informed consent: A discussion with recommendations," reviews the status of the Neel samples and contains excerpts of interviews with Yanomami and correspondence with U.S. researchers in whose laboratories the samples are stored. Chernela finds a contrapuntal alignment between Yanomami recollections of sample taking and purpose with those described by contemporary researchers. This overview aims at a synthesis of Turner's and Chernela's research results.

Consent: The Explanation Offered to the Yanomami and the Goals of Neel's Research

The consent procedures of the Neel expedition were not in compliance with official standards for informed consent in force at the time of the expedition (and would not, of course, meet today's standards). In this failure, however, they reflect practices that were then common. Those in charge of explaining the research carried out by the Neel team in 1968 to the Yanomami indicated that its goal was to look inside their blood to find infectious diseases (see 5.2). This was misleading, as it suggested that the research would yield immediate health benefits to the Yanomami. This suggestion was reinforced by the fact that the Yanomami had received such benefits when health-care workers of the government anti-malaria campaign had tested their blood prior to this. The samples of blood, feces, urine, and sputum obtained from the Yanomami were studied for various traits related to health (such as the presence of intestinal parasites or hepatitis B). Neel filed a report on Yanomami health needs with the Venezuelan government, and published extensively on health-related findings in international journals. Medical treatment was provided by the expedition both in 1968 and in two follow-up years, 1969 and 1970, and Neel continued to send medications to missionaries working among the Yanomami for several years. However these efforts are beside the point of the misleading consent procedure.

It would have been possible and desirable to explain to the Yanomami in understandable language that the main goal of the expedition involved improving understanding of genetically-inherited differences between Yanomami individuals and villages, and between Yanomami and other people around the world.

Dr. Neel and his colleagues wanted to know how genetic variation arises and how village life spreads variation around, over the generations, as people move during their lives, marry, and have children of their own (Ken Weiss, Letter to the Yanomami Conference at Shakita, October, 2001, cited in its entirety in Chernela's case study 4.3. "Collection of bodily samples...").

While this research goal was potentially of general benefit to humanity, it would yield no immediate health benefit to the Yanomami. Yet the Yanomami might very well have been interested in these broader scientific goals of the expedition and even been willing to participate in them for their own sake, had they been given information that would have permitted them to make an informed decision.
Had Neel's team undertaken discussions of these goals with the Yanomami in order to obtain informed consent, a right of the Yanomami as human subjects, the ways in which the Yanomami remember these expeditions might be very different.

The Contexts for Consent in 1968

The official codes accepted internationally by researchers in the late 1960’s included the Nuremberg Code of 1947, the Declaration of Helsinki of 1964, and the WHO standards of 1964 (drafted by a committee led by Neel himself; see 5.2; see also Chernela’s essay “Freedom and comprehension”, 6.2.3.). The Nuremberg Code refers to “experiment”; we discuss below whether any dimension of Neel’s work should be considered to fall within this category. The Declaration of Helsinki was more broadly worded, specifying “research” and dividing the latter into therapeutic and non-therapeutic types. The WHO standards (see 5.2) were similarly broad, and these official standards should have governed Neel’s consent procedure. They all require informed consent of subjects. It is also important, however, to understand the unofficial contexts, those of custom in the medical and scientific community of the time, within which the Neel team was working. Researchers who were active at the time confirm that consent procedures were seldom the focus of much attention, even where research did pose some risks to subjects. Researchers often assumed that participation by subjects implied consent (see 5.2). Neel’s expedition collected samples of bodily materials (blood, sputum, urine, feces), using standard procedures that had proven over many years with many populations to have an extremely low risk of complication. They had no reason at the time to suppose that these procedures would pose risk to Yanomami donors, and they had reason to believe that the minimal risks were balanced by benefit, medical care provided by physicians on the research team to a disastrously under-served population. The Task Force has found no evidence that Neel and his team were unusual in the cursory and misleading nature of their consent procedure. Nonetheless it cannot be condoned.

The research procedures did, however, pose another kind of risk, which we can identify today in the sense of betrayal and injustice shared by many Yanomami. The kind of suffering that we perceive today among the Yanomami has, we believe, hardly been anticipated by efforts in improving consent procedures -- and full understanding of it continues to be absent from most official efforts to regulate consent procedures in the humanities and the social and behavioral sciences. Anthropologists currently conducting research in genetics, skeletal biology and human variation have engaged with communities around the world in collaborative research models that address this issue. This new work not only innovates new forms of consent, but includes examples of technology transfer, educational enrichment, and museum representation that have been negotiated with communities who will, as a result, enjoy a sense of autonomy and empowerment.

Did Neel’s Research Fall under the Nuremburg Code as an “Experiment”

The Nuremberg Code of 1947 consistently speaks of “experiment.” How might this language have been understood? According to Cook and Campbell (1979:5) “All experiments involve at least a treatment, an outcome measure, units of assignment, and some comparison from which change can be inferred and hopefully attributed to the treatment.” Neel’s expedition administered no “treatment” to the Yanomami population (we discuss the measles vaccination campaign below). However, while the work of the Neel expedition did not constitute an experiment in this narrow sense, it might be considered in broader terms to constitute a “natural” experiment. Bernard (1979:63) distinguishes “true experiments”
(undertaken in the laboratory), “quasi-experiments” (which take place in the field but involve a treatment designed by the researcher), and “natural experiments.” Natural experiments are constituted by differences between populations that arise without the intervention of the researcher. For instance, in the case of Neel’s work, he confronted different human populations with different exposure to the mutation-inducing effects of radiation: the Japanese of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, with high exposure, and the Yanomami with almost none. At this level, the Yanomami were indeed a part of an "experiment", a natural experiment offered to the researchers by the use of atomic weapons against some populations, but not others (see the comment by Johnston for a fuller discussion of this issue, which we have abbreviated here for reasons of space).

While not using the "natural experiment" language, Neel does observe (as in Neel et al. 1970) that naturally-occurring phenomena (rather than investigator-controlled treatments) provide research opportunities. In any case this opportunity, which we would now call a “natural experiment,” should have been discussed with the Yanomami, to see if they were willing to be one of the populations participating in a global comparative study of factors shaping genetic variation.
2.1.2. Was the 1968 vaccination campaign organized for research, as a humanitarian program, or both?

Tierney hints that the program of vaccinations against measles administered to the Yanomami might have constituted an "experiment". He is led to this idea by the fact that Neel used the Edmonston B vaccine, which Tierney considered a "dinosaur" (Tierney 2000:59). Tierney observes that "opting for the Edmonston vaccine was a bold decision from a research perspective. Obviously, the Edmonston B, precisely because it was primitive, provided a model much closer to real measles than other, safer vaccines in the attempt to resolve the great genetic question of selective adaptation" (Tierney 2000:59).

Tierney advances one explanation for the use of Edmonston B. Before proceeding, we note that there are several others. Turner’s research, summarized in 5.1 "The measles epidemic of 1968" shows that the manufacturer of the Schwarz vaccine, the main alternative, did not provide it to Neel. Ryk Ward, a biological anthropologist who was a member of the 1968 expedition, provides a different explanation. He states (conversation with Hill April 29, 2002) that Neel had originally planned a public-health campaign, of prophylactic vaccination among those Yanomami communities most likely to face early exposure to new epidemic diseases. In a meeting in late October, 1967, before the measles epidemic had begun, Ward recalls that the team decided to use Edmonston B because they believed that it gave a longer immunity than the Schwarz vaccine, and, when administered with gamma globulin, did not have more serious side effects.

Tierney suggested that vaccine reactions might be a site where Neel could observe differential fitness of headmen and other members of the Yanomami population. Neel was definitely interested in the possibility that the differential reproductive rate of headmen constituted a positive selective pressure in their populations (Neel 1980). Nobody questions this fact about Neel. However, we find no evidence that he developed or submitted a research protocol to test this idea through looking at vaccine reactions.

More recently, Terence Turner (2001), while not insisting that Neel’s vaccination campaign constituted an “experiment,” has argued that the campaign should be represented as having both a humanitarian and a research dimension. The El Dorado Task Force has debated this issue extensively. In trying to understand the campaign, we have stuck as close as we could to the documentary ground, which we summarize here.

Long before the expedition, Neel was interested in disease pressures, as noted in the essay 6.1.1 "Turner Point by Point," and discussed measles and measles vaccination with experts. We know that during the measles epidemic and the vaccination campaign Neel made research observations of the course of the disease in victims (as when he had Tim Asch film Rerebawa (see Report 6.1.2)), and observed vaccination reactions. We know that he was very interested in disease burdens on populations, and, more specifically, that he was advancing a cultural theory about the reason for the high mortality from measles among Native Americans, in opposition to the biological theories held by many scholars at the time (see 6.1.1, “Turner Point by Point.”) The measles epidemic gave him an opportunity to make observations in reference to this theoretical work. Neel had analyzed Yanomami blood samples from the 1966 expedition for antibody titres. He had in this way identified Yanomami vulnerability to measles, and planned the prophylactic vaccination campaign accordingly. He returned in 1969 to one of the 28 Yanomami villages where he had vaccinated in 1968, and collected new titres. He produced a publication (Neel, Centerwall, Chagnon and Casey 1970), based on observations made during the measles campaign and on the follow-up analyses. All of these facts suggest that we should recognize a research dimension to the vaccination campaign, even though it was not planned as an experiment.
The Report of the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ) is often cited as evidence in favor of a conclusion that Neel's vaccination program was planned with a research dimension. The Report (Lobo et al. 2001:7) cites as its own evidence for this Ryk Ward's comments on the Hume website (now unavailable) (http://www.anth.uconn.edu/gradstudents/dhume/Dark/darkness/0161.htm), which state that Neel was interested in returning to the Yanomami after vaccination to determine an immunological response. However Ward (conversation with Hill April 29, 2002) insists that this quotation misrepresents his own position, which is that Neel’s vaccination plans constituted a “public health” campaign, not a research project. The UFRJ report, concludes that "the principal research objectives of Neel associated with the Yanomami vaccination in 1968 and the protocol of this research can be evaluated only after obtaining the original research statement presented to the AEC..." (Lobo et al. 2001:7). Trudy Turner has examined Neel's research proposal to the Atomic Energy Commission for the 1968 expedition, and there is no reference in it to a research procedure involving the measles vaccines. Although Neel had apparently selected Edmonston B as the vaccine of choice in a meeting in October 1967 (Ryk Ward, conversation with Hill, April 29, 2002), the vaccines Neel used in the 1968 campaign were assembled at the last minute. They were administered on a very tight schedule. Gamma globulin doses were administered based on very rough estimates of body weight. While Neel et al. 1970 compare reactions in people who were vaccinated with and without immunoglobulin, the opportunity for this comparison came not from an investigator-controlled research design, but from the fact that Roche vaccinated without immunoglobulin at Ocamo prior to Neel's arrival (the comparison also used data from Brazil and from previously published materials). These facts support the claim that there was no research plan shaping the 1968 vaccination campaign, and that its purpose was humanitarian. Any research results derived secondarily from opportunities that the vaccination program provided for observation.

All members of the Task Force recognize that Neel, out of years of scientific habit, would have been constantly observing, noticing, and documenting what he saw on the expedition, whether undertaking activities related to the AEC-funded grant or administering clinical care. For some members, there is a very important moral dimension to the procedural distinction between this habit, and the publications and results to which it led “after the fact”, versus a program of research planned around the vaccination campaign and in advance of it. These members prefer to insist on this distinction, finding no evidence for a research plan, and much evidence for Neel's humanitarian goals (see 5.1, 6.1.1). For other members, it is very important to recognize the complexity and ambiguity of Neel’s project, and to keep open the idea that it is difficult to establish the interplay between the humanitarian and research goals of the expedition and to evaluate how its potentially conflicting goals affected the activities carried out in 1968. We have learned that the former members are unlikely to convince the latter, and vice versa. This is one of the reasons that we support the suggestion that an independent international team of specialists in research ethics carefully examine all the documentation.
2.1.3. Other Issues
Did Neel’s AEC-funded research interfere with the vaccination program?

The Task Force recognizes that Neel faced a structural conflict between his research program as approved and funded by the AEC, and the vaccination campaign. His notes are full of his frustrations in this regard. See Trudy Turner's case study 4.1, "The Measles Epidemic of 1968" for a fuller enumeration of the steps Neel took in response. Neel’s team administered 1000 doses of vaccine, all that they had, and also provided antibiotics and analgesics to measles victims and to people suffering from vaccine reactions. Case study 5.1 and report 6.1.1 argue that there is no evidence that the research program hindered the vaccination campaign. Indeed, some members of the Task Force argue that the research program, by funding the team's presence in the region, made the vaccination program possible. Other members of the Task Force, however, argue that the question must be kept open, given the possibility that the vaccination program might have been more efficient had it been uncomplicated by the many dimensions of the AEC-funded research that Neel continued to pursue. We are unable to reach agreement on this matter.

Did the Vaccination Program Harm the Yanomami?

Tierney suggested (cf. Tierney 2000:63, 69) that the reaction to the vaccine might itself have led to deaths. He argues that the Neel expedition should never have vaccinated vulnerable Yanomami, who, in Tierney's view, resembled immunocompromised individuals (cf. Tierney 2000:59-60, and 66-69). The UFRJ report rejects this comparison (Lobo et al. 2001:9). Most Yanomami were appropriate candidates for vaccination. Migliazza (Letter 2001) stated that no vaccinations were given to young infants. In addition to its conceptual errors, Tierney's account obscures the fact that wild measles had already arrived in the Upper Orinoco before the Neel expedition began. The choice was a high risk of death from infection with the wild virus in the "explosive environment"(Lobo et al. 2001:3) of a virgin-soil epidemic, versus the likelihood of several days of discomfort from the vaccine reaction that, according to the UFRJ report, is "without the risk of death" (Lobo et al. 2001:9).

Tierney was especially concerned with harm that might have been done by not administering gamma globulin with the doses of Edmonston B vaccine. Turner (5.1) has shown that the team ran short of gamma globulin because the gamma globulin dosages, provided by the Michigan Department of Public Health, were "standard" doses calculated for use with children only. We assume that the UFRJ report is correct when they state that any side effects of the vaccine, with or without gamma globulin, are highly unlikely to have been fatal.

While the death rate among the Yanomami in the 1968 epidemic is a great tragedy, unquestionably the vaccination program of the Neel expedition saved many lives. The UFRJ suggests that Neel's vaccination program was "a beneficial measure" (Lobo et al. 2001: 7). The Task Force agrees.

Did Neel Plan Carefully Enough for the Epidemic?

The UFRJ report suggests that "given that Neel was already aware of the risk of the epidemic during his preparations for the trip (having received information on the epidemic in Brazil in the border regions with Venezuela in late 1967) some additional precautions could have been included or foreseen in his work plans. Some precautions that would have reduced the difficulties encountered in the field include the training of those administering vaccinations, information on complications and treatments, provisions
of medications and antibiotics, an itinerary and schedule of villages to visit, etc."
(Lobo et al. 2001:11)

Turner's case study 4.1, "The Measles Epidemic of 1968" finds that Neel learned on November 28 that the measles epidemic had appeared in Brazil, and on December 11, 1967 that it had reached Venezuela. On the very same day Neel began telephoning and writing to round up vaccine doses, and that same day wrote Miguel Layrisse in Venezuela to get permission to bring in vaccine. 2000 doses of Edmonston B vaccine were delivered to Neel on December 19. On January 11 he sent 1000 of these doses with Ryk Ward to Georgetown, Guyana, where the Pan American Health Organization saw to their delivery to missionaries working among the Yanomami in Brazil. Accompanying these doses was a copy of the Centerwall vaccination protocol, written January 9, 1968. Neel and the others reached Caracas a few days later and left for the field January 20, with part of the team going to Mavaca/Ocamo on the Orinoco and the group with Neel going to the Ventuari River (see 6.1). These dates suggest a highly compressed schedule of activity. Migliazza (Letter July 23, 2001) reports that members of the team did receive training in basic first aid. Neel's notes, as pointed out in 5.1 and 6.1.1, indicate that "plans and replans" were made in Caracas while he waited for transportation. Indeed, the epidemic was not confirmed, or the “All-Orinoco Plan” developed, until the team had already used 700 of their 1000 vaccine doses. The team had hoped for government assistance, and made urgent radio calls to Caracas for additional doctors and medicine. Venezuelan government doctors did arrive in the Upper Orinoco about 3 weeks after the last member of the expedition (other than Chagnon) had left the region (Chagnon 1977:146; Ward, conversation with Hill April 29, 2002).

The experience of the 1968 expedition merits study in more detail than is possible for the Task Force, to see how planning might be improved so that future emergencies can be handled with maximum efficiency.
2.1.4. Beginning to mend the damage

The Task Force takes seriously the evidence that there has been long-term social and psychological suffering among the Yanomami as a result of the 1968 Neel expedition. According to independent interviews conducted among bilingual Yanomami by Janet Chernela (see the "Yanomami Statements" 4.1-5, and see also the commentary by José Kelly in the appendix to this section), there was consensus that the Yanomami were misled by the promise of health benefits in the "consent procedure" of the Neel expeditions and this promise was not fulfilled. Although Turner has pointed out in the case study 5.1, "The measles epidemic of 1968", that the fault probably lay in many places, this is beside the point of the unfulfilled promise.

Obviously many Yanomami who report feeling betrayed by this unfulfilled promise were barely touched by the expedition or were not even alive when it occurred. However, the sense of having suffered an injustice is no less real among them. This sense of injustice comes from the fact that the Neel expedition treated the Yanomami as if they were less than fully capable of understanding and of determining their own destiny. We do not believe that at the time anyone on the Neel expedition ever contemplated such an unfortunate result. Nonetheless, the result is real, and indeed for the Yanomami it is a very significant component of their reality. It cannot be denied or minimized.

One way to address this reality to reopen the matter of the disposition of the biological samples, especially blood and derived genetic materials, collected by the Neel expeditions. Such a reopening has been urged by Chernela, who has throughout her participation in the Task Force pointed to the wording "dynamic and continuous," found in the Association's Code of Ethics to describe informed consent as an ongoing process. This wording is also foregrounded in the Committee on Ethics' most recent briefing paper on informed consent. The Task Force concurs that this understanding of the consent process is correct and that such a reopening is appropriate (see 5.3).

Janet Chernela and Fernando Coronil have spoken to Yanomami representatives who want the sample materials that were collected by the Neel expeditions, especially those that were collected from people now deceased, to be destroyed or returned to them for appropriate disposition. Yanomami spokespersons from Brazil have investigated the possibilities of legal proceedings in both Brazil and the U.S. (see Chernela's translation of Boletim Yanomami No. 25 (April 2, 2002), in 1.7.2 of the current report, and Albert's comment posted April 19, 2002, "Federal Attorney General's Office of Brazil launches investitation into Yanomami blood samples held in the U.S."). Unfortunately, such legal proceedings may obstruct the very process of information exchange that the Task Force has been attempting to broker and that some members of the biological anthropological community wish to initiate. Chernela points out that the Yanomami are not yet properly informed about the condition or uses of their own bodily samples, and publicly demand such information. The Task Force urges a full disclosure in an accessible form of the information, so that the Yanomami may, indeed, come to a truly informed position about the disposition of these samples. We have not been able to arrange any meeting between Yanomami representatives and representatives of the biological anthropological community, but members of the Task Force, especially Chernela, continue to try to broker such a meeting. Such brokering has been fraught with obstacles, in part due to the difficulties of communication, but there is no unwillingness on the part of researchers or Yanomami to enter into dialogue. Ken Weiss, curator of the Neel sample collection at Pennsylvania State University, is fully willing to return samples or to invite Yanomami to visit his lab and...
examine the specimens so that they may make practical decisions regarding their return or destruction (see 5.3).

Weiss has voluntarily declared a moratorium on any study of those samples under his curation (see Chernela's discussion in Case Study 5.3). The Task Force recommends that other scholars follow Weiss in imposing an immediate moratorium on scientific work with materials collected from the Yanomami during the Neel expeditions. The moratorium should remain in place until new agreements can be worked out between the scholarly community and the Yanomami under contemporary procedures of informed consent. One of the results of such new agreements may very well be return of the original biological materials under terms specified by the Yanomami. Ultimately, though, we believe that better communication and informed decisions expand possibilities and lay the beginnings for new collaborations between the Yanomami and the research community, in which the Yanomami are full decision-makers. Moreover, we believe that these agreements should include a commitment by the anthropological community to full collaboration with the Yanomami to see that adequate medical care is provided to Yanomami communities, especially in Venezuela where the need is greatest. This effort should not take the form of vague promises that, for instance, genetic research may ultimately facilitate finding cures or prophylactics for infectious diseases. Instead, it should take the form of working with colleagues internationally toward immediate and material benefit in the form of training, equipment, medical supplies and medicines, clinical access and personnel, and other benefits that will be accessible to Yanomami throughout their homeland. Many barriers to the success of such efforts exist, but the effort must be sincerely made.

Finally, members of the Task Force are in full agreement with the authors of the UFRJ Report (Lobo et al. 2001) and Bruce Albert (in his contribution to the "Borofsky Rounds", http://www.publicanthropology.org/Journals/Engaging-Ideas/RT(YANO)/Albert) who have suggested that an ethics committee composed of independent specialists be assembled to make a final judgement on the procedures of the Neel Expeditions. We support the convening of such a committee, which might well be able to refine and develop further our understanding of the nature of informed consent by looking in detail at the challenges posed by this case.
2.2. REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE INQUIRY INTO SOME MAJOR ALLEGATIONS AGAINST NAPOLEON CHAGNON

2.2.1. Introduction

Napoleon Chagnon is interested in the large-scale structure of Yanomami social organization and geographical distribution and the place of violence in the evolution of that structure. The Task Force has not been asked to take a position on the purely anthropological debates about his work, and does not do so. To the degree that "ethical" questions can be untangled from "anthropological" questions, we try to address only the former.

Professor Chagnon has refused to talk to any member of the Task Force, which we regret. Colleagues (Irons, Hames) who have talked to him have from time to time shared his views with the Task Force. We know that he objects to this inquiry in the strongest terms. We hope that we have proceeded in the spirit of trying to learn from mistakes that he has often modelled in his own work.

Chagnon has been exceptionally frank in discussing his mistakes in his textbooks, and we believe that criticism of his work should give proper credit to his openness in matters such as his mistakes in collecting Yanomami names (see the case study 5.4, "Yanomami names and photographic identification"), or in becoming involved in Yanomami factions (see case study 5.5 "Involvement in Yanomami political affairs"). Members of the Task Force know how easy it is to make mistakes in the field, and we recognize that most careers do not come under such close scrutiny.

Among the case studies are several reviews, some very short, of dimensions of Chagnon's work that are not referenced, or only minimally referenced, in this statement. These include 5.4 "Yanomami names and photographic identification", 5.5 "Involvement in Yanomami political affairs", 5.6 "Engagement of anthropologists in public dialogue with members of study communities", and 5.7 "The Yanomami Survival Fund". We recommend that readers consult these case studies.

A major allegation against Chagnon is that he exacerbated violence among the Yanomami through his practices of distributing gifts. This is a major argument of Ferguson (1995), and it is adopted by Tierney 2000. The Task Force finds this to be a very complex matter, and one that it could not address fully without Hames' expertise. Chernela discusses some of the general issues in the case study 5.8 "Gifting: A commentary...".

We treat in this section two major sets of allegations against Chagnon: First, allegations that his representations of Yanomami ways of life were damaging to them and that he made insufficient effort to undo this damage, and second that his association in the early 1990's with FUNDAFACI, a Venezuelan foundation that sponsored his research, represented an unethical prioritizing of his own research concerns over the well-being of the Yanomami. We concur with both these allegations.
2.2.2. The Problem of Representation (Ray Hames contributed some notes to this section before his resignation from the Task Force, but did not participate as an author.)

In considering the allegation that Chagnon's representations of the Yanomami were damaging to them, we consider primarily what is in the published record of the many editions of his books, and those public statements by Chagnon about the Yanomami that we have seen.

The first edition of Napoleon Chagnon's *Y'nomamö: The Fierce People* was published in 1968 as a contribution to a popular series of short ethnographic treatments, *Case Studies in Cultural Anthropology*, intended for use in introductory classes and edited by George and Louise Spindler for Holt, Rinehart and Winston. Chagnon's text rapidly became the leading seller in the series, and has gone through five editions (the last two with a new publisher, Harcourt Brace).

In addition to the subtitle, "The Fierce People," this first edition emphasized Yanomami violence in many other ways, ranging from the choice of photographs to many details of the text. This book takes as its major task to permit students "to appreciate the effects of warfare on Y'nomamö culture in general and on their social organization and politics in particular" (Chagnon 1968:3). The Spindler's introduction to the book especially emphasized violence, including sentences such as "Y'nomamö culture, in its major focus, reverses the meanings of "good" and "desirable" as phrased in the ideal postulates of the Judaic-Christian tradition (Spindler and Spindler 1968:vii). The ethnography opens with the famous scene in which Chagnon, entering Bisaasi-Teri with the missionary James Barker, encounters a group of men taking hallucinogenic drugs that produce a prolific flow of green nasal mucus. While there are many ethnographic details in the book that have nothing to do with warfare, and while Chagnon explains the logic of many Y'nomamö social arrangements and beliefs, many students took from the book primarily a strong impression of violence, filth, and irrationality. Chagnon's choice of a technical orthography for the representation of the word *Y'nomamö* also meant that the book was usually cited by its subtitle, "The Fierce People." In summary, the die was cast: The Yanomami became "The Fierce People", famous above all else for warfare and violence, and more complex readings of Chagnon's work received little attention.

The accuracy of this image of the Yanomami was challenged as early as 1976 by Sheldon Davis, who argued that to characterize the Yanomami as "fierce" masked another reality: That the Yanomami were in fact almost helpless victims of aggressive expansion by Whites into their traditional lands. Since Davis's work many other anthropologists working among the Yanomami have argued that Chagnon's characterization was incorrect ethnographically, that it reflected specifically North American concerns about the place of violence in human nature at the height of the Viet Nam War, or that it reflected preoccupations with violence and aggression emanating from Chagnon's own personality and background.

Of special importance for many of Chagnon's critics is an article he published in 1988 in *Science*, where he attempts to show that Yanomami men who have killed an enemy enjoy higher rates of reproductive success. The *Science* article is important for two reasons: First, its publication coincided with a disastrous moment in the long history of the struggle for Yanomami land rights in Brazil, the reduction and division of Yanomami lands into a set of Bantustan-like island reserves by Brazilian president Sarney (Chernela 2001). Second, the article received extensive coverage in the popular press. Albert and Ramos (1988) and Carneiro da Cunha (1989) point out that the article was covered in *The Washington Post* and in the *Los Angeles Times* (February 19, 1988 and February 26, 1988, as cited in Carneiro da
Cunha 1989)), and picked up as well in two major Brazilian papers, *O Estado de S. Paulo* (March 1, 1988) and *O Globo* (March 1, 1988). The Brazilian anthropologists, in a letter from Manuela Carneiro da Cunha to the American Anthropological Association sent in 1988, but not published until 1989, urged the North American anthropological community to reflect carefully on the consequences and contexts of representations (see 3.1, "The Role of the American Anthropological Association in Advocacy for the Yanomami and Debates on Yanomami Anthropology ").

The charge to the Task Force does not relate to the technical anthropological debates regarding the extent, origins, functions, etc., of Yanomami violence, or to any relationships that might exist between characterizations of Yanomami violence and the ideologies of anthropologists over the last 35 years. Insofar as Chagnon's role in these debates has affected the Yanomami, the important question for the Task Force is, were Chagnon's representations damaging to the Yanomami, and, when the possibility of such damage was brought to his attention, did he respond adequately to this concern? The conclusion of the Task Force is that it is likely that these representations have been damaging to the Yanomami, and that Chagnon has not adequately addressed his responsibility to try to undo this damage.

Despite changing the characterizations of the Yanomami in his published works, Chagnon has never spoken out clearly and unequivocally to attack misuses of his work by journalists. Instead he has repeatedly used precious opportunities provided by contexts like *New York Times* op-ed essays and interviews in major magazines to attack professional enemies rather than to render clear support to the Yanomami. The Task Force is concerned by the fact that Chagnon has never found it possible to speak out effectively and unequivocally in support of Yanomami human rights in a context where such statements would receive wide circulation. Rather than allying himself with groups with an established record of advocacy for the Yanomami, he has repeatedly attacked such groups as romanticists who manipulate the Yanomami for their own purposes. His public statements consist primarily in defensive attacks on his critics that bypass the issue of Yanomami human rights, or that even undermined efforts in their support (as in his attacks on Davi Kopenawa Yanomami, discussed in 5.6).

In an interview with the Brazilian magazine *Veja* in 1994, we believe that Chagnon did try to produce a "sound bite" that would constitute an unequivocal defense of Yanomami rights. Unfortunately, the language that he chose was regarded as inappropriate, vulgar, and unhelpful by at least some scholars active in pro-Yanomami advocacy, and was eclipsed by an attack on his professional enemies that dominated the interview as published. We return to the *Veja* interview below.
2.2.2.1. Changes in Chagnon's textbooks

Although he has not often directly acknowledged his critics, Chagnon has modified his representations of the Yanomami through the various editions of his textbook and in other writings, which we take to demonstrate his understanding of their potentially damaging character in their original form. The impression a student would get from reading the fifth edition of *Yanomamö* is different from what would be taken away from the first edition.

We review a number of changes in Chagnon's monographs that support the conjecture that he was indeed responding to the widespread perception among his colleagues that there was a potentially damaging overemphasis on violence in the first edition of his textbook. As the editions of his textbook are revised he increasingly tries to balance his discussions of Yanomami warfare and violence with attention to more cooperation-oriented forms of Yanomami politics. In the fourth (1992) edition of his textbook he eliminates the subtitle *The Fierce People*. Furthermore, the more stereotypical characterizations in the prefaces to his books by his editors, George and Louise Spindler, and other authors, are softened and eliminated.

1. *Yanomamö: The Fierce People*: First edition (1968). The first edition of Chagnon's textbook presents the Yanomami as untouched by outside forces, with barely a mention of missionaries or the work of Venezuelan government agencies such as the malaria patrols. The first edition is focussed around warfare and has extensive discussions of other forms of violence including a section on infanticide. George and Louise Spindler, editors of the Holt Rinehart Winston series “Case Studies in Anthropology” have written forewords to every edition of *Yanomamö: The Fierce People* and later *Yanomamö*. In the first edition they strongly emphasize Yanomamö violence and aggression. They say for example (with minor qualification) that “Much of the behavior of the Yanomamö can be described as brutal, cruel, and treacherous, in the value-laden terms of our own vocabulary.” (viii). The editors go on to describe chronic warfare, fear of annihilation, treachery, and dispute settlement. Very similar language appears in the preface to the second edition of 1977. What is troubling here is the almost one-dimensional characterization of Yanomamö life and the fact that Chagnon allowed such a sensationalistic portrayal of the Yanomamö to introduce his ethnography of the group.


This work was intended to introduce students to ethnographic methodology. It opens with a preface by Morton H. Fried that emphasizes the theme of the "exotic" and includes mention of warfare, wifebeating, and infanticide. Fried raises the question of whether the Yanomami, in a period "when many victimized peoples are asserting rights to a say in their own destiny," would want to be "in a class by themselves in the didactic literature of ethnography" (ix). Fried concludes that the Yanomami enjoyed considerable sovereignty and could easily have repelled Chagnon's attentions "with minimal consequences."

*Studying the Yanomamö* is dominated by an account of Chagnon's work in the village of Mishimishimaböwei-teri, and his difficult personal relationship with its headman. A problematic aspect of the book is Chagnon's discussion of his use of identification photographs as part of his genealogical method, in spite of his own admission that the Yanomami often object to being photographed (see the discussion in the case study 4.4., "Yanomami names and photographic identification"). The book includes many photographs of individual Yanomami, including women with young babies, an image that was especially objectionable to them.
3. *Yanomamö: The Fierce People*, Second edition (1977). In the second edition of the textbook Chagnon begins to document the impact of trade goods and the presence of missionaries. He addresses the moral responsibility of the Venezuelan government to protect the Yanomami, and begins to balance his portrayal of fierceness.

The major new material in the second edition is a new Chapter 6 entitled “The Beginning of Western Acculturation”, in which Chagnon addresses the impact of missionaries and his fear of challenging missionaries because it might compromise access to research permits by himself and his students.

About two pages at the end of the new Chapter 6 are entitled “Balancing the Image of Fierceness” where Chagnon says he wants “…to correct some misunderstandings and false impressions that have crept in some of the literature contains summaries of their culture base, allegedly, on my descriptions of it” (1977:162). He emphasizes the following points:

1. The Yanomamö do not spend major fractions of their time making war or abusing their wives (1977:162).
2. Variation in warfare is considerable. In some places warfare is “almost nonexistent” (1977:162) and even where warfare is intense villages there have long periods of tranquil and happy village life.
3. The Yanomamö “…are not aberrant or unusual in having sovereignty and the warfare that sovereignty implies or entails (1977:163).”
4. Yanomamö warfare is not a recent historical event and to understand its characteristics it must be described accurately (1977:163)
5. The films he has made with Tim Asch are designed “to balance the “hyper-fierce” image that is emerging as the exclusive characteristics of the Yanomamö.” (Chagnon 1977:163).

4. *Yanomamö: The Fierce People*, Third Edition (1983). Most notably, the third edition includes a new section on Yanomami practice regarding the regulation and control of violence, which continues to be developed in later editions and balances the emphasis on fighting and warfare elsewhere in the book. In the preface, Chagnon also addresses the possibility that the patterns that he has described may be regionally specific: “I would like it to be clearly understood by both the students who read this book and my colleagues who have done field research in other regions of the Yanomamö tribe that this case study does not purport to describe all Yanomamö villages everywhere or suggest that there is no variation among villages and regions” (Chagnon 1983:ix).

The third edition adds a prologue entitled “The Killing of Ruwëhiwëi”, which continues through the fifth edition of the text. This account of a specific murder, which occurred 15 years before Chagnon’s fieldwork began, is intended to demonstrate how historical events structure political relations among the Yanomamö. While this chapter adds historical specificity to the discussion of warfare which might, for the thoughtful student, challenge the impression that Yanomami violence is somehow innate, it also means that the book opens on this theme.


With the publication of the fourth edition of his ethnography on the Yanomamö, the title changed from *Yanomamö: The Fierce People* to simply *Yanomamö*. In the “Author’s Preface to the Fourth Edition” Chagnon gives several reasons for this change (Chagnon, 1994:xii). The first is that the term fierce when translated directly to some foreign languages carries a connotation that it does not have in English. He claims that the translation of fierce
in English, Spanish *feroz*, connotes animalness, viciousness, and savagery and therefore is pejorative. The second is that some students or instructors might think that the value of fierceness might be incompatible with other moral sentiments such as compassion, fairness, and valor. And thirdly, that “...government officials in, for example, Brazil might try to justify oppressive polices against them on the argument that they are “fierce” and, therefore, ‘animal-like’ (Chagnon 1994:xii). He then justifies the title change in these words “I would rather drop the word ‘fierce’ that have its continued use be a reason to not make the monograph available to students because they might falsely conclude that the Yanomamö are ‘animal-like’.

This title change and discussion appears to directly address the concerns of the Association of Brazilian Anthropologists (cf. Carneiro da Cunha 1989) that the image of fierceness can be used against the Yanomamö.

This edition of the textbook contains only minimal notes on infanticide. Chagnon states (1992a:114, 1992b:93; 1997:94) that he stopped publishing on this matter after he learned that a Venezuelan congressperson wanted to try for murder any Yanomami found guilty of this practice.

6. *Yïnomamö*: The Last Days of Eden (1992). In 1992 Harcourt Brace issued a version of Chagnon's monograph aimed at a general audience, under the title noted. This edition is prefaced with a foreword by E. O. Wilson, who emphasizes Yanomami primordiality and briefly reviews sociobiological themes of interest to Wilson. In Chagnon's own preface he spends several pages defending himself against charges that he has overemphasized Yanomami warfare.

This work concludes in its final chapter with vigorous attacks on the missions and on unnamed Venezuelan anthropologists who are said to be jealous of Chagnon's success. It also includes Chagnon's attack on the legitimacy of Davi Kopenawa as a Yanomami spokesperson, discussed in more detail in the case study entitled "Engagement of anthropologists in public dialogue with members of study communities". The chapter also has extensive discussions of threats to Yanomami health and well-being from a variety of forces, and discusses the invasions by gold miners of Yanomami lands in Brazil and their illegal transgressions across the international border into Venezuela.

The Task Force notes that most of the photographs in this work are from the 1960's and 1970's. That is, the photographic documentation reflects a period of Yanomami history that is long past, and undercuts the accounts of change, which are not visually documented.


This edition of the textbook continues many of the themes found in the fourth edition and in *Yïnomamö*: The Last Days of Eden. As in the former work, Chagnon develops sharp attacks on the missions. It adds a brief discussion of the Haximu massacre of 1993. As a representative of a commission appointed by President Caldera headed by Charles Brewer Carias, Chagnon was briefly involved in an investigation of the massacre. Chagnon here presents his views on why his involvement was terminated by his expulsion from the region on the orders of a Venezuelan judge, which he argues occurred because of unethical machinations on the part of his political enemies.

In this late edition the introductory remarks by the Spindlers have been greatly changed, eliminating stereotyping statements about Yanomami violence and instead emphasizing the dangers to them from outside pressures.
2.2.2.2. Chagnon's interview in Veja

Of special concern because of their public impact are vulgarized representations of Chagnon's findings that have appeared in the popular press, including in major Brazilian newspapers. Chagnon has from time to time had the opportunity to discredit these representations, and unfortunately has not used these opportunities effectively. One example of such a missed opportunity is Chagnon’s 1995 interview in the important Brazilian magazine *Veja*. In *Veja*, December 6, 1995 (6-10), the journalist Eurípedes Alcântara published an interview with Chagnon under the title *Índio também é gente* (The Indian is a person too). The subtitle points to a theme that has been important to Chagnon: *O antropólogo americano diz que é errado transformar os indígenas em seres angelicas e sem defeitos e acusa ONGs e missionários de manipular os ianomâmis brasileiros* ("An American anthropologist says that it is a mistake to turn indigenous people into angelic beings without faults, and accuses NGOs and missionaries of manipulating the Brazilian Yanomami"). This theme dominates the interview.

In the interview, Alcântara quotes Chagnon as saying that "Nobody is interested in the real Indian. Western society needs an imaginary Indian, an idealization." When Alcântara asks Chagnon, "What is a real Indian like?", Chagnon is quoted as replying: *Os índios reais se sujam, cheiram mal, tomam alucinógenos, arrotam depois de comer, cobiçam e às vezes roubam a mulher do próximo, forniram e fazem a guerra. São seres humanos normais. É razão bastante para que mereçam cuidado e atenção." (Real Indians sweat, they smell bad, they take hallucinogenic drugs, they belch after they eat, they covet and at times steal their neighbor's wife, they fornicate, and they make war. They are normal human beings. This is reason enough for them to deserve care and attention.") An extract from this quotation is used as the boldface caption under the photograph on the first page of the article.

This statement could be read as a strong statement in defense of Indians, tough, realistic, and sympathetic. It is clearly related to a similar statement in *Y'nomamö: The Last Days of Eden* (1992:245): "For my part, I think the Yanomamö warrant our sympathy and our help just as they are." It is probably an attempt to create a quotable "sound bite" that will convey sympathy for the Yanomami -- and *Veja* did extract a part of it, including the last sentence, for a boldface caption, as noted above. However the statement could also be read in quite a different way. Thus Martins (2001: 4; also at http://www.publicanthropology.org)) characterizes it as "essentializing ... a mere Rousseauian notion with inverted content."

The problem faced by advocates of the Yanomami in Venezuela and especially Brazil is, unfortunately, not to combat romantic images of Indians, but to deal with a public -- and, most importantly, powerful national and regional politicians and businessmen -- that sees Indians as worthless savages who block the development of Brazil. Chagnon's remarks about sweating, smelling, belching, and fornicking, in this context used precisely the terms of this popular image, which can be found reproduced in films, television programs, cartoons, and other sites where the most vulgar images of Indian "savagery" are reproduced for public consumption. And, most unfortunately, much of the rest of the interview attacked NGOs, other anthropologists, and missionaries who have advocated for the Yanomami. About them, Chagnon is quoted as saying that their motives are ignoble, aimed at recruiting the fame of the Yanomami -- derived (he notes "without false modesty" (p. 8)) in part from his own work -- for purposes that have nothing to do with their well-being. It is unclear on what basis Chagnon founds these attacks.
2.2.b.3. The denial of coevalness and the image of the Yanomamö as an endangered people

While questions about the impact of Chagnon's representations of the Yanomami have centered on his attention to violence and warfare among them, the Task Force believes that there is another discourse in Chagnon's work that is also problematic. This is the representation of the Yanomami as a "Stone Age" people. It is certainly not surprising to find statements to this effect in Chagnon's early work, when the idea that certain contemporary societies might constitute survivals of earlier stages of human history was very widespread in the discipline. Chagnon did his graduate work at the University of Michigan, a center for the development of the theory of sociocultural evolution, and had Leslie White, a leading proponent of this school of thought, on his doctoral committee.

In the 1968 edition of the textbook, we find Chagnon characterizing the Yanomami as "unacculturated" and "primitive" (the latter term was already disappearing from much anthropological discourse in 1968 but was used frequently in this work). The notion that the Yanomami represent a survival from the past is implicit in the observation on the first page of the text that they are "still [italics inserted] actively conducting warfare" -- as if warfare were necessarily a survival. This discourse that represents the Yanomami as survivors from antiquity is elaborated over the several years of Chagnon's publications. In the preface to the second edition of 1977, we find Chagnon characterizing his fieldwork as a "race against time" to document the features of "a truly primitive cultural adaptation ". He observes that the twentieth century "would witness the end -- the extinction -- of particular varieties of culture that had endured for thousands of years..."(Chagnon 1977:xii). Especially in the new sixth chapter, devoted to "change" and "acculturation," it is clear that Chagnon believes that "change" is something new for the Yanomami. He increasingly seeks out villages that have had little direct contact with Whites, and clearly believes that what is "noble" in Yanomami culture is more likely to be found in such places (Chagnon 1977:164).

Perhaps the most egregious examples of this discourse were probably not written by Chagnon, but were apparently approved by him. These appear on the cover of Yanomamö: The Last Days of Eden (Chagnon 1992a). On the cover of the paperback edition the Yanomami are characterized as "our contemporary ancestors", "cleaving to their ancient patters of culture and organization ... they have yet to invent the wheel, and they use a number system that knows no refinements beyond 'one,' 'two,' and 'many.'" Newsweek (of all sources) is quoted here as saying "the Yanomamo had the good fortune to live their Stone Age lives on land no one else wanted."

The elaboration of the discourse of "antiquity" of the Yanomami sometimes takes startling forms. For instance, in the fifth edition, Chagnon amends his discussion of personal cleanliness among the Yanomami as follows: "It is difficult to blow your nose gracefully when you are stark naked and the invention of handkerchiefs is millennia away" (1997:13).

Members of the Task Force do believe that anthropological comparisons between contemporary human groups, such as the Yanomami (and every other human group) and peoples from earlier periods of human history about whom we recover evidence from archaeology, are appropriate. But such comparisons, given their implications, should be made with enormous care and detail, with the most exacting attention to context. The Yanomami live today. In the 1960's they were certainly relatively isolated. However, Chagnon himself documents that Yanomami even then were aware of the "White" world, of Caraca-teri and of outboard motors and guns. They had been in contact with that world and had formed ideas about it during hundreds of years. They were hosts to missionaries,
military personnel, traders, miners, and others from it. Artifacts from this world circulated in their communities. They were also deeply involved with other groups of Indians, who often took advantage of their own "down-river" locations to marginalize and stigmatize Yanomami, preventing them engaging in trade and other social relationships that were controlled by communities such as Ye'kuana and Baniwa.

Chagnon began his work at a time when the sort of detailed history of "people without history" (Wolf 1982) was not a major trend in anthropology -- although the kinds of points well-known from the work of Wolf and Fabian had been raised long before by Ortiz (1994 [1940], 1946). However, the systems of classification and metaphors that Chagnon uses into the 1990's fall directly into the discursive system that Fabian (1983) has called the "denial of coevalness." Fabian and others have clearly demonstrated the objectifying and racializing implications of this discursive system. Promoting critical understanding of the limitations of these ideas should be a major goal of any introductory course. Any use of Chagnon's books in anthropology courses should include, in our view, a full discussion of these usages and their implications with this goal of critical understanding in mind.
2.2.b.4 Responsibility and Representation: A Reflection

Anthropologists must write the truth as they see it. Yet anthropologists are accountable for what they write, and we must acknowledge the effects of our words. Anthropological truth, especially when it deals with very vulnerable people, must be treated carefully, with the utmost attention to balance, to the full complexity and contradiction and ambiguity and variability of human life. Anthropologists working with indigenous people face many temptations to neglect this attention to balance. Publishers, who want to make money on books, detest ambiguity and complexity and prefer marketable essentialism of the sort that can be condensed into an attractive cover blurb. Journalists also know that simple messages that resonate with the preconceptions of the media marketplace are more likely to survive the passage across the editor's desk than is a piece that is filled with questions rather than easy answers. However, the goal of anthropology is not to sell books or to advance a career by media mention. The goal of anthropology is to advance knowledge and human well-being. Anthropologists have a responsibility to resist the siren call of simplifying essentialism and to work to create public appreciation for the world in its full complexity. Anthropologists will not always be able to control the forces that work against such appreciation. However, they have a responsibility also to speak out when publishers and journalists advance simplistic and damaging stereotypes, and they especially have this responsibility when their own work may be the unintended source of these. In this case, they enjoy special intellectual and moral weight as "authorities", and should not hesitate to use that. In such cases, they should speak clearly and resolutely, and not permit that clarity to be complicated or diverted by the details of professional -- or personal -- disputes that may be irrelevant to the basic issue of stereotyping and the damage it does to vulnerable people. Media workshops and other training in "public" anthropology will prepare anthropologists to better fulfil this responsibility.
2.2.C. FUNDAFACI

We turn now to the inquiry into the critique in Darkness in El Dorado of Napoleon Chagnon’s participation in FUNDAFACI (Fundación para la Ayuda de la Familia Campesina e Indígena, Foundation to Aid Peasant and Indigenous Families), a foundation created in Venezuela in 1989 ostensibly to protect indigenous and peasant families. This discussion is one of the most serious and better supported allegations of the book. Although it stands by itself, it must be placed within the context of Tierney’s comprehensive critique of Chagnon’s longstanding involvement with the Yanomami.

Tierney claims that throughout his career Chagnon took advantage of his professional status, personal connections and material resources to gain access to the Yanomami and to advance his own career as their major ethnographer. While scholars have disagreed concerning the validity of many of these claims, they are in fundamental agreement about the impropriety of Chagnon’s involvement in FUNDAFACI. In a field deeply divided by critics and supporters of Chagnon’s work, this remarkable consensus suggests that this allegation may be well founded in this particular case. The evidence the Task Force has gathered thus far supports this consensus. On the basis of the evidence we have gathered we feel that Tierney’s account of Chagnon’s participation in FUNDAFACI is accurate.

Tierney’s discussion of FUNDAFACI begins in the introduction (p. xxv, including a detailed account in footnote 25, p. 329) and is developed in Chapter 11, “A Kingdom of Their Own.” On the basis of numerous interviews, newspaper articles, letters, and court and congressional records, Tierney weaves together a story that had already circulated in Venezuela in fragmentary form, largely through the press, but in official records as well.

The basic outline of this story is well established. FUNDAFACI was founded in 1989, during the second presidency of Carlos Andrés Pérez (1989-93). The foundation had enormous political and logistical support, as it was under the leadership of Cecilia Matos (whose official title was "Coordinadora Nacional;" its General Director was Milagros Mendoza de Parra). FUNDAFACI was coordinated by Charles Brewer Carías, a prominent naturalist and businessman. The inclusion of Chagnon in the research program of the Foundation sought to give it respectability. It linked its research project to a famous anthropologist and to the University of California at Santa Barbara, which was listed as a supporter, along with FUNDAFACI, in the publication, Proyecto El Bosque Tropical como Habitat del Hombre (p. 1).

In Venezuela it was widely known that Pérez’s first administration (1974-79) had led to the intensification of state corruption and that Cecilia Matos was a key mediator between Pérez and many questionable business associates (Coronil 1997:334-8, 351). Matos’s position as de facto head of FUNDAFACI tarnished its public image; it was widely believed that the foundation was merely a smokescreen behind which Matos concealed corrupt business activities (Coronil, interviews in Venezuela 2001).

The involvement of Brewer Carías and Chagnon as its two lead researchers also raised questions about its objectives. Brewer Carías, whom Chagnon had known at least since the 1968 Neel expedition in which both participated, was a controversial but influential public figure who had been denounced numerous times for his participation in illegal mining activities in Venezuela. While a 1972 decree (1.019, June 28, 1972) issued by President Caldera restricted mining in the Territory of Amazonas and in certain districts of Bolivar State, with the only exception being diamond mining, Brewer Carías had attempted to start a cassiterite mining enterprise in Amazonas (in Yanomami territory) in 1984 through a company called MAVA C.A. (the acronym spelled out the name of a well-known mission station in Yanomami territory); this venture was stopped in 1984 by the intervention of the
Salesian Bishop of Amazonas. In 1984 Brewer Carías was accused of illegal gold-mining in Amazonas, specifically of diverting airforce planes supposedly being used for scientific research at Cerro La Nebulina to illegal mining sites where he employed indigenous people as miners. He was accused of covering up the illegal flights that went to mines on the upper Ventuari River by altering flight plans (El Diario de Caracas August 4, 1984 "Denunciaron ante el fiscal al ex ministro Brewer Carías"; Deposition of April 20 1984 by Ricardo Antonil Trivisi Muñoz, commercial helicopter pilot). In addition, Venezuelan Air Force officers assigned to this work complained that foreign scientists were working at Cerro La Nebulina illegally, without the Venezuelan participation required by law (Statement by Lt. Col. Milano and Lt. Godoy, Puerto Ayacucho, 18 April 1984 to the Regional Command). In defending himself against these charges, Brewer Carías revealed that his company, Minas Guariche C.A., held legal mining concessions in Bolivar State, so there is no question of his involvement in mining. The background here is that there was national concern about abuse of indigenous labor and land rights, pollution of river headwaters, and the despoiling of unique landscapes such as the famous table mountains of the Guyana Highlands, by mining concessions that during the 1980's were "handed out liberally by the Ministry of Energy and Mines, taking little or no account of existing indigenous communities, titles or land claims" (Colchester and Watson 1995:19).

Brewer Carías, however, claimed that his enemies -- including those who were trying to create a biosphere reserve and national park that included Yanomami lands -- were not disinterested supporters of indigenous people or of environmental concerns, but leftist who were trying to found an independent indigenous movement in order to establish a new nation in the border regions with Brazil ("Brewer denuncia el 'Plan Gadhafi'", El Diario de Caracas August 15, 1984). Brewer Carías was also notorious for statements like one in an article in a leading newspaper in which he argued that mining development in the Sierra Parima, a Yanomami region, was important for national development and that the few Yanomami living there could "be relocated without damage to nearby territories" if "scholars" decided that it was not appropriate to involve them in the changes that the mining would bring (Brewer Carías 1987, Una futura zona en reclamación, El Universal May 10, 1987).

Napoleon Chagnon, who by the late 1980's was a polemical figure in anthropological circles in Venezuela and Brazil, had been unable to obtain stable institutional backing for his research among the Yanomami in Venezuela for many years (Venezuelan law since 1975 required foreign scholars working in border areas such as Amazonas to have an affiliation with a Venezuelan institution). In 1989 he had a research permit through a Venezuelan group with the acronym FUDECI to make a documentary film. However, the Director of Indigenous Affairs received requests that the permit be suspended from CONIVE, the national indigenous organization, and from César Dimanawa, then president of SUYAO, the Yanomami cooperative founded with Salesian help. The Director wrote Chagnon requesting that he consult with CONIVE, with SUYAO and the Yanomami communities, and with the Salesians before the permit could be restored (letter from Maria Luisa Allais to Napoleon Chagnon, February 21, 1990). Chagnon insisted that the requested consultation would be futile and that the campaign against him was a sham organized by leftist anthropologists in league with the missionaries, so did not follow the Director's request. However through his association with Brewer Carías in FUNDAFACI, Chagnon managed to gain access to the Yanomami through FUNDAFACI. Thus, while technically Chagnon had Venezuelan support for his research, this support overrode the objections of the government agency and officials directly charged with regulating research access to indigenous groups in Venezuela.
The form of this access through FUNDAFACI is objectionable at three levels. First, it involved the development of a plan to create a biosphere in the Upper Orinoco controlled by FUNDAFACI that would grant privileged rights over this area -- a part of the Guyana Highlands known to be rich in minerals -- to the individuals involved in the foundation. (It should be noted that previous proposals to develop a protected status for Yanomami lands in the Venezuelan Amazonian territory dating back to at least 1980(cf. Arvelo Jiménez 1984, Arvelo Jiménez and Cousins 1992) had been supported by local anthropologists but were opposed by Brewer Carías, as noted above). The plan promoted by FUNDAFACI proposed the creation of a small reserve of around 6,000 square miles, that would have included only about one-sixth of the Venezuelan Yanomami population, those communities that were judged by Chagnon (1992a, 1997) to be the least influenced by external contacts (Chagnon (1992:70) describes the proposed biosphere as the relatively "untouched" lands in the Siapa River basin). In contrast to the FUNDAFACI proposal, President Pérez in 1991 followed the advice of the Venezuelan anthropological community, decreeing a National Park and Biosphere Reserve that included essentially all Yanomami lands in Venezuela, an area of 32,000 square miles. Tierney’s (2000:188) claim that the FUNDAFACI proposal would have established a “private biosphere [that] would have given Brewer and Chagnon a scientific monopoly over an area the size of Connecticut” cannot be proven, since the plan was eventually aborted. Yet the evidence suggests that their aim was indeed to develop significant personal control over this area through FUNDAFACI. By placing this area under the control of the foundation, Brewer Carías would have been able to pursue his mining interests and Chagnon to advance his anthropological research unhampered by their lack of local support and or by professional or governmental controls. The activities that they carried out in preparation of this project lend support to this assessment.

Second, in developing this project Chagnon and Brewer Carías made many visits to isolated Yanomami villages, bringing journalists and state officials from Venezuela and other countries. Their own report about their activities, titled “Proyecto El Bosque Tropical como Habitat del Hombre, Caso Etnia Yanomami,” co-authored by Charles Brewer Carías and Napoleon Chagnon, describes this research project as involving anthropological, ecological, medicinal, biological, cartographic and educational goals. According to their report, over the course of eight months (August 1990-March 1991) they carried out eight expeditions, visited many communities, employed fifty hours of helicopter use, identified “fully” (“plenamente”) 4,400 individuals, took 3,000 photographs, and produced eleven hours of film (Proyecto, p. 14). They claim to have lived among Yanomami groups that “had never been contacted by any person” in the Siapa region, and explain that they sought to contact twelve other groups (“pueblos”) for research purposes (Proyecto, p. 6). A central aim of the anthropological dimension of this project was to “prove a theory through which it can be explained how, from a society based merely on familial links, similar to those that can be observed now in the Siapa river, there developed in the past the agricultural and cooperative society which originated in Mesopotamia our civilization ten thousand years ago” (Proyecto, p. 11)

Tierney’s account builds on the reports of Venezuelan authorities (state officials and military officers) as well as on accounts by academics and journalists who have criticized FUNDAFACI’s activities on various grounds. Among the most serious charges, these reports indicate that no quarantine precautions were taken to protect the Yanomami from exposure to diseases that might be carried by these outsiders to their region. According to the foundation’s own report, a medical doctor accompanied its members on only two of the seven expeditions for which a list of participants is included in the Chagnon-Brewer Carías report (Proyecto, pp. 8-10). It has been established that military planes and resources were
deployed without following legal protocols. It was also widely reported, as Tierney documents, that containers with biological samples were taken out of the region without required permission, and that there was speculation that gold samples were carried in the sealed containers. Military officers who were involved in the 27 November 1992 military coup attempt against President Pérez stated that one of their reasons for the coup was the misuse of state resources to support these illegal activities.

Third, Chagnon’s access to the Yanomami during this period was made possible because of his association with individuals who were widely known to have been involved in illegal and corrupt activities. Any anthropologist with even minimal familiarity with Venezuelan politics should have known of the accusations against them, and been able to assess the consequent dangers to anthropology and to the Yanomami of becoming involved with Cecilia Matos and Brewer Carías in a project of this character.

Public opposition finally halted FUNDAFACI’s project. President Pérez was impeached in 1993 on charges of corruption and he was removed from office. An arrest order was issued for Cecilia Matos, who fled the country, on several counts of corruption and misuse of state funds. Some of the charges against her involved the illegal use of state resources to support FUNDAFACI activities, including the deployment of military airplanes and helicopters.

Is There a Pattern?

Was Chagnon’s involvement in FUNDAFACI an exception to his research procedures and political ties, or part of a pattern? An answer to this question would require a more extensive examination of Chagnon’s earlier use of highly suspect means to gain access to the Yanomami. By "suspect means" we have in mind the following. After 1975, Venezuelan law required non-Venezuelan researchers to be sponsored by a Venezuelan institution. At a time when his NSF funding was for research on Yanomami adoption and descent, Chagnon was sponsored as a member of an investigation of rural and indigenous housing sponsored by the Center of Historical and Aesthetic Investigations of the Architecture Department of the Central University of Venezuela in 1984-87. A second example is his effort to obtain blood samples illegally in Brazil in 1995 under the guise of his participation in a journalistic project (see Martins 2001a:5). The third is his effort to obtain support from the U.S. State Department to investigate what he claimed were Yanomami subversive activities in the area in 1998 (an effort that seems to continue the theme first raised by Brewer Carías in 1984; see above). A State Department team did indeed visit the Yanomami region to conduct an inquiry, but Chagnon himself was not permitted to leave Caracas (Jesús Cardozo, interviews with Hill and Coronil).

Whether part of a pattern or an exception, Chagnon’s involvement in FUNDAFACI was unacceptable on both ethical and professional grounds. It violated Venezuelan laws, associated his research with the activities of corrupt politicians, and involved him in activities that endangered the health and well-being of the Yanomami. Chagnon apparently chose to overlook these problems in order to pursue his own research questions. For this reason the Task Force believes that a charge of a breach of ethics is proper under the AAA Principles of Professional Responsibility, the code of ethics then in effect, which required that the best interests of the study population should always be the first consideration of the anthropologist. It would also constitute a breach of the current Code of Ethics, which states that "anthropologists must do everything in their power to ensure that their research does not harm the safety, dignity or privacy of the people with whom they work..."
2.3. DEEPPening AND MovING Beyond INFORMED Consent: Toward Collaborative Models of Anthropological Research

As part of his contribution to the work of the Task Force, Joe Watkins, building on work by Zimmerman (2001), has contributed an essay (6.2.4) entitled "Roles, responsibilities, and relationships between anthropologists and indigenous people in the anthropological enterprise." The essay reviews four styles of research: colonial, consensual, covenantal, and collaborative. The El Dorado Task Force insists that the anthropology of indigenous peoples and related communities must move toward "collaborative" models, in which anthropological research is not merely combined with advocacy, but inherently advocative in that research is, from its outset, aimed at material, symbolic, and political benefits for the research population, as its members have helped to define these.

By "colonial" research is meant research carried out without attention to the wishes, desires, or feelings of the study population, with research questions and design being shaped entirely by the concerns of the researchers. The most egregious examples of "colonial" research, which saw anthropologists impose themselves on unwilling communities through the use of physical force, are perhaps in the past. Yet many anthropologists even today see indigenous communities mainly as a source of "knowledge" that will be of benefit to anthropology, but not necessarily to the communities themselves. This does not, of course, preclude a genuine humanitarian concern for the well-being of the subject populations. The research undertaken by the Neel expeditions in 1968 and later, and the research undertaken by Chagnon, falls mainly within this "colonial" paradigm.

"Consensual" research refers to "research carried out by one party merely with the consent of the other... Restrictive terms or conditions may become a part of the consent process, but once consent is obtained, the researcher is generally free to proceed with minimal interference" (Watkins, 6.2.4, this report). Watkins's definition of "consensual" research is not identical to the notion of informed consent in the AAA Code of Ethics. As Chernela (in case study 5.3, "Collection of bodily samples...") points out, the Code of Ethics restricts researcher freedom by defining the informed consent process as "dynamic and continuous", continuing throughout the conduct of the research. "Consensual" research often retains from the "colonial" model one very important element: The presupposition that research questions and research designs will originate in the research community, and that the community from which subjects are drawn need have no role in developing these.

In the most favorable contexts for "consensual" research, human subjects will share with the researchers, at least in a very general way, the cultural understandings that regulate and generate knowledge and power. In such a context, while we may debate the fine details of whether individual human subjects fully understand their role in a research project, or even fully understand the balance of risks and benefits that comes with this role, we may assume that they share a general view. This is that the goal of research should be to advance knowledge, and the goal of the advancement of knowledge should be to benefit humanity, with the corollary that, the more knowledge we have, the more benefit humanity will enjoy. However, all anthropologists will be aware that even where such shared understandings prevail, conflicts will arise.

Many indigenous groups do not share this understanding about research, knowledge, and benefit. In such cases, to achieve a level of consent that is even loosely "informed" may be very difficult. In such cases, subjects may agree to participate in research for reasons that are not at all understood by the researchers, and that will later come to seem inauthentic to both sides. Thus the Task Force believes, as outlined in the introductory statement on informed consent (2.1, this report) and in Turner's case study 5.2. "Informed consent and its
contexts ...", that Neel's research with the Yanomami in 1968 was not fully "consensual". However, even had the expedition made great effort to explain the full purposes of the research, members probably would not have been able to fully understand the reasons for Yanomami consent or lack thereof. Chernela's work with Yanomami consultants (see 3.1-4 in this report) reveals that a sense of betrayal and injustice is now pervasive among Yanomami spokespersons. This carries for us an important lesson about the weaknesses and problems in the "consensual" model of research.

A sense of violation developed where "consensual" models, with their colonialist presuppositions, are in effect is not restricted to members of indigenous groups. People everywhere are insisting on increasing levels of collaboration and autonomy. Lay community representatives now appear on review boards at all levels of the research process in every branch of science, charged to question research questions, designs, and selections of populations made by professional researchers.

Members of the Task Force believe that anthropological research with indigenous peoples should deepen the informed consent model in the direction of fully "collaborative" models of research. Collaborative research involves the side-by-side work of all parties in a mutually beneficial research program. All parties are equal partners in the enterprise, participating in the development of the research design and in other major aspects of the program as well, working together toward a common goal. Collaborative research involves more than "giving back" in the form of advocacy and attention to social needs. Only in the collaborative model is there a full give and take, where at every step of the research knowledge and expertise is shared. In collaborative research, the local community will define its needs, and will seek experts both within and without to develop research programs and action plans. In the process of undertaking research on such community-defined needs, outside researchers may very well encounter knowledge that is of interest to anthropological theory. However, attention to such interests, or publication about them, must itself be developed within the collaborative framework, and may have to be set aside if they are not of equal concern to all the collaborators. In collaborative research, local experts work side by side with outside researchers, with a fully dialogic exchange of knowledge (that would not, of course, preclude conventional forms of training). Much fruitful and interesting research among Native North Americans is now being conducted within such a "collaborative" model. There are many opportunities to move to such a model in Latin America as well, as is already apparent from work accomplished by Brazilian and Venezuelan colleagues discussed elsewhere in this report (see 3.2 "Background on the Yanomami", as well as the comment on the Brazilian work submitted by Gale Goodwin Gomez in her comment of March 7, 2002).

The Task Force has learned from Yanomami interlocutors that they need improved health care, better access to education, fairer access to their rights of political involvement as citizens, the guarantee of security of their lands, and adequate protection against violence from within and without. We believe that anthropological research among the Yanomami should have as an early goal to help them put in place political frameworks that will permit definition and articulation of these needs, assuming that the Yanomami concur that such development is important. In any case, we believe that anthropological work among them in the foreseeable future should be developed in collaboration with them to address questions that are to a great degree defined initially within Yanomami communities, and elaborated in consultation with such outside researchers as the Yanomami may invite as consultants. It may be that at some time in the future (perhaps in the very near future) there will be sufficient trust between Yanomami communities in Venezuela and outside researchers that outsiders will be permitted to present proposals involving research that would be of no
immediate benefit to Yanomami communities. In such a case the standard system of informed consent that is evolving internationally may be appropriate. However, we suggest that the future of anthropology among indigenous peoples lies primarily within the collaborative model, with its intrinsic recognition of their full and unfettered right to define their own futures.

Finally, we remark on the relationships between U.S. anthropologists and anthropological communities in Brazil and Venezuela. The Task Force has been continually impressed by the very constructive attention to its work, and the truly collegial spirit in addressing our common problems, among both individual anthropologists and national associations in Brazil and Venezuela. We believe that all colleagues and the American Anthropological Association must continue work that will develop and enrich these relationships.
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APPENDIX:

4.4.b Commentary submitted by José Antonio Kelly May 1, 2002

The reason we [Chernela, Domínguez, Kelly, Wichato (4.4)] ended up talking about malaria tests, blood transfusions, and blood collection in Shakitha was because we thought it would shed light on what kinds of issues the Yanomami might have regarding the medical use of blood, hence providing context for understanding Yanomami concerns regarding the blood samples being kept in USA.

Regarding the above interview and other statements that have been posted on the internet:

It is important to mention Wichato's emphasis on results, as well as Davi's comments on how the results or benefits of the Neel-Chagnon blood extractions were never seen. I think this is telling us something quite clear about blood extraction, and when it is justified from their point of view. Finally, I think Dr. Domínguez's comments are spot on, and aligned with what many Yanomami are saying.

A brief inspection of the statements of Wichato and others reveal a focus on a) results i.e. a directly associated benefit in health terms (not pots and pans). b) the fact that the blood is still stored or can still be used.

On the second point just mentioned: the Yanomami that have expressed their opinions on this matter did not know these samples still existed and were "operational" until the Tierney controversy reached them. Reading their statements, I think what is troubling is not so much the fact that many Yanomami have died without their complete body, but rather, that the remains of dead people are still being kept, stored, used, seen, analyzed by napës, which is a different matter.

Consider the Toto Yanomami statement:

"Yanomami never take blood to keep. Yanomami don't need to take blood to study and later keep in the refrigerator...The doctors have already examined this blood; they've already researched this blood. Doctors already took from this blood that was good - for the children, for the future. The leftover blood is kept hidden..." (Working Paper 4.5, p3).

Wichato's worries, beyond the fact that no results have been sent to the Yanomami, indicate a preoccupation with the samples being a) kept frozen and b) studied. That is, Yanomami remains are being stored for use. He insists on the fact that their use (studies) be terminated and the samples returned or destroyed (not kept).

Any Yanomami who has had a tooth removed by a dentist (some keep it, some bin it on the spot) or malaria tests will inevitably leave behind some biological remains upon death, but this doesn't seem to be in their
minds when they undergo these procedures. The difference is that these remains are discarded, done away with, they disappear, in short, they cease to exist. I would also like to mention how, upon enquiring why many Yanomami do not like their picture taking (cameras or films), one argument goes along the lines of "how can it be that a napê will have a Yanomami's picture hanging on a wall after this person has died? this cannot be..." (this is not a direct transcription). The image - another non-trivial aspect of the person -, is hanging, being observed, being kept, it continues to exist after the person has died.

Consider Toto Yanomami on this once more:

"Blood is important in shamanism [inaud]. All the blood of the Yanomami belongs to [the deity] Omami...We Yanomami don't forget [the dead]. Never! When Yanomami die, we cry. It's very sad. This blood is here! Those people have died!..." (Working paper 3.5, p3).

At least some of the reasons why the continued existence of an aspect of the Yanomami person (like blood or images), once the person has died, is troubling to the Yanomami should point in the eschatological direction, yet more detailed explanations (the fait of soul-aspects of the person that result upon death, for instance) are beyond my brief experience. We could of course develop logical arguments based on the extensive ethnography available, but this is not the same. Moreover, I am sure many Yanomami could speak more on this subject as could Yanomami specialists with a lot more experience than myself.

Finally, I would like to add that, based on conversations held with influential Yanomami, the speeches of a number of Yanomami in the Shakitha conference, and reading the statements of other Yanomami on the internet, it seems clear to me that any biomedical intervention with no direct health justification would be strongly objected to, if not downright rejected, by the people at Ocamo (where I stayed most of the time in the field) and in general by those close to the missionary and health posts in the Upper Orinoco. There seems to be a strong sense among many Yanomami leaders that they (Yanomami) have been historically deceived by the napê and hence it is part of their task to prevent this from happening in the future. Hence, I would tend to think that concerns about blood extraction, informed consent, and general napê researcher's activities, cannot be understood outside of the framework of the historical napê - Yanomami relation.
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1989 (Fall) Research Professorship, Social-Behavioral Sciences Research Institute, University of Arizona

In addition, I have held three summer grants from the Social-Behavioral Sciences Research Institute of the University of Arizona, all funding work on Tohono Oodham. I was co-investigator with Ofelia Zepeda on two. I have also held an SBSRI Small Grant for research on The Flower World in prehistoric Southwest material culture, supporting research by Kelley Hays-Gilpin.

2000 (Fall) Senior Research Fellow, Research Centre for Linguistic Typology, La Trobe University

**Courses Taught:**

Introduction to Anthropology; Social Anthropology; Language and Culture; Sociolinguistics; Introduction to Phonology; Introduction to Morphology; Introduction to Syntax; Anthropological Theory to 1940; Foundations of Language; Discourse and Text; Language, Cultural Knowledge, and Ideology (1989 LSA Summer Linguistic Institute, University of Arizona); Foundations of Linguistic Anthropology (core course); Historical Linguistics, Political Economy of Language in the Southwest; Language and Social Issues (AILDI Institute, Summer 1991, with Richard Ruiz); Acquisition of Native American Languages (AILDI Institute, Summer 1993); Sociolinguistics of Native American Languages (1995 LSA Summer Linguistic Institute, University of New Mexico); Aztecs (freshman colloquium); Mesoamerican Discourse (Universidad Autonoma de Sonora, Hermosillo, Son. (In Spanish)); Language Diversity and Human Adaptation (2000 Australian Linguistic Institute, University of Melbourne; National School of Anthropology and History, Mexico, D.F. (in Spanish))

**Seminars Taught:**

Language, Symbol, and Self (with Peter Stromberg); Language Contact; Advances in Linguistic Theory; Language Variation; Language and Social Boundaries; Symbolic Anthropology; Sociolinguistics of American Indian Languages; Methods in the Study of Language Variation; Language and Emotion; Language, Ideology, and Political Economy (with Susan U. Philips); Mesoamerican Discourse; Language and Racism

**Doctoral Advisees:**

Volume I, Page 51
William Washabaugh, Ph.D. 1974, Wayne State University (Professor of Anthropology, University of Wisconsin Milwaukee)

Adolph Greenberg, Ph.D. 1978, Wayne State University (Professor of Anthropology, Miami University, Miami, OH)

David M. Coombs, Ph.D. 1981, Wayne State University (Summer Institute of Linguistics, Lima, Peru)

Molly E. DuFort, Ph.D. 1991, Department of Anthropology, University of Arizona (Tohono O’odham Nation)

Laura Cummings, Ph.D. 1994, Department of Anthropology, University of Arizona (South Texas Council on Alcohol and Drug Abuse, Laredo, TX)

John Sherry, Ph.D. 1995, University of Arizona (Intel Corporation)

Ning Yu, Ph.D. 1996, Second Language Acquisition and Teaching, University of Arizona (Assistant Professor, University of Oklahoma)

Shelby Tisdale, Ph.D. 1997, Department of Anthropology, University of Arizona (Philbrook Museum, Tulsa, OK)

José Luis Moctezuma Zamarrón, Ph.D., 1998, Department of Anthropology, University of Arizona (Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, Mexico, D.F.)

Ludmila Dutková, Ph.D. 1998, University of Arizona (Assistant Professor, East Carolina University)

Kuniyoshi Kataoka, Ph.D. 1998, Second Language Acquisition and Teaching, University of Arizona (Assistant Professor, Aichi University, Nagoya Campus, Aichi, Japan)

Yvonna Roepke, Ph.D. 1998, Second Language Acquisition and Teaching, University of Arizona (Composition Program, University of Arizona)

Andrea Smith, Ph.D. 1998, University of Arizona (Assistant Professor, Lafayette College)

Kathleen Williamson, Ph.D., 2000, Department of Anthropology, University of Arizona

Gail Shuck, Ph.D., 2001. Second Language Acquisition and Teaching, University of Arizona. Assistant Professor, Boise State University

Luciana Fellin, Ph.D., 2001. Second Language Acquisition and Teaching, University of Arizona. Assistant Professor, San Diego State University

Barbara A. Meek, Ph.D., 2001. Joint Degree in Anthropology and Linguistics, University of Arizona. Assistant Professor, University of Michigan.

**Participation in Advanced Seminars and Conferences (Invited and Funded):**

Conference on The Role of Theory in Linguistic Description, William A. Foley, organizer; Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, Ocho Rios, Jamaica, October, 1987


Advanced Seminar on Language Ideology, Paul Kroskry, organizer, School of American Research, Santa Fe, NM, May, 1994


Conference on Theorizing the Americanist Tradition, Regna Darnell and Lisa Valentine, organizers; London, Ontario, Canada, June 1995

Planning conference and final conference on Language Communities, Nation States, and Global Culture: The Discourse of Identity in the Americas (Department of Anthropology, University of Iowa)
Conference on Endangered Languages, Endangered Knowledge, Endangered Environments, Berkeley, CA, October 25 -27, 1996 (Funding declined in favor of funding international participants)

Conference on Nature Knowledge/Sapiere Natura, Istituto Veneto di Scienza, Arte, e Littere, Venice, Italy, December 4-6, 1997


Conference on Farming and Language Dispersals, MacDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, Cambridge University, August 24-27, 2001.


**Professional Service:**

Occasional Referee for:


Granting Agencies: National Science Foundation, National Endowment for the Humanities, National Institute of Health, National Geographic Society, Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research


Editorships: Editor in Chief, Language in Society, 2000-


**Offices in Professional Associations:**


University Service
Wayne State University: Vice President, WSU AAUP (1995-1978); Chief Negotiator, WSU AAUP (1976); Chair, Subcommittee on the Urban University of the Long-range Planning Commission (1977); Chair, Task Force on Outside Contracts, Presidents Commission on Affirmative Action (1977-1978); University Promotion and Tenure Committee (1978); Educational Development Grants Review Committee (1977); Faculty Research Award, Behavioral Sciences Review Committee (1978); Presidential Selection Advisory Committee (1977); University Council (1979-1982); Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee, University Council (1979-1980); Policy Committee, University Council (1980-1982); Chair, University Library Committee (1981-1982); Priorities Advisory Committee (1980-1982); numerous committees in the Department of Anthropology including Chair, Graduate Committee (1972-1974)

University of Arizona:
University: University Senate (1984-86); Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (1985-1987), Chair (1987-1988); Committee of Eleven (1990-92); University Promotion and Tenure Committee (1991-1993), Chair (1992-1993); Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee (1991-1996); Comparative Cultural and Literary Studies Ph.D. Program Executive Committee (1991-1996); Classics Department Review Committee (1997); NCA Accreditation Steering Committee (1998-2000); numerous ad hoc search committees and academic program review committees (African-American Studies, Classics, Womens Studies, 5-year Review of SBS Dean, etc.)

College of Social-Behavioral Sciences: Head Search Committee, Department of Journalism (1985); Head Search Committee, Black Studies Program (1991); Promotion and Tenure Committee (1984-1985), Chair (1985); Chair, Program Review Committee for African-American Studies (1992); SBSRI Grants Committee (1994-95); Dean Holly Smith Review Committee (1998)

College of Humanities: Outside Member, Promotion and Tenure Committee, 1994-1996; NEH Doctoral Fellowship Selection Committee (1994); Africana Studies Search Committee (1999), Public Folklorist Search Committee (2000)


Publications:

Books:

Articles:
1971 The linguist as imperialist. *New University Thought* 7:16-20.


(Winner of Carlos and Guillermo Vigil Prize for best paper in Volume 5)


1993b Mrs. Patricio's trouble (with Ofelia Zepeda). In Hill and Irvine, eds., pp. 197 -225.
1993f Is there a modular faculty of social cognition, and what could be in it? In Workshop on Language, Cognition, and Computation, pp. 61-78. Barcelona: Fundació Catalana per a la Recerca and Institut d'Estudis Catalans.
1996a Languages on the land: Adaptation and the structure of regional variation in some Native American languages. The David Skomp Distinguished Lecture in Anthropology, Indiana University. Bloomington, IN. (published as pamphlet and distributed)
1998c Tohono O'odham (Papago) plurals (with Ofelia Zepeda). *Anthropological Linguistics* 40:1-42. [Same title as 1994b, but a very different paper.]

1999g  Lenguaje e identidad en la frontera. In José Luis Moctezuma and María Elisa Villalpando, eds. Antropología de la Identidad e Historia en el Norte de México, Homenaje a Alejandro Figueroa Valenzuela, pp. 50-56. Special Issue of Noroeste de México. Hermosillo, Son: Centro INAH Sonora.


In Press:
Anthropological linguistics. Commissioned for *Encyclopedia Americana*. (*This must have appeared but I haven’t seen it*).
Los rasgos redondo y labial en tohono o'odham. To appear in *Memoria del V Encuentro Internacional de Lingüística en el Noroeste*. Hermosillo: Universidad de Sonora
Mock Spanish, bad Spanish, and complex inference (with Daniel Goldstein). To appear in a special issue of *Textus*, Giuseppina Cortese and Dell H. Hymes, eds. (Submitted January 2001)
(with Kenneth C. Hill) Word order type change and the penetration of Spanish de in Modern Nahuatl. To appear in a special issue of *STUF* edited by Jose Antonio Flores F. (2001)

Submitted:

1999 Finding culture in narrative. For *How to Find Culture in Language*, edited by Naomi Quinn.
2001 Subject number, grammaticalization, and transitivity in Cupeño. To appear in a festschrift.

Review Articles:


**Brief Reviews:**


1990 Language Attrition in Progress, B. Wellens et al., eds. Language in Society.

Papers Presented (Available on request)

Papers Presented:
1963 Language size and population density in Highland New Guinea. Southwestern Anthropological Society, Riverside, CA
1969 Volitional and non-volitional verbs in Cupeño. Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago, IL
1970 On the evolutionary foundations of language. Central States Anthropological Society, Bloomington, IN
1970 A note on the functions of primitive war. Central States Anthropological Society, Bloomington, IN
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>To cause to die in Cupeño.</td>
<td>American Anthropological Association, New York City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>To cause to die in Cupeño.</td>
<td>Department of Linguistics, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>The linguist as imperialist.</td>
<td>Central States Anthropological Society, Detroit, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Evidence for a discontinuity theory of language.</td>
<td>Central States Anthropological Society, Cleveland, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>New light on the origins of language.</td>
<td>Womens Research Club, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Origins of Language.</td>
<td>Psycholinguistics Program, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Language and ancient human population structures.</td>
<td>American Anthropological Association, Toronto, ON, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Language death, language contact, and language evolution.</td>
<td>International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, Chicago, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Language death and language style.</td>
<td>linguistics Colloquium, Wayne State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>The languages of power and solidarity: Language obsolescence in native America.</td>
<td>Linguistics Atelier, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada (invited, funded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Language shift in modern Nahuatl.</td>
<td>Department of Linguistics, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Culture shock, positive face, and negative face: Being polite in Tlaxcala.</td>
<td>Central States Anthropological Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Variation in the construction of subordinate clauses in modern Nahuatl.</td>
<td>Conference on non-English Language Variation in the New World, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Relative clauses in modern Nahuatl.</td>
<td>Michigan Linguistic Society, Detroit, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Gender ambiguity in the Mexican fotonovela (with Carole Browner).</td>
<td>Popular Culture Association, Detroit, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Language death in Uto-Aztecana.</td>
<td>Symposium on Uto-Aztecana Historical Linguistics, Albuquerque, NM (invited)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Role performance in the Mexican fotonovela.</td>
<td>Conference on Popular Culture in Latin America, Las Cruces, NM/El Paso, TX/Ciudad Juárez, Chihuahua, México, March 5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>The vernacular remodeling of international languages.</td>
<td>International Association of Applied Linguistics, Symposium on Vernacular and International Languages, Lund, Sweden, August 10-14 (invited)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Ambivalent language attitudes in modern Nahuatl.</td>
<td>International Sociological Congress, Mexico City, August 16-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1983 The voices of Don Gabriel. American Anthropological Association, Chicago, IL (invited)
1984 Relative clauses revisited. Department of Linguistics, University of Texas at Arlington (invited, funded)
1984 Language, Genuine and Spurious? Harry Hoijer Memorial Lecture, UCLA Department of Anthropology, Los Angeles, CA (invited, funded)
1984 Demystifying Maya ergativity. Maya Study Group, Tucson, AZ
1985 Cuatro lecturas sobre la sociolinguística. Universidad de Sonora, Hermosillo, Son. (invited, funded)
1985 The grammar of consciousness and the consciousness of grammar. American Ethnological Society, Toronto, ON (invited)
1986 The Spanish interlanguage of Mexicano speakers. Program in Linguistics and Department of Anthropology, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, March (invited)
1986 Spanish as a pronominal argument language. Department of Linguistics Colloquium, University of Arizona, April
1986 The Political Economy of Interlanguage. Department of Anthropology Colloquium, University of Arizona, November
1987 Restrictions on V(h/V clusters in central dialects of Tohono Oodham. Friends of Uto-Aztecan, Salt Lake City, UT
1987 The flowery world of Old Uto-Aztecan. American Anthropological Association, Chicago, IL
1987 Formalism, functionalism, and the discourse of evolution. Wenner-Gren Conference on the Role of Theory in Linguistic Description, Ocho Rios, Jamaica, October (invited, funded)
1987 Weeping and coherence in narrative and selthood. American Anthropological Association, Chicago, IL
1988 The terror of Montezuma. International Congress of Americanists, Amsterdam, The Netherlands (invited)
1988 Nin gobiero de Puebla: Mexicano penetrations of the Mexican state. In Symposium on Nation-State and Indian in Latin America, Latin American Studies Center, University of Texas Austin, Austin, TX (invited, funded)
1988 The flowery world of Old Uto-Aztecan. Friends of Uto-Aztecan, Reno, NV
1988 Mrs. Patricios trouble: The distribution of responsibility in a narrative of personal experience. Keynote address, LASSO, Albuquerque, NM (invited, funded)
1989 The cultural (?) context of narrative involvement. One of six featured speakers in the Parasession on Language in Context, Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago, IL (invited, funded)
1989 Tohono Oodham epenthesis. Uto-Aztecan Study Group, Department of Linguistics, University of Arizona
1989 Culture theory in linguistic perspective (invited discussant presentation). Society for Cultural Anthropology, Washington, DC
1989 An update on Tohono Oodham dialects (with Ofelia Zepeda). Friends of Uto-Aztecan, Tucson, AZ
1989 Person as a vantage in Aztec codices. Symposium on cognitive grammar, Tucson, AZ
1989 Tohono Oodham spatial deictics. Seminar on Construction of Space, W. Hanks, organizer, Department of Anthropology, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL (invited, funded)
1990 The terror of Montezuma. Department of Anthropology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI (invited, funded); also to Department of English and Communications, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, Las Cruces, NM (invited, funded)
1990 Prosodic morphology of Tohono Oodham (with Ofelia Zepeda). Friends of Uto-Aztecan, México, DF
1990 Structure and practice in language death. Symposium on Progression and Regression in Language, Stockholm University and the Swedish Institute for Immigration Research, Stockholm, Sweden (invited, funded)
1990 Speaking of landscape in the indigenous Southwest. Commonwealth Center for Literary and Cultural Change. University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA (invited, funded)
1991 Tohono Oodham dialect outsiders (with Ofelia Zepeda). Southwest Anthropological Association, Tucson, AZ
1991 The production of self in narrative 2nd Bi-Annual Conference on Current Thinking and Research of the Society for Psychological Anthropology, Chicago, IL, October 11-13 (invited)
1992 Dialectology of the Piman Corridor (with David Leedom Shaul). Department of Anthropology Colloquium, University of Arizona, April
1992 Mexicano on the Malinche Volcano. NEH Summer Institute on Mesoamerican Languages, F. Karttunen, Director, Cholula, Pue, Mexico (invited, funded)
1992 Hasta la vista, baby: Anglo Spanish in the American Southwest. Second Language Acquisition and Teaching Program Colloquium, September
1992 Spanish in the indigenous languages of Mexico and the Southwest. Eighteenth Annual Minnesota Conference on Languages and Linguistics/Thirteenth Annual Conference on Spanish in the US. Second International Conference on Spanish in Contact with Other Languages. Keynote Address. Minneapolis, MN, October 24 (invited, funded)
1992 Linguistics and archaeology. University of Arizona Undergraduate Anthropology Students Colloquium, October
1992 La velocidad del habla en el tohono oodham. II Encuentro de Lingüística en el Noroeste. Hermosillo, Son, November (invited)
1992  Keynote Speech, SBS Honors Convocation, November
1993  The terror of Montezuma. Second Language Acquisition and Teaching Program Colloquium, University of Arizona
1993  Is it really No problemo? First Annual SALSA Conference, Austin, TX April 16 -18 (Keynote address); Linguistics Colloquium, New Y67rk University, May; Conference on Fixation and Disavowel: Strategies of Resistance and Desire, Institute for Humanities Research, University of Californialrvine, Irvine CA, June 10-12; Keynote Address, Michigan Linguistic Society, Detroit, MI, October 8 (all invited, funded)
1993  Competition between phonological and semantic principles in Tohono Oodham plurals. Friends of Uto-Aztecan, California State University at Long Beach, August
1993  Pimans and the Hohokam. Colloquium presented to the staff of Desert Archaeology, Inc., Tucson, AZ September 20
1993  Is there a modular faculty of social cognition, and what could be in it? Paper delivered at the workshop on Language, Cognition, and Computation, Fundació Catalana per a la Recerca/Institut DEstudis Catalans, Barcelona, Spain, November 25-26 (invited, funded)
1994  The incorporative power of Whiteness. American Ethnological Society, Santa Monica, CA, April 14-16 (invited)
1994  From Mark Twain to Terminator II: Junk Spanish and Anglo Racism. Taft Lecture, Department of Anthropology, University of Cincinnati (invited, funded)
1994  Read my article: Language ideology, personalism, and political commitment es in elite American English discourse. School of American Research Advanced Seminar on Language Ideology, Santa Fe, NM, May (invited, funded)
1994  Pimans and Hohokam. Friends of Uto-Aztecan, Reno, NV, August 10-11
1994  Three sources of phonological irregularity in Tohono Oodham. Department of Linguistics Colloquium, University of Arizona, October
1994  El flujo de aire pulmónico-ingresivo en el habla de las mujeres tohono oodham. III Encuentro sobre la Lingüística en el Noroeste, Hermosillo, Son., November 16
1994  Speaking of landscape in the indigenous Southwest. Elderhostel, Tucson, AZ
1994  Spanish loan words as sociolinguistic markers and historical clues in Tohono Oodham (Papago) regional variation. American Anthropological Association, Atlanta, GA, December
1995  Pulmonic ingressive air stream in the speech of Tohono, Oodham women. Sociolinguistics Brown Bag Group, University of Arizona, January
1995  Language decay: The loss of structural differentiation in obsolescent languages. American Association for the Advancement of Science, Atlanta, GA, February 18 (paper read by W. Poser, session organizer) (invited)
1995  Junk Spanish: The anatomy of a racist discourse. Department of Anthropology, University of Chicago, March 6; Distinguished Lecture, Department of Anthropology, Brandeis University, April 6 (both invited, funded), Anthropology
Colloquium, University of Iowa, October, SBS/COH Distinguished Lecture, University of Arizona, October 10

1995  The reduction to writing. Conference on Theorizing the Americanist Tradition, London, ON, June 1-4 (invited, funded)

1995  On transcribing and translating a Mexicano Text. Videotape/Audiotape Workshop, Linguistic Society of America Summer Institute, July 27


1995  Language ideology and the overdetermination of promising in U.S. presidential politics. Second Language Acquisition and Teaching Colloquium, University of Arizona, November 10


1996  The flower world in material culture (with Kelley Hays-Gilpin). Southwest Symposium, Tempe, AZ, March

1996  The prehistoric differentiation of Uto-Aztecan languages and the lexicon of early Southwestern agriculture. Society for American Archaeology, April 10-14, New Orleans, LA (invited)

1996  Languages on the Land. David Skomp Distinguished Lecture, Indiana University Department of Anthropology, Bloomington, IN, March 21 (invited, funded)

1996  Uto-Aztecan Plurals (with Kenneth C. Hill). Presented at the Friends of Uto-Aztecan, Salt Lake City, UT, August

1996  Languages in conflict, voices at play, or the struggle for the control of meaning? Conflicting visions of discourses of identity. Keynote address, presented at the conference Language communities, states, and global culture: The discourse of identity in the Americas. University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA, October 10 -12 (invited, funded)


1997  Plot: Narrative as an interactional site. Department of Anthropology, University of California, Davis: March 10 (invited, funded)

1997  From Mark Twain to Terminator II: Mock Spanish as a racist discourse. Department of Anthropology, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO, Wednesday, Mar. 26 (invited, funded)

1997  Tohono o'odham: Sumario de algunos estudios, con bibliografía. Presented at the 25th Annual Conference of the Friends of Uto-Aztecan, Hermosillo, Sonora, June 20-22

1997  La historia cultural yutoazteca y la evidencia de la lingüística comparativa. Presented at the 25th Annual Conference of the Friends of Uto-Aztecan, Hermosillo, Sonora, June 20-22

1997  Plot as an interactional site. Second Language Acquisition and Teaching Colloquium, University of Arizona, September 26


1997  What is lost when names are forgotten? Presented in the section Naming, Conference on Nature Knowledge/Sapiere Natura, Istituto Veneto di Scienza, Arte, e Littera, Venice, Italy, December 4 (invited, funded)


1998  Language, race, and white public space. Groundworks Bookstore, UCSD, La Jolla, CA, February 5, 1998

1998  Where are Whorfian effects? Department of Anthropology, University of Michigan, February 13 (invited, funded)

1998  Making languages unequal. Presented at A symposium in Honor of Dell H. Hymes, Charlottesville, VA, April 25 (invited, funded)

1998  Stories from the language wars: Narrative in Dell Hymes theory of linguistic inequality. International Pragmatic Association, Reims, France, July 22 (invited)

1998  Language and racialization. Paper read in absentia at the International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, Williamsburg VA, July 31 (invited, funded)


1998  Lenguaje e identidad en la frontera. Simposio en Homenaje a Alejandro Figueroa Valenzuela, Hermosillo, Son., June (invited)


1998  Los rasgos redondo y labial en el tohono oodham. V Encuentro sobre la Lingüística en el Noroeste, Hermosillo, Son., November

1998  Language, Gender, and biology: The case of Tohono Oodham pulmonary ingressive airstream. Keynote Address, Linguistic Association of the Southwest, Tempe, AZ, October 9 (invited)


1999  Combining teaching and research in linguistics. Linguistic Society of America, Committee on the Status of Women in Linguistics workshop, Los Angeles, CA, January 9 (invited)

1999  Mock Spanish. Department of Ethnic Studies, UC San Diego, February 5, 1999 (??? check date)

1999  The real culture wars: Who controls cultural resources in the Southwest?". New Directions in Southwest Anthropology Lecture Series, University of Arizona, April 1,? 1999


1999 Why is Uto-Aztecan so big? Department of Anthropology, UC Davis, May 24, 1999
1999 Why is Uto-Aztecan so big? Archaeology Field School, University of Arizona, June 29, 1999
1999 Why is Uto-Aztecan so big? Mesa Redonda sobre Estudios Yuatztecos, Mexico, DF June 15, 1999
1999 El agua en la cultura yuatzteca. Friends of Uto-Aztecan, 26th Annual Meeting, Taxco, Gro, Mexico June 18, 1999
1999 We have all always been multiculturalists: A suspicious anthropologist looks at multiculturalism. Reed College Symposium on Multiculturalism, Featured Speaker. Reed College, Portland, OR September 4, 1999
1999 Reproducing Racism in Everyday Language. Building Campus Community Lecture Series, University of Arizona, September 8, 1999
2000 (with Barbara Meek and Jacqueline Messing) Avoiding the Matrix language in RLS. Linguistic Society of America, Chicago, IL, Jan. 9, 2000 (invited paper in plenary session on Language Endangerment).
2000 The origin and dispersal of the Uto-Aztecan languages. Australian Linguistic Society, Melbourne, VIC, July 7, 2000
2000 Reportative evidentials as discourse particles in the Takic languages. Ethnopragmatics Workshop, Australian Linguistic Institute, Melbourne, VIC, July 10, 2000
2000 Reproducing racism in everyday language. Department of Anthropology, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University, Canberra, ATC. August 30, 2000
2000 Nahuatl and language ideology at three sites. Department of Linguistics, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, VIC, October 6, 2000
2000 Sociolinguistic focussing as subsistence strategy: Two Tohono O’odham (Papago) dialects. Department of Linguistics, La Trobe University, Bundoora, VIC October 19, 2000
2000  CupeZo case and transitivity.  Department of Linguistics, University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia, October 27, 2000
2000  Person and number in CupeZo.  Research Centre for Linguistic Typology, La Trobe University, Bundoora, VIC October 31, 2000
2000  Case and transitivity in CupeZo.  Research Centre for Linguistic Typology, La Trobe University, Bundoora, VIC November 6, 2000
2000  Tense and aspect in CupeZo.  Research Centre for Linguistic Typology, La Trobe University, Bundoora, VIC November 13, 2000
2000  Discontinuous constituency in CupeZo.  Research Centre for Linguistic Typology, La Trobe University, Bundoora, VIC, November 20, 2000
2001  Number marking in CupeZo.  Uto-Aztecan Colloquium Series, Departments of Anthropology and Linguistics, University of Arizona, February 7, 2001
2001  Case and transitivity in CupeZo. Uto-Aztecan Colloquium Series, Departments of Anthropology and Linguistics, University of Arizona, February 14, 2001
2001  Discontinuous constituency in CupeZo. Uto-Aztecan Colloquium Series, Departments of Anthropology and Linguistics, University of Arizona, February 21, 2001
2001  Language wars in the Southwest. Invited lecture, Southern Arizona Diversity Association, Doubletree Hotel, Tucson, AZ May 24, 2001)
2001  CupeZo negative sentences. Uto-Aztecan Colloquium Series, Departments of Anthropology and Linguistics, University of Arizona, September, 2001
2002  Toward a linguistic prehistory of the Southwest. Invited JAR Distinguished Lecture, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, April 19, 2002.
CURRICULUM VITAE (brief)
FERNANDO CORONIL
May 1, 2000

Address

616 Fountain Ave., Ann Arbor, MI 419103
Phone: (734) 665 5878
E-Mail: coronil@umich.edu
Fax: (734) 763-6077

Education

Ph.D. 1987 The University of Chicago (Anthropology)
M.A. 1970 The University of Chicago (Anthropology)
B.A. 1967 Stanford University (History and Social Thought and Institutions)
Distinction, Phi Beta Kappa

Professional Experience

1997-present Associate Professor, Department of Anthropology, U. of Michigan
    Associate Professor, Department of History, U. of Michigan
1997-present Research Associate, IDEA, Universidad Simón Bolívar
1996-present Invited Professor, Summer Language Program, Middlebury College
1997 Invited Professor, Curso de Posgrado de Ciencias Sociales, Universidad Central de
    Venezuela, June-July; Coordinator of Post-Graduate Studies
1991-1997 Assistant Professor, Department of Anthropology, U. of Michigan
    Assistant Professor, Department of History, U. of Michigan
1988-1991 Assistant Professor, Departments of History and Anthropology
    Fellow, Michigan Society of Fellows University of Michigan
1988-1989 Profesor Invitado, Centro de Estudios Latinamaericanos Rómulo Gallegos
    (CELARG) Caracas, Venezuela
1988 (Winter) Lecturer, The University of Chicago
1987 (Fall) Visiting Faculty Fellow, Helen Kellogg Institute, University of Notre Dame
1985-1986 Lecturer, The University of Chicago
1975-1979 Investigador Associado, Centro de Estudios del Desarrollo (CENDES)
    Caracas Director de proyecto de investigación, Consejo Nacional de
    Investigaciones Científicas y Tecnológicas, Caracas
1974-1975 Profesor asistente, Universidad Católica Andrés Bello UCAB), Caracas
1971 (Winter) Profesor Invitado, Departamento de Sociología, Universidad de la
    Habana

Administrative Experience

Chair, Doctoral Program in Anthropology and History, University of Michigan (1997,
    Fall; Sept.1999-May 2002).
Awards and Fellowships

2000-2004         Dean's Faculty Award, University of Michigan
1988             Helen Kellogg Institute Fellowship, University of Notre Dame

Grants
1998 Rackham Graduate School's Program to Promote International Partnership
1997 Office of the Provost for Academic and Multicultural Affairs Travel Grant
1997 Rackham Graduate School Travel Grant
1989 Spencer Foundation Small Grant

Languages

Spanish, English, French, Portuguese, Italian

Field Research

Venezuela, 1974 to present

Recent (Selected) and Most Significant Publications

Books:
Published.
In preparation.
States of Violence. University of Michigan Press (with Julie Skurski)
Nation and Transculturation: Ortiz Reader. Minnesota University Press (with George Yudice).
Un solo palo no hace monte. Contrapunteando con Ortiz, Malinowski y sus interlocutores, presentes y ausentes. Fundación Fernando Ortiz.
El estado mágico: naturaleza, dinero y modernidad en Venezuela. Caracas: CELARG/Nueva Sociedad

Articles

Book Chapters:
Most Significant Papers and Lectures

1999: "Una ciencia social transcultural para la América Latina," keynote speaker and closing comments, "La reestructuración de las ciencias sociales en los países andinos, Instituto Pensar, Universidad Javeriana, Bogota, Colombia.


1998: "Voices and Silences in the Archives," comments as Chair of the student roundtable, Cienfuegos/Michigan History Workshop, Cuba.


Courses Taught

Comparative Study of Culture (Anthropology 222); Latin America: The Modern Period (477)
Traditions I (Anthropology 526); Traditions II (Anthropology 527).
State and Nation in Latin America (LACS, History, Anthropology).
Time, Memory and Agency (Anthropology 658); Geneologies of the State (Anthropology 658).
States of Violence (Anthropology 447); several courses on Occidentals focusing on various topics: on Space, Gender, Capitalism, Globalization, State(Anthropology 658, History 697).
JANET M. CHERNELA
Curriculum Vitae

Address
Dept. of Sociology and Anthropology
Florida International University
North Miami, Fl 33181
Tel.305-758-3938; 301-779-8582
e-mail chernela@fiu.edu

Higher Education
1983 Ph.D., Columbia University, New York, received with Distinction

Academic Experience
1999-pres Professor, Department of Sociology/Anthropology, Florida International University, Miami
1990-99 Assoc. Prof., Department of Sociology/Anthropology, Florida International University, Miami,
1985-1990 Assist. Prof., Department of Sociology/Anthropology, Florida International University, Miami,
1980-1985 Research Faculty, Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas da Amazonia (INPA),
National Institute of Amazonian Research, Manaus, Brazil

Visiting Appointments:
2000 Adjunct Professor and Visiting Scholar, Center for Latin American Studies, Georgetown University
1993, 1994 Adjunct Professor, Department of Anthropology, Columbia University, New York
1988 Visiting Professor, Museu Emilio Goeldi/Ford Foundation, Belém do Pará, Brazil

Research and Teaching Specializations
Indigenous Peoples of Amazonia
Human Rights of Indigenous Peoples
Development, Conservation, and Local Peoples in Latin America
Advisory, Representational, and Consulting Activities


2000 Consultant, International Study Programs, College of Life Sciences, University of Maryland, College Park


1991 Faculty Advisor, The Coolidge Center for Environmental Leadership

1989-90 Academic Coordinator, Fulbright-Hays Seminars Abroad Program, Brazil Orientation

1989 Consultant, Ford Foundation, Environmental NGOs, Brazil

1987-88 Consultant, Cultural Survival: Indigenous Peoples, Self-Determination, and Environmental Preservation

1982-86 Organizer and Advisor, Association of Indigenous Women of the Upper Rio Negro in Urban Manaus (AMARN)

Fieldwork

2001 Indigenous Organization and Human Rights, Brazil

2001 Area Indigena Kaiapo, Aucre Meeting on Territorial Monitoring (TNC)

2001 Democracy, the Church, and Community Organization in the Central Amazon of Brazil (FIU)

2000 Environmental and Social Impacts of Goldmining in Yanomami Territory, Brazil (TNC)

2000 Resource Management and Political Organization: Kaiapo, Yanomami, and Makuxi (TNC)

1999,2000 Silves: An Experiment in Community Organization and Environmental Protection, Brazilian Amazon
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985-87</td>
<td>Gender and Language among the Wanano (Eastern Tukanoan) of Brazil (Post-doctoral Research Fellowship, Social Science Research Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>Indigenous Use of Amazonian Blackwater River Margins: Managing a Fragile Floodplain System in Light of Human Development Needs (WWF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-85</td>
<td>Society and Economy of the Wanano (Eastern Tukanoan) of Brazil (INPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Symbiosis and Hierarchy among Tukanoan Fisher-horticulturalists and Makuan Hunter-gatherers in the Northwest Amazon (National Geographic Foundation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-82</td>
<td>The prevalence of Ascaris infection in Amerindian populations of the Brazilian Amazon (CNPq)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-82</td>
<td>The Social Economy of the Wanano (Eastern Tukanoan) speakers of Brazil (SSRC, Fulbright)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Honors and Grants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Stipend, Archival Research, Early Policies of Indigenous Rights in Iberian New World Colonies, Florida International University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Faculty Development Award, Florida International University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Ford Foundation Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>McKnight Junior Faculty Development Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Faculty Development Award, Florida International University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>World Wildlife Fund and the Conservation Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Advanced Research Grant, Social Science Research Council (Joint Committee on Latin American Studies of the American Council with funds provided by the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Ford Foundation, and the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-82</td>
<td>CNPq (National Science Foundation of Brazil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Fulbright Fellowship for dissertation research (U.S. Dept. of State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Social Science Research Council Undergraduate Fellowship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Fellowship, Princeton University Program in Latin American Studies (declined)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Fellowship, Columbia University Doctoral Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1977  Graduate Faculties Alumni Scholar, Columbia University
1977  Department of Anthropology Stipend for Individual Research, Columbia University
1976  Presidential Fellowship for Doctoral Study, Columbia University

PUBLICATIONS:

Books and Edited Volumes


Articles

2002  "with Ali Ahmad, Fazlun Khalid, Viv Sinnamon, and Hanna Jaireth, “Innovative Governance of Fisheries and Ecotourism in Community-based Protected Areas,” Parks. 12(2) In press


1985 "Indigenous Fishing in the Neotropics: the Tukanoan Uanano of the Blackwater Uaupés River Basin in Brazil and Colombia, INTERCIENCIA 10(2)78-86.


Book Chapters


Invited Book Reviews


1999a  Review of The Struggle for Amazon Town: Gurupa Revisited, by Richard Pace (Lynne Rienner Publishers), Luso-Brasillian Review 36(1)154-156.


**Published Reports and Essays**


1989a  "Zoning the Amazon: Rondonia," *Hemisphere*, 1(2)22.


1988b  "Recuperating Devastated Lands: An Experimental Farm in Cauca, Colombia," *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 12(4)53-54


Invited Lectures, Conferences, and Presentations

"Domestication of Women and Land in the Northwest Amazon of Brazil 1680-1980," American Society for Ethnohistory, Tucson Arizona, October 18, 2001


"Real-politik and Ecotourism in Northern Brazil" Latin American Studies Association, Chicago, September 25, 1998


"Violença e Identidade num Complexo Mítico Arapacho do Noroeste Amazonia," International Congress of Americanists, Quito, Ecuador, July 7, 1997

"The Language of Wealth: Valuation, Policy, and the Implications for the Environment and Local Peoples, XXI International Congress of the Latin American Studies Association, Guadalajara, Mexico, April 17, 1997


"Gender, Culture, and Human Rights: Indian Women Domestics in Brazil" Women and Human Rights Series, School of International and Public Affairs, Columbia University, New York, March 1, 1994

"Hierarchy and Symbiosis in the Brazilian Northwest Amazon," Department of Anthropology, Hunter College of the City of New York, February 23, 1994


Invited Speaker, "The Role of the Floodplain in Settlement Pattern and Subsistence in Native Lowland South America," New York Botanical Garden, May 21, 1993

Invited Speaker, "Labor, Gender and History in North Central Brazil," University of Arizona Department of Anthropology, Women's Studies, and Latin American Studies Program, Tucson, March 1993

Invited Speaker, "Green Development and Indigenous Peoples in the Western Amazon," Coolidge Center for Environmental Leadership Conference on "Challenges for Sustainable Development," Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, November 6-8 1992


Invited Speaker, "Native Peoples, Conservation, and Development," Opening Exhibit Symposium, Transforming the Amazon Rainforest, The University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania, March 7, 1992

"Doing the Dozens in Wanano: Verbal Dueling in the Northwest Amazon" LAILA/ALILA X International Symposium, San Juan, Puerto Rico, Jan. 1992


Invited Speaker, "Binational Cooperation in Environmental Campaigns: The Role of Brazilian and American Anthropologists in the Case of Brazil Highway 364," Symposium,
Invited speaker, "Brazilian Indians and the Changing Amazon Rainforest," Texas Memorial Museum, Austin Texas, April 19, 1990


Invited Speaker, "Challenges to Democracy in Latin America: the Environment," Seventh Annual Journalists and Editors Workshop on Latin America, Miami, Florida, April 8, 1989

Invited Speaker, "Bi-polar Strategies for International Development," The Coolidge Center for Environmental Education, Cambridge, Massachusetts March 8, 1989

Invited Speaker, "Ethnographic Exhibition and Interpretation," Museu Paraense de Emilio Goeldi, Belem do Para, Brazil, August 3, 1988


Invited Speaker, "Sustainable Indigenous Control in the Awa Binational Biosphere Reserve in Colombia-Ecuador," First International Congress of Ethnobiology, Museu Paraense Emilio Goeldi, Belem, Brazil, July 21, 1988


"Multilateral Lending and Indigenous Peoples: Two Brazilian Cases" New England Environmental Conference, The Fletcher Center, Tufts University, March 18, 1988


Invited Speaker, "Rituals of Gender and Procreation among the Garifuna (Black Caribs) of Honduras," University of Chicago Department of Anthropology seminar series, "The Newest, The Best, and The Brightest," January 11, 1988

Invited Speaker, "Indigenous Domestics in the Urban Centers of Northern Brazil," Eighth National Congress of Brazilian Women, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, August 1986
Conference Participation


Chair and Co-Organizer (with Marianne Schmink), Gender, Resource Management, and Biodiversity Conservation in the Neotropics," XXII International Congress of the Latin American Studies Association, Miami, March 17, 2000


Chair and Co-Organizer (with Arturo Oyola-Yemaiel), Ecotourism and Sustainability: Cooperation for a New Millennium," XXII International Congress of the Latin American Studies Association, Miami, March 17, 2000


Discussant, "Ecotourism in Latin America: Lessons Learned," Latin American Studies Association XXI International Congress, Guadalajara, Mexico, April 18, 1997


Professional Appointments and Elected Positions


2001  Chair (elected position), Committee for Human Rights, American Anthropological Association

2001  Member (elected position), Executive Board, Brazilian Studies Association, BRASA

2000  Member (elected position), Committee for Human Rights, American Anthropological Association

1998, 1999 Program Editor and Coordinator, Society for Latin American Anthropology of the AAA

1997-2000  Councillor (elected position), Society for Latin American Anthropology of the AAA

1997-1999  Councillor, Environment and Society Section, Latin American Studies Association

1994-7  Co-Chair, Working Group on Natural Resources and the Environment, Latin American Studies Association

1990-pres  Scholar and Fellow, Cultural Survival, Department of Anthropology, Harvard University

1989-pres  Contributing Editor, *Hemisphere* (a journal of Latin American and Caribbean affairs)
RAYMOND B. HAMES
CURRICULUM VITA

CURRENT POSITION
Professor, Department of Anthropology, University of Nebraska-Lincoln

ADDRESSES
Home: 2765 Rathbone Rd, Lincoln, Nebraska 68502
University: 126 Bessey Hall, Department of Anthropology, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE 68588-0368

TELEPHONES
University (402) 472-6240, 472-2411
Home 474-6298

Email: rhames@unl.edu

EDUCATION
1978 Ph.D. Anthropology, University of California, Santa Barbara
1974 MA Anthropology, University of California, Santa Barbara
1971 BA Anthropology, University of California, Santa Barbara
1966-1968 Biology Major, California State Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo

OTHER ACTIVITIES
1992-1993 NSF Cultural Anthropology Program Director
1991 NSF Summer Institute in Comparative Research. UCLA, Department of Anthropology.
1988-1990 National Science Foundation Cultural Anthropology Advisory Panel Member.
1970-1971 Peace Corps Volunteer, assigned to Paraguay to coordinate a program of environmental sanitation with local village health inspectors.

ACADEMIC POSITIONS HELD
1999- present Professor and Acting Director of the University of Nebraska State Museum
1989-1996 Chair, Department of Anthropology (on leave 1992-3)
1985-1999 Associate Professor, University of Nebraska
1987-1989 Assistant Dean, College of Arts & Sciences
1980-1985 Assistant Professor, University of Nebraska
1980 Assistant Visiting Professor Penn State University (Spring Quarter)
1977 Lecturer for Extended University, University of California, Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California (Winter Quarter)
1972-1974 Teaching Assistant, UCSB

COURSES TAUGHT
The Anthropology of Warfare Economic Anthropology
Introductory Cultural Anthropology Anthropological Ecology
Contentious Issues in Anthropology Social Organization
Introduction to Anthropology Hunters and Gatherers
FIELD RESEARCH
May 1980 - July 1980: Paraguay
Jan. 1979 - March 1979: Bridgeport, CT

HONORS, FELLOWSHIPS, RESEARCH AWARDS
11/74 - 6/77: NIMH pre-doctoral fellowship (N. Chagnon, P.I.) entitled "Yanomamö Warfare, Expansion and Political Evolution".
1/78 - 6/78: NIMH doctoral fellowship continuation (N. Chagnon, P.I.).
1/79 - 5-79: NIE Ethnographic Researcher Principal Investigator: Abdin Noboa) "Hispanic Segregation Trends in Major School Districts with Large Hispanic Enrollments".
5/81 - 7/81 Summer Faculty Fellowship, University of Nebraska-Lincoln ($3,160).
10/81: Advancement to Graduate Faculty Member), University of Nebraska, Lincoln.
10/81: Invited University Symposium Award ($3,000), University of Nebraska Research Council. Symposium title: "Optimization Theory in Human Evolution." Coordinator: R. Hames (Submitted with five others).
11/82: November 1982: Invited speaker award for N. Chagnon (University of Nebraska Research Council, $454.00).
11/82: November 1982: Funds for visiting scholar for Kim Hill (College of Arts and Sciences, $200.00).
3/83 - 2/86: Research associate (5% time) on a three year National Institute of Ageing Career Development Award to Dr. Jane Potter (University of Nebraska Medical Center) entitled "Beneficial Effects of Moderate Obesity".
1/84 - 6/88: National Science Foundation funding for a 3 year research project entitled "The Social Effects of Mortality and Divorce in the Yanomamö Nuclear Family: Kinship Fosterage, and Marriage Choice Implications for Tribal Societies". R. Hames, P.I., $63,541. (BSN 8411669)
9/84: Advancement to Graduate Faculty (Fellow), University of Nebraska.
4/85: Advancement to Associate Professor.
7/87: NSF REU supplement to "The Social Effects of Mortality and Divorce " (BSN 8411669). R. Hames, P.I., $4,000.
9/94: Award from the office of the Senior Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs to create multimedia materials for Essential Studies courses ($4,500)
10/96: Summer Faculty Fellowship, University of Nebraska Research Council ($6,500)
6/97: LSB Leakey Award entitled "Trekking Variation among the Yanomamö" ($8,196).
12/98: Diversity Enhancement Award for "Enhancement of Native American Cultural Awareness, Recruitment, and Retention" with three others ($3,000)

FIELDS OF SPECIAL INTEREST
Human and Evolutionary Ecology          South American Indians
Biosocial Anthropology                 Exchange
Economic Anthropology                  Hunters and Gatherers
Time Allocation                        Social Interaction
PUBLICATIONS

Key:
(r) refereed publication
(i) invited commentary
(nr) non-refereed
(rp) translation and/or reprint of previously published article
(br) book review

1976

1979

1980

1981

1982

1983

1984

1985

1986


1987


1988


1989


1991


1992


1993


1994


1995

1996

1997

1998
(i) Comments on "Reproductive Interests and Forager Mobility" Douglas MacDonald and Barry Hewlett. *Current Anthropology* 40:515-517.

1999

2000

2001

IN PRESS

(i) Comment on Hawkes et al. “Hunting and Nuclear Families” *Current Anthropology* 42 (5).
(rp) Wildlife Conservation in tribal societies. *In Evolutionary Perspectives on Environmental Problems: A Reader*. Penn, Dustin and I. Mysterud, eds. Rutgers University Press
In preparation


Patterns of Inter-village visiting among the Yanomamö

Women's work, child care and helpers at the nest in a hunter-gatherer society. (With Patricia Draper, second author)


MINOR PUBLICATIONS


(http://dizzy.library.arizona.edu:8000/jpe/vol4~1.htm)


PAPERS READ


April 1984 "Protein Maximization or Time Minimization" Nebraska Academy of Sciences. Lincoln, Nebraska (abstract published).

March 1985 "Parental Loss and Allo-parental Investment in Offspring". Invited paper presented before the Faculty of Social Sciences and sponsored Departments of Sociology and Anthropology, Universidad Central de Venezuela, Caracas, Venezuela.


October 1985 "Problems in Coding Behavioral Data." NSF Workshop on Cross-Cultural Time Allocation Databases. Department of Anthropology, UCLA.


April 1986 "Female Choice and Divorce". Invited lecture at the University of Missouri-Columbia, Department of Anthropology.


June 18, 1999 “Birth Order, Sibling Investment, and Fertility among Ju/'hoansi (San). Annual Meeting of Evolution and Human Behavior Society.” University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT. (Patricia Draper, first author)

June 19, 1999 “Parental Investment and Child Health in a Yanomamo Village”. Poster presentation and winner of best poster at the Annual Meeting of Evolution and Human Behavior Society. University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT

CURRICULUM VITAE
Trudy R. Turner

October, 1999

Office Address:
Department of Anthropology
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201
Telephone: (414) 229-4175
FAX: (414) 229-5848
E-Mail address: trudy@uwm.edu

EDUCATION


1970-1973 Graduate School of Arts and Science, New York University - M.A.
(Anthropology), 1973, Thesis title: "A Functional Analysis of the Musculature of the
Forelimb of Three Prosimian Species"

1973-1977 Graduate School of Arts and Science, New York University - Ph.D.
(Anthropology), 1977, dissertation title: "Biological Variation in Vervet Monkeys
(Cercopithecus aethiops)"

1981-1982 Postdoctoral Scholar, Department of Human Genetics, University of Michigan
Medical School

RESEARCH INTERESTS
Genetic variation in humans and non-human primates; population genetics, paternity
assessment, genetics and behavior; genetic diversity studies and conservation and ethics;
women in science.

EMPLOYMENT

1974-1975 Lecturer, Anthropology, Lehman College, City University of New York

1975 Lecturer, Anthropology, John Jay College, City University of New York

1976 Lecturer, Anthropology, State University of New York at Purchase

1977-1987 Assistant Professor of Anthropology, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (on
leave: September, 1978 - September, 1979; January 1981-January 1983; September, 1985 -
January, 1986)
1978-1979  Field Director, Biogenetic Survey of Kenya Vervets - Obtained biological samples from 400 vervets at four sites in Kenya

1981-1983  Postdoctoral Scholar, Department of Human Genetics, University of Michigan Medical School

1987-  Associate Professor of Anthropology, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

1996-  Chair, Department of Anthropology, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

1998-  Professor, Department of Anthropology, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

1998-1999  Interim Coordinator, Faculty Mentoring Program, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

OTHER APPOINTMENTS
1978-1981  Honorary Research Scientist, Laboratory of Physical Anthropology, University College, London - Participated in laboratory analysis of primate samples

1988-1989  Consultant - Genetic Counseling for women considering amniocentesis and chorionic villus sampling. Prentice Women's Hospital, Northwestern University, Chicago, Illinois

FELLOWSHIPS AND GRANTS

1974-1975  National Science Foundation Grant for Doctoral Dissertation Research, (Supervised by C.J. Jolly) Biological Variation in Ethiopian Vervet Monkeys, Grant No. SOC74-24166 ($4000)

1978-1980  National Science Foundation Grant, "Biogenetic Survey of Kenya Vervets" (Co-principal Investigator with C.J. Jolly), Grant No. BN770-3322 ($50,000)

1979-1980  Biomedical Research Support Grant (BRSG), University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, "Genetic Markers in Nonhuman primates: Applications as Medical Models" ($5000)

1981  National Science Foundation Doctoral Dissertation Improvement Grant for C.S. Mott, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee "Genetic Variation in Four Subspecies of Cercopithecus mitis in Kenya," Grant No. BNS-8104435 ($1500)

1981-1982  Postdoctoral Scholar, National Institutes of Health, Department of Human Genetics, University of Michigan Medical School - Awarded for additional training and updating in techniques in molecular genetics ($36,000)

1983  University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Graduate School Research Committee Award, "Restriction Fragment Length Polymorphism in Non-Human Primate DNA ($5000)
1990-1992 National Science Foundation Grant "Male Migration in Yellow Baboons (Papio cynocephalus)" Co-investigator with E.O. Smith, Emory University ($200,000)

1989-1991 National Science Foundation Grant, "Paternity Assessment in Non-Human 1993-1995 Primate Populations" (Co-principal Investigator with M.L. Weiss) Grant No. BNS-8818405 ($100,000)

1994-1995 University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Graduate School Research Committee Award, "Paternity Analysis of Lepilemur mustelinus using DNA from hair. ($7119)

1998-1999 National Science Foundation. Workshop: Anthropology, Genetic Diversity and Ethics ($29,000)

AWARDS AND HONORS
1998 Martine Meyer Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching, College of Letters and Science, University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee

BOOKS

WEB PUBLICATION


[Back to Top]
ARTICLES PUBLISHED


BOOK REVIEWS


PAPERS PRESENTED AND ABSTRACTS PUBLISHED


Volume I, Page102


INVITED LECTURES
1982 "Biological variation in vervet monkeys" Chicago Academy of Sciences

1983 "Comparative measurements of variation in non-human primates", Department of Anthropology, Harvard University

1987 "New techniques in the study of genetic variability in non-human primates", Department of Anthropology, University of Wisconsin- Madison

1988 "Genetic variability in non-human primates", Department of Biology, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

2000 "Primates and Evolution: Examples from the Field" A Symposium on the Nature of Science, Fermilab, Batavia, IL

FIELD AND LABORATORY EXPERIENCE
1973 Field collection of samples from 125 vervet monkeys, Awash National Park, Ethiopia

1978-1979 Field collection of demographic information and biological samples of 400 vervet monkeys at four sites in Kenya

1980-1981 Electrophoretic examination of blood samples of 100 Cercopithecus mitis from Kenya
1981 Collected samples from Erythrocebus patas colony at Perguera, Puerto Rico, for study of genetic variation

1981 Examination of enzyme kinetics of samples of six primate species using fast centrifugal analyzer, department of Human Genetics, University of Michigan Medical School

1982 Examination of human and primate polymorphisms using restriction endonucleases and recombinant DNA technology, Department of Human Genetics, University of Michigan Medical School

1987-present Examination of Microsatellite loci variation and DNA fingerprinting in non-human primates for paternity assessment and population genetics

INSTRUCTION
Courses Taught

(Undergraduate )
Introduction to Anthropology : Human Prehistory
Introduction to Human Evolution
Human Evolution and Variation
Heredity, Environment and Human Populations
Proseminar: Primate Behavior
Primate Populations
Freshman Seminar: Thinking About Human Evolution
Honors Seminar: Human Adaptation
Coordinator: Dead Men Do Tell Tales, Forensic Science, A Multidisciplinary Approach to Solving Crime
(Graduate )
Primate Populations
Core course in Physical Anthropology
Seminar: Evolutionary Theory and Primate Biology
Seminar: Molecular Anthropology
Student Committees
Ph.D. Advisor
Carol Mott (completed, 1987)
Dawn St. George (completed, 1997)
Christine Ruth (completed, 1998)
Nancy Napier (in process)
Karen Dalke (in process)
Shirley Gaines (in process)
Ph.D. Minor Advisor
Nina Thumser (Biology, completed, 1993)
Gaye Rheinhartz (Biology, completed, 1997)
OTHER PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

1977-present Reviewed proposals for National Science Foundation, Guggenheim Foundation, Wenner-Gren Foundation, Center for Field Research

Reviewed texts for Prentice-Hall


1977-1978 Co-organizer (with T. Olivier) of Chicago Primatological Group

1991 NSF Panel member - Review BBS Research Training Grants - multidisciplinary, multiinstitutional training grants

1995 NIH Panel Member - Review chimpanzee breeding programs

1998 NSF Panel Member – IGERT grants, preproposal panel

1999 NSF Panel Member – IGERT grants, full proposals

1999 Organizer of NSF sponsored workshop, Anthropology, Genetic Diversity and Ethics at UWM

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES

American Anthropological Association - member; elected Executive Committee, 1994

American Association of Physical Anthropologists - member

American Society of Human Genetics - member

American Association for the Advancement of Science - member

International Primatological Society - member

American Primatological Society - member

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Professional

1988-1989 Education Committee, American Society of Primatologists

1989-1991 Local Arrangements Chair, American Association of Physical Anthropology Meeting in Milwaukee - 1991
1990-1993 Program Committee, American Association of Physical Anthropology Arrange meetings program

1995-1997 Chair, Membership Committee, American Association of Physical Anthropologists, designed and implemented demographic survey of membership

1995-1997 Executive Committee, American Association of Physical Anthropologists, elected 3 year term

1997- Chair, Task Force on Gender Equity/Membership Composition, American Association of Physical Anthropology

1997- Liaison-American Association of Anthropological Genetics and the National Committee of the International Union of Biological Sciences within the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences

1999- Nominated, Committee on the Status of Women in Anthropology, American Anthropological Association

1999- Nominated, Committee, Annual Meeting, American Association of Physical Anthropology

2000- Student Awards Committee, Annual Meeting, American Association of Physical Anthropology

University

1977-1979 Washington Internship Program

1984-1990 Women's Studies Advisory Council

1988-1989 Search and Screen Committee for Program Director, Women's Studies

1994-1995 Executive Committee of the Division of Social Sciences - Tenure and Promotion

1995-1997 Graduate School Research Committee

1995-1996 UWM Research Policy Committee

1996-1997 College of Letters and Science Task Force on Geosciences

1997- UWM Faculty Mentoring Program, faculty mentor

1997- College of Letters and Science Committee for UWM Center for Jewish Studies

1998- Advisory Board, CIPD (Center for Instructional and Professional Development) UWM Advisory Board, Interim Coordinator, Faculty Mentoring Program Department - ongoing
1999- Advisory Committee, Center for Forensic Science

Graduate Admissions & Financial Aid Committee
Space Allocation Committee
Graduate Studies Committee
Graduate Examinations Committee
Course and Curriculum Committee
Colloquium Committee
CURRICULUM VITAE
(April 2002)

Joe Edward Watkins

Home:       Office:
P.O. Box 1453      Bureau of Indian Affairs - Anadarko
Anadarko, OK 73005     P.O. Box 309
(405) 966-2004,     Anadarko, OK 73005
(405) 247-9232 fax      (405) 247-6677, ext 233
email: jwatkins@telepath.com   (405) 247-9232 fax

Areas of Interest:
Aboriginal Populations/Archaeologist Relations; Ethics in Archaeology; Archaeology of the Southern Plains; Archaeology in the Public Interest; Study of Archaeology, Public Archaeology.

College and University Training:
1973  University of Oklahoma, B.A. in Anthropology
1977  Southern Methodist University, M.A. in Anthropology, Archaeology specialization
1994  Southern Methodist University, Ph.D. in Anthropology, Archaeology specialization

Dissertation Title:
Ethics and Value Conflicts: Analysis of Archeologists’ Responses to Questionnaire Scenarios Concerning the Relationship between American Indians and Archeologists

Administrative Experience:
1993-July to Present: Archeologist, Branch of Land Operations, United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs--Anadarko Agency, Anadarko, OK
1990: May-July 1993: Archeologist II, Oklahoma Archeological Survey, University of Oklahoma, on contract to the Oklahoma Department of Transportation
1984: Sept-Feb 1987: Business Manager, Millicent Rogers Museum, Taos, NM
1982: Jan-Aug 1984: Assistant Director, Oklahoma Indian Legal Services. Oklahoma City
1980: July-Oct 1983: President, American Indian Cultural Consultants, Inc. Oklahoma City
Teaching and Professional Experience:


1997-Present: Research Associate, Department of Anthropology, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN


1999: April: Co-Instructor, "Consulting with Native American Groups", Division of Continuing Education, University of Nevada-Reno Course HP 699.


1997: Fall Session. Visiting Assistant Professor, Department of Anthropology, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN

1996: Summer Session. Instructor, “Native American Archaeology”, University of Oklahoma, Anthropology Course 2953

--- Spring Session. Instructor, “Archaeological Science, Ethical Responsibility, and the Law”, University of Oklahoma, Anthropology Class 3953/5893


1992: May: Co-Instructor, "Archaeological Science, Ethical Responsibility, and the Law” University of Oklahoma, Intersession Anthropology Class #3953/5893

1981--1990: Project Archaeologist/Report Author/Field Archaeologist on more than 100 cultural resource projects in Oklahoma and surrounding states for consulting companies


1979: Jan-June 1980: Archaeologist/Native American Specialist, HCRA-DOI Atlanta


--- Jan-April: Special Project, computer-based data storage and retrieval system,
Tennessee-Tombigbee and Richard B. Russell Multiple Resource Districts, IAS-Atlanta and Southeast District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

1977: June-Aug: Graduate Field Assistant, Archaeological Field School, Fort Burgwin Research Center (Southern Methodist University) Taos, NM. Dr. Pierre Morenon, PI

1976: June-Aug: Excavator/Photographer, Joint Smithsonian/National Geographic Society Expedition to the Dutton-Selby Sites, CO. Dr. Dennis Stanford, PI

1974: June-July: Excavator, Testing at Wallace Ruin, CO. Dr. Bruce Bradley, PI

1973: June-Aug: Archaeological Field School, Fort Burgwin Research Center (Southern Methodist University), Taos, NM. Dr. Ronald Wetherington, PI


Awards and Fellowships:
1999 -- Society for American Archaeology Presidential Recognition Award
    -- Oklahoma State Historic Preservation Officer's Citation of Merit
1997 -- Society for American Archaeology Presidential Recognition Award
1979 -- Faculty Development Grant, University of California-Los Angeles (funding lost)
1978 -- Graduate Fellowship for Native Americans, Ford Foundation
1974 -- Graduate Fellowship for Native Americans, Ford Foundation
1973 -- Graduate Fellowship for Native Americans, Ford Foundation

Grants Awarded (Principal Investigator):

1999 -- Fulbright Scholarship (Alternate) to Sweden: "Examining Saami/Archaeologists Relationships in Sweden"

--- National Science Foundation: "Scholarships for Archaeological Training for Native Americans and Native Hawaiians" (through Society for American Archaeology).

--- Wenner-Gren Foundation funding (with Dr. Willow Powers, Co-PI): "Lines of Communication: Opening a Dialogue with Tribal Archivists on the Goals of the Council for the Preservation of the Anthropological Record".

1998 -- National Science Foundation funding: "Native American Scholarships for Training in Archaeology" (through Society for American Archaeology).

Publications:


--- (with T.J. Ferguson) “Working with Indigenous Peoples”. In Handbook of Archaeological Methods. Herbert D.G. Maschner and Christopher Chippindale, eds. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek.

--- “Native American Archaeology or Archaeology of Native Americans? Public Policy and Native Americans: How Do We Go From Here?”. In New Directions in First American Studies: Extended Abstracts from the Clovis and Beyond Conference. Bradley Leeper, ed. Center for the Study of the First Americans, Corvallis, Oregon.


2000 --- Indigenous Archaeology: American Indian Values and Scientific Practice. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.


--- (with K. Anne Pyburn, and Pam Cressey) "Community Relations: What the Practicing Archaeologist Needs to Know to Work Effectively with Local and/or Descendant Communities". In Teaching Archaeology in the Twenty-First Century, Susan J. Bender and George Smith, eds., pp. 73-81. Society for American Archaeology, Washington, DC.


--- with T. J. Ferguson and Gordon Pullar. “Native Americans and Archaeologists: Commentary and Personal Perspectives”, Nina Swidler, Kurt Dongoske, Roger Anyon and Alan Downer, eds., Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground, AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek.


--- Review of Red earth, white lies: Native Americans and the myth of scientific fact by Vine Deloria, Jr., Antiquity 70(267):221-222.

1995 -- Review of Buried roots and indestructible seeds: the survival of American Indian life in story, history, and spirit by Mark A. Lundquist and Martin Zanger, eds. Public Archaeology Review 3(3), Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis.


1994 -- “Cultural Resources as ‘Owned Property’”, Public Archaeology Review 2(2), Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis.


1991 -- with John D. Hartley, Test Excavations at the Whirlwind Mission Site, 34Bl47, Oklahoma Department of Transportation Project BRO-6(126)c, Blaine County, OK.


--- “Prehistoric, Ethnohistoric, and Historic Overview of the Oklahoma Section of the Proposed Trans-Anadarko Gas Pipeline”, New World Research, Pollock.

Papers and Presentations:
2002 – Invited speaker, Social Archaeology: Artifacts, Archaeologists, and Native Americans, Center for Archaeology, Columbia University, New York, April.

--- Discussant, Exploring Links Between Site Destruction and the Commercial Market in Archaeological Materials sponsored forum, 67th annual meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Denver, March.

--- Co-organizer (with Dorothy Lippert), Scratching the Surface: Implications of Indigenous Archaeology sponsored forum, 67th annual meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Denver, March.


--- Invited Speaker, Stanford University Department of Anthropology, Palo Alto, California, February.

--- Invited Speaker, Department of Anthropology/Historic Preservation Program, University of Nevada-Reno, February.


--- Presenter, "From the Earth: Indigenous Perspectives on Human Origins", invited paper presented at the American Association for the Advancement of Sciences' *Becoming Human ... and Beyond* symposium, Chicago, November.


--- “Brief History of American Indian/Archaeologist Relationships.” Paper written for the *Native American Repatriation Summit II*. Oklahoma City, June.


--- Discussant, *Managing the Cultural Landscape through Consultation* symposium. 65th annual meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, New Orleans, April.


--- “Archaeology through Indian Eyes”. Symposium organized for the *Keepers of the Treasures* Conference, Seminole, Ok., August.

--- “Seven Tribes, Seven Voices; Seven Tribes, One Voice.” Paper presented at the *Native American Repatriation Summit*, Oklahoma City, June.


1999 -- "Native American Archaeology or Archaeology of Native Americans? Public Policy and Native Americans: How Do We Go From Here?", Public Policy Panel, Clovis and Beyond Conference, Santa Fe.


--- "Button, Button, Who's Got the Button?", Ethical scenario presented in the "What Would You Do If ...?" forum, 63rd Annual Meetings of the Society for American Archaeology, Seattle.


--- "Conflicting Codes: Professional, Ethical, and Legal Obligations in Archaeology", paper written for the "Ethics in Science: Special Problems in Anthropology and Archaeology" symposium, American Association for the Advance of Science Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, PA.

--- (with K. Anne Pyburn, and Pam Cressey) "Community Relations: what the practicing archaeologist needs to know to work effectively with local and/or descendant communities", paper prepared for the SAA Workshop "Enhancing Undergraduate and Graduate Education and Training in Public Archaeology and Cultural Resource Management" held at Wakulla Springs, Florida, February 5-8.

1997 -- Moderator, Roundtable Discussion, “Repatriation: Issues, Questions, and Problems”, Second Annual Native American Symposium, Southeastern Oklahoma State University, November, Durant, OK
--- “A Critical Examination of Archaeology’s Contribution to Native American History”, paper presented in “The Rights of Indigenous Peoples: Understanding Archaeology and Sovereignty” symposium, Second Annual Native American Symposium, Southeastern Oklahoma, State University, November, Durant, OK

--- “Living in the Ant Farm”, paper presented in the “Forbidden Field: Native American Archaeology” symposium, 51st National Preservation Conference, National Trust for Historic Preservation, Santa Fe, NM.


--- “Awash in a Sea of ‘White Tape’: A Brief Examination of Federal Agency Attitudes toward Native Americans and Archaeologists”, paper presented in the Opening Session of the 62nd Annual meetings of the Society for American Archaeology, Nashville

--- “Putting the ‘Nag’ in ‘NAGPRA’ while removing the ‘Con’ from ‘Consultation’”, paper presented at the 39th Caddo Conference, Norman.


--- Discussant, Native Americans and Archaeology: Perspectives from Both Sides, sponsored forum, 61st Annual meetings of the Society for American Archaeology, New Orleans.

1995 --- Discussant, Playing with Time: Academic Archaeology and the Public, sponsored forum, 28th annual Chacmool Conference, Calgary, Alberta, Canada.

--- Discussant, United States Indian Policy and the Conduct of Archaeology on Indian Lands: A Dialogue with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, sponsored forum, 60th Annual meetings of the Society for American Archaeology, Minneapolis.


1993 -- “Ethics and Value Conflicts: An Examination of Archeologists’ Responses to Questionnaire Scenarios”, paper prepared for the Native Americans and Historic Preservation symposium at the 51st Plains Anthropological Society Conference, Saskatoon.


National Committees:
-- Chairman, Committee on Native American Issues, Register of Professional Archaeologists (1999-present)
-- Member, Scientific Advisory Board, Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center (2001-2003)
-- Member, Committee on Ethics in Archaeology, Society for American Archaeology (1998-2003)
-- Member, Program Committee, 67th Annual meetings of the Society for American Archaeology, Denver
-- Member, Program Committee, 62nd Annual meetings of the Society for American Archaeology, Nashville
-- Past Chairman, Native American Scholarships Committee, Society for American Archaeology (1997-2000)
-- Past Chairman, Committee on Native American Relations, Society for American Archaeology (1995-1997)
-- Chairman, Committee on Native American Issues, Society of Professional Archaeologists (1995-1998)
-- Past Vice President, Oklahoma Council for Archaeological Preservation
-- Advisor, Sam Noble Oklahoma Museum of Natural History Native American Advisory Committee working with the Social Science Exhibit Committee

Professional Societies:
-- Member, Society for American Archaeology
-- Member, American Anthropological Association, Archaeology Division
-- Member, Plains Anthropological Society
-- Member, Register of Professional Archaeologists
-- Member, Federal Preservation Forum
-- Member, National Trust for Historic Preservation
-- Member, Keepers of the Treasures (Native Organization)
-- Member, Council for the Preservation of the Anthropological Record
-- Member, Citizens' Advisory Board to the Oklahoma Archaeological Survey
-- Board Member, Oklahoma Preservation, Inc.
-- Board Member, Choctaw Code Talkers Association

References available on request