
From the Editors

**Sonja Luehrmann and Alexandrine
Boudreault-Fournier**

Writing and publishing are integral parts of the research process, but are often separated by funding conditions and the economics of publishing. That was one of the takeaway points from “Opening Access: Writing, Reviewing, and Publishing in the Social Sciences and Humanities,” a symposium of journal editors and scholars of publishing held at Simon Fraser University in April 2019, for which *Anthropologica* was a co-sponsor in collaboration with the editorial teams of *American Ethnologist* and *Anthropology of Work Review*. At the same time, accessible research requires resources. At the symposium, AWR co-editor Kathleen Millar told a story of the founding of her journal in 1980, when readers were asked to send stamps to the editorial offices and received a copy in return – in Millar’s words, “the original open access.”

That writing and disseminating knowledge cannot easily be separated from data collection may be more intuitive to anthropologists than to scholars in some other disciplines. This issue contains several reminders that how we represent research encounters has real-life consequences. In the thematic section on “Chiefs of the Pacific,” guest editor Simonne Pauwels and her contributors present cases where indigenous knowledge and archival documents become sources for what is politically possible in the present, both in the internal life of a community and in relation to nation states. In the 2018 prize-winning essay for the CASCA Women’s Network student paper award, Dafna Rachok invokes the phrase “Nothing about us without us” to show how Ukrainian sex workers, through public activism, demand a voice in legislative and policy-making processes that are meant to improve their condition. Careful not to formulate an agenda for the workers, Rachok describes how some of them took her under their wings, providing her with suggestions on “how to dress, put on make-up ... and raise children.”

Most of us would associate reflection on writing and social knowledge with the “writing culture” debate of the 1980s. The *Reflections* section in this issue presents two examples of a “reflexive turn” arising from contemporary politics outside North America. Beltran Roca, Iban Diaz-Parra, and Vanessa Gómez-Bernal look at Spanish anthropologists’ analyses of the protest movement known as 15M, concluding that the sense of existential engagement on the part of academics may legitimize new styles of “engaged ethnography.” Igor Machado, drawing in part on Brazilian debates about writing and memory, reflects on the often arbitrary (yet necessary) boundaries between ethnographic research and personal life and the ethical challenges involved in blurring them.

Finally, this issue returns to *Anthropologica*’s past practice of publishing reviews of films and exhibits relevant to ethnographic representation. Dara Culhane and Simone Rapisarda will share responsibility for this section. In her review of *Hexsa’am: To Be Here Always* at the University of British Columbia’s Belkin Art Gallery, Sarah Shamash reminds us that “visual sovereignty” is an integral part of how communities claim ownership over their public representation.

Ideas of visual sovereignty and collaborative knowledge production from different places and social locations take us back to the importance of where and how we publish research, and who has access to it. CASCA continues to explore ways to make *Anthropologica* sustainable in open access by 2021, following SSHRC mandates and members’ commitment to open scholarship. Meanwhile, the articles in this issue challenge us to consider what we are making accessible. Will those who gave time and knowledge recognize their contributions, even if they may not agree with all conclusions? Will those with lived connections to the topic of research find themselves respected in what they read? Might they even find it useful for their children and grandchildren to see? These questions of content as well as finance are perhaps anthropology’s most specific contributions to the open access debate.
