Anthropologists who work with immigrant communities engage in culture change while balancing challenges, competing priorities, and politics. This Bulletin provides a rare view into the personal and professional when working as both an advocate and an academic simultaneously. I provide a basic overview of the history of anthropologists engaging immigrant communities, which overlaps with the movement of anthropology and education, Americanization projects, and refugee anthropology. Next, I present an overview of three themes that emerge from the articles in this Bulletin. I end with a series of discussion points that could be utilized for classes or as a framework for anthropologists engaged with vulnerable immigrant groups in social change. I appreciate the amazing efforts of all the contributors in this Bulletin and the unwavering support provided to us by David Himmelgreen and Satish Kedia, coeditors of the NAPA Bulletin series, without which this Bulletin would not have happened at all. Keywords: immigrant communities, Americanization, applied anthropology, educational anthropology, cultural broker, advocacy, activism

Whenever an anthropologist enters a culture, he trains people to objectify their life-world for him. Within all cultures, of course, there is already objectification and self-reflection. But this explicit self-conscious translation into an external medium is rare. The anthropologist creates a doubling of consciousness...the data we collect is doubly mediated, first by our own presence and then by the second-order self-reflection we demand from our informants—Rabinow, 1977

Rabinow’s observations continue to be as valid today as they were in 1977 (Rabinow and Bourdieu 2007) and they serve as a starting place for this volume, which seeks to highlight the unique position of anthropologists, specifically applied and practicing anthropologists, in the communities in which we work. As more and more of us devote years of fieldwork in immigrant communities in the United States, it occurred to the authors that we should also explore the ethical, personal, professional and career challenges that this type of fieldwork and praxis create.

This Bulletin explores how the nature of applied and action-oriented anthropology impacts us as anthropologists and the communities in which we work—a huge and daunting task. The task, however, is not in the vein of postmodern analysis but rather emergent from our combined and substantial work in immigrant and increasingly marginalized communities or groups. All of the contributors to this Bulletin have responded to real
needs, expressed by our “subjects” who have increasingly become subaltern as the national dialogue about immigrants leaves no “us” but only “them.” As anthropologists, we are challenged to report, document, and publish, to conduct participant-observation and all of us have gone beyond this role to one of cultural broker, advocate, change agent, or policy expert. As applied and practicing anthropologists who utilize a variety of community-participatory approaches, there are forces beyond our academic or anthropological purview at work.

Power imbalances are critically important in our work with vulnerable populations (Suarez-Orozco 2001). We, as documented, employed persons, whether as students or professionals, are not dependent on a labor-exploitative agricultural system to survive. Not all, but many, of the articles in this Bulletin focus on anthropologists working with farmworkers, who are excluded from fair wage and hour legislation and have limited organizing rights outside of California. Farmworkers are not a homogeneous group by any means, but as they are portrayed in the media as mainly undocumented Mexicans, we as anthropologists have a unique opportunity to act as culture brokers and share our knowledge and perspectives with the majority population to help provide a more honest and balanced view.

Working at the grassroots, community level means that first and foremost, our subjects become people, friends, and, sometimes, guides. We establish long-term relationships with them and that changes things. Yes, relationships are formed; we meet extended family members, we become part of a transnational network, we become madrinas and padrinos, we become role models for the children of the immigrants. Our lives become intertwined. The people with whom we work have rights and one right is for them to question why they would engage in a voluntary project with us. What do they get out of it?

I remember clearly my first experience with the blurring of lines between allegiance to project and duty to humanity. I had been working as a research associate at a local university and had come out to a run-down trailer court to conduct some key informant interviews with farmworkers in rural Florida. Because one thing led to another, an informal group discussion emerged between me and a few of my key informants. At this point I had known them for approximately five years—now I have known them over 17 years. We were discussing the community, “same old, same old” type of conversation when my key informant looked at me and said: “With all this research you do, why doesn’t any of this ever get better? Why does everything stay the same?” Ouch. Heartsinking feeling. Yes, it hurt. How do you respond to someone with such a brave and fair question? Unknown to them, I had had the same sinking feeling for years and I had gotten nowhere in speaking with my supervisor about how to change things—the response back then was that it was not my job to create programs for farmworkers. I eventually left the university and began to work in a community-based organization (CBO) that collaborated with other CBOs and universities. Even so, gaps continue to exist, collaboration is not always so easy, and progress is sometimes garnered only in fits and starts. This probably sounds familiar to you if you have ever worked in long-term projects, NGOs, CBOs, or any multitude of partnerships.
Those of us who call ourselves applied and practicing anthropologists working with immigrant communities may have to answer these hard questions multiple times from multiple sources. The only way to answer it is honestly. The best response is dependent on a myriad of personal, public, cultural, social, and economic characteristics that impact our own personal and professional skill- and interest-sets. This means that we need to be able to explain what it is that we are doing, for whom, why, and how to balance our roles to avoid the blur.

All of the contributors to this Bulletin have taken the plunge to explore their own roles as anthropologist, culture broker, soccer league president, administrator, activist, spokesperson, media liaison, mentor, and advocate. Wearing so many hats simultaneously is difficult on both a personal and professional level. For what it is worth, these articles are all the more valuable because they are written by anthropologists who are so busy within their communities that often they have little to no time to write about their work. We are proud to be able to present them together in one Bulletin that can be utilized by educators, activists, community groups, and students alike. We take the position that the blur is fine as long as everyone understands the multiple roles and that these roles are not harmful to anyone in any way. This includes paternalism.

One cannot discuss these topics without first discussing the training that did or did not prepare us for fieldwork and praxis at this level. Although laudable, applied anthropology texts and internships can only prepare students minimally for long-term engagement with communities that are constantly shifting and changing. Take, for example, Bourgois’s revelation that “I was forced into crack against my will” as the first sentence of his book (1995:1). Later he observes,

only by establishing long-term relationships based on trust can one begin to ask provocative personal questions, and expect thoughtful serious answers. Ethnographers usually live in the communities they study, and they establish long-term, organic relationships with the people they write about. In other words, in order to collect “accurate data,” ethnographers violate the cannons of positivist research, we become intimately involved with the people we study. [Bourgois 1995:13]

Indeed, garnering that trust is not something that an anthropologist can learn in a classroom. It’s something that we all have to figure out, and it’s different for different groups. Only by spending a substantial amount of time in a culture can one figure out what personal characteristics and behaviors will help build that trust. Often, because we are outsiders, we have a few lessons to learn before getting to that point. This is where our selection of key informants is critical. No one can really tell you how to pick an informant but, over time, we gain skills and insights that guide us.

GOALS AND VISION

We approached the Bulletin as separate authors who can speak to the ways that our applied engagement with immigrant communities has impacted our anthropological
practice and how this in turn has shaped both theory and praxis. This bulletin has six overall goals:

1. Illustrate the many ways anthropology and anthropologists have contributed to shaping, documenting, and advocating the continuum of immigrants’ experiences.
2. Share case studies of applied work in immigration.
3. Transcend the case studies with theoretical and methodological development aimed at practical outcomes.
4. Focus on current best practices in research and applied work with immigrants.
5. Highlight cross-cutting trends in applied and practicing anthropology related to immigration, state policies, migration shifts and group responses to post-9/11 changes.
6. Discuss future opportunities and forecast trends for applied work in immigration and immigration studies as a whole.

Each author has endeavored to not only discuss our work and the challenges we face on both a personal and professional level but also to provide examples through a case study methodology that would help answer some core questions. These questions included: How has your dedication to your work taken you in different directions than you originally anticipated? What are the intended and unintended consequences that you can identify? How do you advocate and maintain objectivity? What do researchers bring to the table when working with immigrant communities?

ANTHROPOLOGY AND U.S. IMMIGRANT COMMUNITIES: A BRIEF OVERVIEW

To explore anthropology’s role within immigrant communities in the United States, it was first instructive to review how America dealt with immigrants at the outset of the 20th century. Graham and Koed (1993) undertook a historical review of Americanization efforts of immigrants in the 20th century. They document the three ways the United States has traditionally dealt with immigrants and a pluralistic society: (1) nativist approaches that focus on English-only and protectionist laws; (2) democratic Americanization, including settlement houses, English classes, and programs to help bridge immigrants into U.S. culture, and (3) reduction of the flow of immigrants (Graham and Koed 1993:28–32). After two decades of a push toward democratic Americanization and two world wars, patriotism became mixed with programming. Consequently, aid became tied to implementation of a conservative, assimilationist-oriented social agenda (Graham and Koed 1993:42). Graham and Koed review the literature, reminding historians that the data on Americanization is sparse but that “Americanization was very substantially an immigrant-generated enterprise, impressive evidence that rapid assimilation was seen as the key to making it in America” (1993:37). Indeed, they point out that current-day historians and social scientists who discount the value of the efforts toward Americanization are utilizing a lens that may be inadequate because, owing to the very
The fact that this movement was never adequately documented, studied, or analyzed by historians of the time, the benefits of it became less convincing. They ask what could have happened to the United States if we had not had such programs in place for 50 or 100 years in our past that contributed to making us the country we are now. Finally, they point out that the United States of 1993 is not comparable to the turn of the 20th century or even midcentury and that the immigrants themselves are different, bringing different skills and expectations with them (Graham and Koed 1993:42).

Graham and Koed conclude that funding should be continued to assist immigrants in their assimilation but not through schools or public institutions, because a thorough reading of existing literature showed that CBOs and successful immigrants themselves were probably better at helping new immigrants not only adjust but also prosper:

Conflict thus comes with the territory, a reality which underlies the importance of the liberal Americanizers’ growing awareness that “change agents” or successfully assimilated immigrants were valuable allies. Historical perspective also confirms their instinct that negotiating the path between cultures is best assisted not through governments, whose programs have a role to play, but through voluntary organizations such as that durable institution still found in American cities—the settlement house. [Graham and Koed 1993:44]

Although Graham and Koed do not mention anthropologists or anthropology per se, anthropologists appear to have been involved in Americanization efforts through universities. Anthropology has always been concerned with cultural documentation and preservation, and early U.S. anthropology dedicated substantial time and effort into Native American projects, linked to colonialism, as documented by Rylko-Bauer et al. (2006). Led by Franz Boas, U.S. Anthropology’s core tenet is cultural relativism, which values all cultures as equally worthy of study with no culture superior or inferior to another and must be studied scientifically and neutrally (Harris 1968). Anthropologists have always had the advantage of cultural relativism in our work with immigrant communities as subgroups who lack equal power to the dominant population. Historically, we have utilized the comparative method to better position and identify the differences between and among immigrant groups to the dominant group in a framework of power or vulnerability through applied anthropology (Rylko-Bauer et al. 2006:184).

As early as the 1920s, anthropologists in U.S. universities were drawn to the vocation of teaching other academics about immigrants as well as helping immigrants to “Americanize,” as Jenks discussed in a 1921 article published in Scientific Monthly:

The great problem of the assimilation of the immigrant in America is at base anthropological. Ethnic groups differ one from another. It is commonly supposed to be true that their differences are only “skin deep,” but biologists know that ethnic groups differ beneath the skin. They know that the processes of pigment metabolism are so unerring and persistent that patches of skin taken from one person and grafted on another take on the proportion of pigmentation natural to the “stock” or seat on which the transplanted skin lives. They know also that ethnic differences are so much more than only “skin deep” that ovaries transplanted from one person to another person would reproduce children of their own kind without influence by the person who served as “stock” or seat for the transplanted ovaries. There
are no experiments of this sort known to me, but what has been proved true with other animals would without question be true of human animals. Thus there is scientific reason to speak of different “breeds” of people whose differing physical characteristics are today due to the factors of heredity resident in the reproductive germ cells. Ethnic differences are not simply “skin deep.” They are germinal. They begin at the functional innermost center of the person, and they continue through to the outside. The man who runs sees the outside world differences between breeds of people. The anthropologist knows they begin inside in the seeds of the breeds. Out of the physical man grows the psychic man. As out of these different physical characteristics of the different breeds of people come the psychic characteristics of those breeds of people, it should be expected that the reactions of the different breeds of people would exhibit differences. The practical handler of peoples knows such is the case—whether he is an administrator of colonies, a policeman in any cosmopolitan city, or boss of a gang of mixed “foreigners” on any American railway job. At the present moment it can not be said that these differing reactions of the different breeds of men are due to physical differences or to psychic differences or to social and cultural differences, or to something yet unnamed. All that is known is that different breeds of people commonly possess distinguishing reactions in many of the affairs of life. The American assimilation problem centers in the various breeds of people who are in our midst. What facts and tendencies of strength and weakness for the future of America are in those various ethnic groups? [1921:242]

Jenks then goes on to outline the types of activities and training courses he and others were implementing at the University of Minnesota beginning circa 1907 or so:

For fourteen years we have been developing anthropological courses in our university. Those courses have consisted not only of the usual foundation courses on the development of man, races and culture, but of courses dealing with modern anthropological problems, especially those of vital importance to our immigrant nation. They have dealt with the peoples who have come and who are coming to America as immigrants, with the dominant characteristics of the diverse foreign peoples now in the United States, their modification in America, and the importance of these peoples to the American nation. [1921:248]

Jenks makes specific recommendations with a sense of urgency because of a shortage of funds in higher education:

This Training Course is not yet fully manned or as complete as is desired, due to the almost universal shortage of funds in higher education. We need especially research men in physical anthropology, amalgamation, and environmental influence, as well as experts in certain practical fields. There should be research equipment to investigate many phases of the peoples in America. In fact, there should develop a genuine laboratory of research and of practical application of anthropological knowledge to American problems. The time is coming quickly when this will be developed somewhere. Not only is this work being done in the University of Minnesota, but under the impetus of the Americanization movement many colleges and universities which had never before had anthropology courses of any nature have recently been putting in courses on modern peoples, especially our immigrant peoples, and some have added various professional courses on technique and method of adult education. Not only are these anthropology courses of value in purely Americanization work, but it will come to be recognized more and more that all economic, social and political problems in America today are intimately bound up with the reactions of the different peoples in our
midst. More and more it will be seen that with America’s vast heterogeneous population her public school educators, her social workers, her police and correction agencies will have to make practical use of anthropological knowledge of the various peoples with whom they deal. This paper aims simply to focus attention on one phase of practical anthropological knowledge, namely, as applied to Americanization. In pragmatic America all sciences must be able to prove their “practical worth” in helping solve our momentous national problem, and it seems to me our experiment proves that modern anthropology is capable of practical service to our nation. [1921:245]

Harrell-Bond and Voutira (1992) similarly argue that the anthropology of refugees predates any of the writings about it, because of the nature of anthropology itself. The anthropology of refugees grapples with the ethical dilemmas inherent within the context of forced migration, which is usually precipitated by violence, famine, or natural disaster (Harrell-Bond and Voutira 1992). Again, they contend that there is a dearth of published articles on the plethora of work that applied anthropologists have done on this area. The authors provide an overview of the history of forced migration and anthropological engagement with highly vulnerable refugees and they assert that anthropology alone is best suited to the study of refugees because to survive, refugees must adapt to radical new social and material conditions. Documenting and interpreting the variety and diversity of human cultural phenomena is the work of anthropology. Indeed it was in the course of intensive empirical documentation that anthropology acquired its scientific status and legitimized its method of investigation as its hallmark among other social sciences: long term and intimate ethnographic fieldwork. [Harrell-Bond and Voutira 1992:7]

Anthropologists have a long history of studying displaced peoples, which the authors trace back to publications in 1909 as examples of applied anthropology related to forced migration (Harrel-Bond and Voutira 1992:9). They make the point, which is echoed by many of our authors in this Bulletin, that policymakers are perhaps the best served by our anthropological efforts because we are usually the only ones who have studied a problem, such as refugees, before there is a crisis to which they are forced to respond with little or no time to adequately study the problem and come up with reasonable solutions (Harrell-Bond and Voutira 1992:7).

Nowhere has this Americanization engine been stronger than in the school system. For this reason, many anthropologists who have engaged immigrant communities have concerned themselves with the education of immigrant children and the socialization of school systems, which has created a strong movement in the anthropology of education. Educational anthropologists engage in research, teaching, and advocacy across the levels of education. Dynneson (1973) began a dialogue on educational anthropology in what he published as “Can Anthropology Revolutionize Public School Curriculum? A Position Paper on the Emerging Role of Anthropology in Education.”

It is believed by some that education systems offer the anthropologist an important aspect of culture for study while the anthropologist offers educators new approaches to exploring
the system. The result of the anthropologist’s work should provide the educator with a better understanding of, and some possible solutions for, existing problems. The problem of immediate concern in how anthropology may change and hopefully improve existing patterns of curriculum organization. [Dynneson 1973:1]

This early concern has been expanded into a national discourse on multicultural and bilingual education, schools as socialization mechanisms, and especially regarding bias and discrimination (Lukose 2007; Suarez-Orozco 2001). Because immigrant children make up a large percentage of the school systems in many areas, anthropologists have been able to study and engage schools along the way (Suarez-Orozco 2001:22). Schools reflect larger society and its unequal power relations, which, as Suarez-Orozco points out, “scholars tend to see the classroom as a microcosm of the larger socio-economic power structure, recreating or reproducing social inequality through interethnic and interclass miscommunication between immigrant students and teachers from the dominant culture” (2001:22). These perspectives can be useful if there is engagement in finding solutions to said problems. However, Lukose attempts to instead encourage anthropologists to break away from Americanization efforts and assimilationist modalities in favor of a focus on transnationalism as a strength that education can build on to the betterment of all students (2007:408). She favors partnership and joint scholarship between diasporic studies and educational anthropology that focuses on how immigrant children and families’ use of education produces differential outcomes (Lukose 2007).

Echoing Suarez-Orozco (2001), Lukose challenges educational anthropology to go to the very root of anthropology: definitions of immigrant, homeland, and nation-state. Anthropology has always been concerned with these issues and if not us, then who? Lukose concludes that paradigms in both educational anthropology and diaspora studies prove important to the next level of study related to immigrants, socialization, and communities in the United States—globalization and transnationalism:

As diaspora studies disentangles itself from overly optimistic accounts of the “end of the nation-state,” an attention to educational processes is particularly important. National schooling systems are a dense site at the intersection between media, markets, states, and generations. They are excellent sites for better understanding the work of cultural (re)production in the age of globalization. Diaspora studies provide us with a critical lens through which to interrogate the productions of U.S. national identity, a phenomenon that the anthropology of education has too often assumed rather than interrogated. [2007:416]

CROSSCUTTING THEMES

Heyman et al. (this volume) make a central point that all of the contributors to this volume would support: “The truth is that, whatever the material realities, we have to do this work, because it is so strongly attuned to the combination of our values and interests.”

There are three basic crosscutting themes that run across and through the articles in this Bulletin. Although there are many ways to organize and view the diversity of work
presented here, I have categorized the themes according to the role of the anthropologist and not the immigrant population. My goal in this section is to highlight the types of roles, challenges, and successes the anthropologists discuss, rather than analyze the roles of the community in the process. Although all the contributors outline multiple simultaneous roles that they play in these diverse articles, I have taken the primary role that emerged from the articles in this overview. It is worth noting that none of the authors played only one role, and Martinez’s article specifically addresses her multiple roles and the challenges they created for her.

**Theme 1: Anthropologist as Culture Broker**

The anthropologist as culture broker mediates between immigrant and majority communities to enhance mutual understanding and help immigrants negotiate their situations. Articles by Wallace and Griffith exemplify how our work is powerful in helping to shape and negotiate access to resources for immigrants who do not vote or otherwise have a solid voice in agenda setting. Griffith’s article examines his role in stepping into a relatively new area in analyzing tobacco workers and their ties to the industry for a client. He is able to outline how and why work in tobacco is less attractive to immigrants and the implications of these findings to policymakers. Wallace’s work on soccer and identity illustrates how influential one person can be in helping to organize and create positive social space that helps immigrants negotiate their identity while becoming leaders in a new land, even if this new leadership is not always what we may have envisioned at the outset of the project.

**Theme 2: Anthropologist as Advocate**

Smith-Nonini and I (Unterberger) provide examples of the divergent ways in which anthropologists can advocate for and with disenfranchised communities. Smith-Nonini’s work illustrates the power of the pen and film in documenting and creating awareness of the injustice in farmwork with both the public and policymakers. She relates how she gains access to the Farm Labor Organizing Committee’s leadership and her ability to document their struggle, although it was not always an easy role to play. In my article, I analyze not only how Mexican origin students become categorized as “gang members” but also the role of the anthropologist working in a CBO that is implementing anti-gang programming across two sites and the differential outcomes we observed as a result. I provide recommendations for implementing anthropologically based interventions with youth and outline the importance of forming partnerships with parents, schools, community, and religious organizations to strengthen vulnerable youth.

**Theme 3: Anthropologist as Policy Expert and Change Agent**

Martinez, Garcia and Gonzalez, and Heyman et al. provide insight into the subtleties of research, advocacy, and recommendations that do or do not get implemented. Martinez’s
article focuses on the multiple roles of the anthropologist, exploring her personal and professional efforts and challenges in helping the immigrant communities in San Diego post fire. She provides a detailed illustration of the importance of knowing how and when to utilize the hat of advocate, administrator, or culture broker. In the midst of the life or death crisis, Martinez was able to not only spur social service agencies but also the community advisory boards to movement on their own behalf. She illustrates the unique skills we bring to the table in tailoring our specific messages to each target population to effect the desired changes. Garcia and Gonzalez relate their experience in identifying the use of juramentos or vows by Mexican immigrants in substance abuse treatment and link this to a series of recommendations that include collaboration between clergy and providers to help immigrants with their addictions. Although the recommendations were not implemented, Garcia and Gonzalez analyze why. Along the border, Heyman et al. examine their years of experience as academics and members of Border and Immigration Task Force, providing an excellent case study of helping immigrant groups and the policymakers to devise “more humane” policy. Their article outlines how academics might not always work directly on behalf of the community coalition but that our work and ties to that coalition are invaluable to the ultimate success of combined efforts toward structural change.

Rather than view these roles as discreet, they are more or less based on a continuum of roles that range from helping create communication and understanding to effecting structural change. I would argue that all three roles are necessary and complementary in our work at the ground level with immigrants. As proof of this, Martinez makes the observation that “this form of applied, practical yet academically grounded work has the potential to elevate the anthropology of immigration beyond that of traditional researcher.” Similarly, Rylko-Bauer et al. remind us that

Effective engagement requires flexibility, awareness of the complexities of sociopolitical contexts, and excellence in research, because the stakes are often higher than in the case of research for its own sake. There is always a risk that those in power will use findings against, rather than for, intended beneficiaries of anthropological work. [2006:284]

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION POINTS

Sometimes the role of a scholar is not to answer questions but to ask them. As the United States embarks on a new era of change, the effects are already being felt by those at the margins, the most vulnerable, especially immigrants and their families. In the aftermath of the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, immigration laws and policies have become increasingly tighter and a public sentiment that has become, on the whole of the United States, less favorable to immigrants. Meanwhile, as anthropologists and our communities age and mature, so too do our perspectives, abilities, and interests. These factors create new opportunities and challenges to our work. Therefore, it is critical to frame future projects and responses with immigrant communities by looking at the
situation holistically. I offer these ten questions as a basis on which dialogue could be implemented, starting with a vision of the end goal:

1. What structural changes do we want to see in one, three, five, or ten years that we need to start working on now? Who is needed at the table now to see that this can happen?
2. Who are the natural allies in combating this problem?
3. What are potential motives or causes behind the policy or problem at hand? In other words, who benefits most from this policy or problem?
4. How does my employer or university view my involvement with immigrants and do I have limitations in my work that I need to negotiate?
5. What do I and my colleagues bring to the table in terms of skills, connections, resources, and knowledge?
6. What kinds of skills, connections, resources, and knowledge are still needed to strengthen our efforts toward cultural brokerage, advocacy, or policy change?
7. What is the theoretical underpinning or praxis element to this project or problem and how can we operationalize it to maximize the contribution to anthropological literature?
8. What ethical considerations are there and are they able to be reconciled by all parties involved as worth proceeding? Is IRB approval necessary?
9. What other similar endeavors are there? Does it make sense to join an existing project, rather than create a new one?
10. If no action is taken, what can we envision as happening?

For all the authors contributing to this Bulletin, the professional has become personal. We have spent years working within the immigrant communities we describe, and many changes have occurred that have continued to reposition us as participants, observers, activists, administrators, leaders, and followers. Changes also occur at the individual, family, and community level. Over time, some communities have changed from within. In other cases, they change from the outside as they have had to adapt to outside threats and shifting power relationships with the majority population. When this happens, the anthropologists have also adapted and it is in this adaptation and response that we learn and grow as professionals and people. Anthropologists probably do not address this phenomenon enough. We may talk about it with colleagues here and there; however, students and professors could—and probably should—discuss how fieldwork changes you and your community. After decades of engagement with immigrant communities, the anthropologists in this Bulletin have only recorded a fraction of the lessons that we have learned.

One of the lessons learned in compiling this Bulletin is that most of us are so busy working at the grassroots level that we have difficulty finding time and energy to document what we do, how we do it, and why. As Graham and Koed (1993) outlined in their historical overview of Americanization efforts, because many of these efforts were not well documented, it became easy for them to be forgotten and, worse yet, dismissed as ineffective. For those of us who are immersed in creating social and structural changes on
a daily basis, we must recommit to devote time to making our case for anthropology, our programs, our craft, and calling. If we do not do it, the truth is that no one else will.
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