2014 Weaver-Tremblay Award Winner
Applied Anthropology: Disciplinary Oxymoron?

Regna Darnell *University of Western Ontario*

Abstract: This essay argues that the term *applied anthropology* is an unnecessary oxymoron because the discipline of anthropology itself entails application of anthropological knowledge. Examples from the author's personal experience are used to argue for the application of anthropology as a process of seeing in a particular way, rather than as a mechanical expectation of particular changes embedded in research design. Collaboration of anthropologists with individual consultants and their communities is long established at the centre of applied anthropology. The Canadian Anthropology Society/ Société canadienne d'anthropologie (CASCA), in part through its recognition of the significant applied work of Sally Weaver and Marc-Adélard Tremblay, privileges an anthropology of application through dialogue and based in a relational ontology.

Keywords: applied anthropology, history of anthropology, collaborative anthropology, Cree, Ojibwe, interdisciplinarity

Résumé : Cet article soutient que le terme « anthropologie appliquée » est un oxymore superflu, dans la mesure où la discipline de l'anthropologie elle-même implique l'application du savoir anthropologique. Des exemples tirés de l'expérience personnelle de l'auteur sont utilisés pour plaider en faveur de l'application de l'anthropologie comme processus de vision particulière du monde, plutôt que comme attente mécanique de changements spécifiques intégrée à la conception de recherche. La collaboration entre anthropologues et consultants individuels, ainsi que leurs communautés, est depuis longtemps établie comme étant au fondement même de l'anthropologie appliquée. CASCA privilégie, en partie par sa reconnaissance de l'important travail appliqué effectué par Sally Weaver et Marc-Adélard Tremblay, une anthropologie de l'application qui passe par le dialogue et fondée sur une ontologie relationnelle.

Mots-clés : Anthropologie appliquée, histoire de l'anthropologie, anthropologie collaborative, Cris, Ojibwés, interdisciplinarité

Introduction

Academics, sadly, have few opportunities to speak to their colleagues en masse, and I am delighted to address my fellow Canadian anthropologists, both directly at the annual meeting of the Canadian Anthropology Society/Société canadienne d'anthropologie (CASCA) at York University in May 2014 and in this written version for our flagship journal.[1] I have added some examples and elaborations for verisimilitude, while still attempting to retain the flavour of the spoken word. Because the Weaver-Tremblay Award has traditionally recognized achievements in applied anthropology and few have identified me primarily as an applied anthropologist, I am simultaneously grateful for this honour and a tad

defensive about whether I really fit the traditional mandate. Precisely for this reason, however, I have thought a lot about the nature of applied anthropology and what might constitute excellence in pursuing it. While I applaud the recent revision of the award's description to recognize achievements in "anthropology," it seems to me that the "applied" part remains implicit, both in CASCA tradition and in our practice as anthropologists. So I use this opportunity to address what that might mean.

I am proud to stand in the genealogy of Sally Mae Weaver and Marc-Adélard Tremblay, each of whom I treasured as a colleague and a friend. Both of them worked within the system to make a better world through dialogue, through understanding the standpoint of others who were and continue to be part of "us" rather than some unintelligible other. Sal mediated elegantly (and my goodness she was elegant) between Indian voices and Canadian public institutions. Her work moved deftly between ethnography and theory/policy (Weaver 1972, 1981). She left us far too young, while the loss of Adé in March 2014 is far more immediate.

Adé built institutions through which the academy could serve society by applying anthropological knowledge. He founded the department at Laval around principles and practice of applied anthropology and developed an interdisciplinary social science approach to the society surrounding the university. He simultaneously reached out from region to province to a larger Canadian context, with an ethnographer's eye that encompassed Indigenous peoples, rural farmers, Quebec society. He was a careful steward of the checks and balances entailed by a bilingual professional organization, both for the Canadian Ethnology Society (CES) and CASCA. The Hawthorne-Tremblay Report on the status of Indigenous relationships to the Canadian state in 1957, although its recommendations were largely abortive, established a mandate for the application of anthropological knowledge to emerging and ongoing political and policy dilemmas.

Previous recipients of the Weaver-Tremblay Award constitute an equally distinguished though somewhat motley crew, as anthropologists are wont to be. It is a legacy in which we can all take pride.

It behooves us to begin our examination of the nature of applied anthropology by speaking about CASCA's own history and considering the degree to which it is generalizable to Canadian anthropology more broadly. When Julia Harrison and I exhorted our colleagues to define the singularity of Canadian anthropology a few years back in *Historicizing Canadian Anthropology* (Harrison and Darnell 2006), CASCA was the only collective institutional framework available and yet CASCA is not representative of all Canadian anthropology. Our skewed access to a clearly defined collectivity aside, the results of our inquiries were neither definitive nor unambiguous. Canadian anthropologists could not define what they had in common with any great degree of consensus. Each contributor to *Historicizing Canadian Anthropology* took a different tack. Most favoured an inclusive definition of our professional identity, one that inevitably was blurred in its own boundaries. Despite this variability, however, there was widespread agreement that applied anthropology held a more prestigious place here than in the United States and that more of us did it in Canada (whatever "it" was).

In the early years of CASCA's predecessor organization, the CES, applied anthropology provided a unifying umbrella under which otherwise undifferentiated anthropologists met concurrently with separate associations of applied anthropologists and medical anthropologists, most of whom were also CES members. To my recollection, the term *ethnology* reflected the critical early support that Sal Weaver, Dick Preston, Adé Tremblay and others negotiated with the Canadian Ethnology Service of the National Museum of Canada. The scope of the organization was not entirely clarified by the splitting off of the anthropologists from the Canadian Association of Sociology and Anthropology in the early 1970s. At that time, the linguists, archaeologists and physical anthropologists declined to join the exodus, opting to remain in their more specialized and autonomous associations. The failure of Sal's proposed federation of anthropological sciences to capture the imagination of colleagues in other subdisciplines, none of whom had been active in the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association, militated against co-opting the term *anthropology* for the sociocultural anthropologists who remained to form the new organization. Nonetheless, *ethnology* failed to catch on as a cover term of self-identification, although it was not until 1990, under the presidency of Michael Asch, that CASCA reclaimed the holistic identifier of Canadian anthropology, unmarked in its potential extent. Indeed, ethnographically inclined linguists and the occasional archaeologist or biological anthropologist sometimes have joined us.

In this context, I tended to conflate the medical and applied groups within CASCA, and I suppose that others have done likewise. In my experience, they tended to be the same people. Over the years, CASCA has incorporated the medical and applied anthropologists within a single entity, simply anthropologists—except of course

when we gather to honour the legacy of Adé Tremblay and Sal Weaver as "applied." What is now the Weaver-Tremblay Award was set up by the Society for Applied Anthropology and adopted by CASCA subsequent to the merger. Although the applied anthropology part now remains implicit, the intentions of many of the founders are still reflected in the CASCA website affirmation of the "belief that professional associations need, where appropriate, to take public positions on matters of social and political concern, particularly in cases which impact directly on those who have been the traditional subject of anthropological study" (CASCA n.d.). The distinction to be protected under the new regime was less one of discipline or subdiscipline than of the integration of the francophone and anglophone anthropological communities. In realizing this commitment, both Sal Weaver and Adé Tremblay were key figures. I conclude that applied anthropology in Canada does not operate in isolation from other variables that define us.

I wonder about the degree to which "the Canadian anthropologist" has incorporated these applied and medical identities. Medical anthropology, one of my own more recent excursions into new territory, has always seemed to me an applied subfield of anthropology, albeit one with fascinating theoretical implications and immense practical importance to the well-being of Canadians. And yet most practitioners seem to write primarily in a descriptive mode, focusing on the implementation of programs and models. Moreover, medical anthropology in Canada today functions under great duress—abandoned by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC), unintelligible to the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), yet essential to Canadian society. I recently read a set of grant proposals in which several highly productive young medical anthropologists were retooling to represent themselves as anything else. A few had devised ways to continue their health-related work by calling it something else, but, sadly, more were simply moving to other fields of specialization. CASCA members, especially Janice Graham and Jim Waldram, have been articulate in leading the collective protest, with remarkably little effect to date. We anthropologists do not speak from a position of power, perhaps not even a position of authority from the standpoint of the quantitative biomedical evaluators privileged by CIHR. And yet I suggest that such interventions in public policy are nevertheless integral to our practice of applied anthropology more generally. This is one of the important ways we apply our expertise. When the funding of urgent medical anthropology projects is unobtainable for many of our colleagues, it is difficult to see a way forward for this crucial segment of our collective professional practice. We are losing a generation of young scholars and the continuity of this arena of application that we have built together.

Defining Applied Anthropology

Let me return to defining the beast. I suspect that Canada's mediating but autonomous role between Anglo and American anthropology has something to do with the relative valuation that these national traditions place on the application of research results in the real world. British social anthropology, whatever its pragmatic efficacy (given that our British colleagues did not speak from a position of power either), aspired to guide colonial administrators in shouldering the white man's burden. A.R. Radcliffe-Brown, whom I seldom quote since I am an unrepentant Americanist, nonetheless struck a resonant note for my own balancing act between the ethical and intellectual necessities of applying or practicing our discipline and a persistent fascination with ideas for their own sake, that is, with theory, a predilection I willingly acknowledge that I share. Radcliffe-Brown said this:

> The recognition of applied social anthropology has certain very definite advantages and certain equally definite disadvantages. To mention only one of the latter, theoretical social anthropology is still in the formative stage. The demand of social anthropologists to spend too much of their time on practical problems would inevitably reduce the amount of work that can be given to the development of the theoretical side of the science. But without a sound basis in theory, applied anthropology must deteriorate and become not applied science but merely empirical practice. [1958:105-106]

Despite the whiff of things I like less here—the patronizing edge of *he* who knows best, the memory of civilizing the savage as the mandate of colonialism—Radcliffe-Brown enjoins us to toggle between styles and methods of thinking from the theoretical to the methodological to the pragmatic and political. Radcliffe-Brown intended, I think, a reversible circuit, rather than a stark binary choice. Nor do I think he intended to suggest that we should reconstitute the Victorian division of labour between armchair and field.

Lest we conclude that this conundrum has long since faded into disciplinary history, here is a 2014 statement:

> The dominant narrative in academic applied anthropology is that we conduct research to solve practical human problems. The dominant practice in the field, however, seems to be that we do research but also

> engage with people to facilitate change to improve local conditions ... In applied settings with many variable conditions that affect outcome, it remains important to generalize from our practice to develop theories of applied social change so that we learn as we go. [Preister 2014:1]

American anthropologists were already talking about applied anthropology by the mid-1930s in the context of "acculturation" as a panacea to cure the purported ills of a salvage ethnography increasingly accused by born-again functionalists from the other side of the pond of being insulated from the realities of then-contemporary Native American lives. A. Irving Hallowell, already a veteran of extensive field research in Canada with the Berens River Ojibwe, chaired the National Research Council Committee on Acculturation. When the Rockefeller Foundation stopped funding the social sciences after about 1933, however, this approach largely fizzled.

More recently, how applied anthropology, in its current manifestation of practising or public anthropology, got to be the fifth subdiscipline of the four-square Americanist tradition within the American Anthropological Association is another—and a distinctly un-Canadian—story. In this usage, it serves largely as a euphemism for someone who couldn't get a job in academia and who thus was forced to settle for a non-academic position, someone who was usually embittered by their lack of agency in a rotten job market. Although the American Anthropological Association's intention was to legitimate non-academic employment, to my ear, even then, the overtone was patronizing. The legitimacy of applied anthropology seemed to me to be recognized primarily when academic anthropologists also did such things in their spare time, whereas non-university-based applied anthropologists were tacitly excluded from theory as a prerogative of the academy.

I do not much like any of these ways of thinking about applied anthropology, nor do I think they capture adequately the quintessence of the Canadian anthropological experience. My institutional home away from home, the American Philosophical Society, was founded in Philadelphia by Benjamin Franklin in 1743 "for the promotion of useful knowledge" (APS n.d.b). The gentleman scholars of American colonial society (Thomas Jefferson, Albert Gallatin, John Pickering and Peter Stephen Duponceau among them) were men of affairs well endowed with the financial resources and cultural capital to pursue the sciences. They valued progress, technology, innovation and, in an odd sort of way, democracy. Theirs was a strangely populist elitism. Useful knowledge, after all, had to apply to someone or something. They sought practical knowledge for evidence-based policy as they forged a new kind of polity that entailed coming to terms with the Indigenous societies in whose midst they had settled. In any case, to be useful to society remains not a bad goal for applied anthropology.

The discomfort with the label "applied anthropology" expressed in my title may perhaps be provocative for some colleagues, especially those impatient with theory. I intend, however, to evoke reflection rather than irritation or outright dismissal. To state the matter baldly, I am acutely uncomfortable with the term *applied anthropology* primarily because I believe that *all* anthropology is applied. It follows that everything anthropologists do is—or potentially becomes—anthropology. I conclude, therefore, that the applied part must be an oxymoron. How, after all, can we purport to study human life without engaging it? To engage the world inevitably has consequences, whether for good or ill. These consequences, of course, may be either conscious and empathetic or unintended, carelessly playing ideas off against one another as though they could exist in isolation from society and its members. This is my first objection to the term as normally used.

My second objection is that "application" has the potential to become an end in itself, an excuse not to engage with the dynamic debates at the core of our discipline. This is the sense in which *applied* is often opposed to *theoretical*, as though one precluded the other. I argue, in contrast, that each may have value, depending on the circumstances and the question, but that when they enrich one another, the whole becomes greater than its parts. The urgency of the short-term project quite legitimately holds a necessary priority in applied research. But it behooves us to recall that there is also a longer *durée*, requiring ongoing commitment to an issue, a group of people or a set of institutions with an evolving presence in time and space. These things are mutually entailed. Anthropology is at its very heart a comparative discipline in which our case studies, our ethnographies, reciprocally highlight the insights of the particular.

All this may seem rather abstract, more theoretical than applied. Let me turn to some of the projects and preoccupations, many of them interdisciplinary, albeit in a characteristically anthropological way, that underpin my claim to be an applied anthropologist. I cite my personal experience not out of egomania but because I know it best and can thus tease out the underlying threads of motivation and integration. Reflexivity is a powerful tool in the hands of the anthropologist as analyst of both self and society. I have jousted, with varying degrees of success, with linguists, historians, literary

critics, demographers and medical clinicians and researchers. Isaiah Berlin's contrast between the hedgehog, with one great idea, and the fox, who jumps from one idea to another, has long fascinated me. Like most of us, I have experienced multiple moments of deploying both strategies, sometimes simultaneously. My several, mostly sequential, career specializations are, at first glance, suggestive of the flightiness of the fox. Such repositionings have arisen with a recurrent element of serendipity over the course of my career. I have rarely planned to move from this point to that one. The contingency of what I actually ended up doing at any given time has taught me not to project the future in great detail but, rather, to take up each opportunity because it is there, because something needs to be done, I know a little bit about it, and, paraphrasing Charlie Trick, my colleague in Ecosystem Health at The University of Western Ontario, "if I didn't do it, it might not get done." We applied anthropologists have a habit of charging into doing the things that ought to be done and working out the details as we go along.

I argue, however, that what in the moment appears to be a series of happenstances tends to develop over time an underlying logic, a hedgehog-like continuity that, for me, resides in the application of anthropological knowledge. This is what the subtitle of my fourth-year undergraduate theory seminar calls "how to think like an anthropologist," regardless of the subject at hand. It is a lens, a way of seeing the world. Applied anthropology, as I understand it, then, is the glue uniting the larger enterprise that I still prefer to call simply "anthropology." Or perhaps they are coterminous in magnitude but distinguished primarily by the standpoint from which we view our own work at a given conjuncture or in a given context. Application in this context, theory in that one.

There is also, of course, an aesthetic moment, an appreciation of the beauty as well as the truth of seeking and applying knowledge. Sir Isaac Newton epitomizes such a view of science when he says, "I don't know what I may seem to the world, but as to myself, I seem to have been only like a boy playing on the sea-shore and diverting myself in now and then finding a smoother pebble or prettier shell than ordinary whilst the great ocean of truth lay all undiscovered before me" (Partington 1996:494). Similarly, Bruno Latour (1987) portrays the Janus-faces of science, contrasting the fascinating, messy business of doing the work with the much tidier presentation of the results (that so often stifles the transmission of anthropological knowledge in the classroom). The pleasure is in the doing.

From the second, the non-ivory-tower source of my narrative tools for thinking about the world—my fieldwork—the Plains Cree of northern Alberta say, "peyak esa," once upon a time, the culture hero/trickster/creator Wisahketchak was walking—and the most amazing things began to happen. And he co-created the world with those who lived in it. It was not exactly dialogue. Wisahketchak was not forthcoming about what he really thought; indeed, he was (and remains) a creature more of impulse than of thought, so much so that the consequences are often awkward if not fully tragic. The meaning of the cautionary tales about his antics resides in the eye and ear and imagination by which the hearer applies the object lessons of the stories told and retold about the things they say that that one, that Wisahketchak, did and how his *applied* creative energy made the world in the form that we know it today.

The Alberta Years

As I was walking, I found myself in Edmonton in 1969, trained (at least in retrospect) in eerily abstract versions of linguistic anthropology and the history of anthropology, looking for some Indians to study who had a language I could learn. They turned out to be Plains Cree, and they found the city girl from down east endlessly amusing. Things began to happen, and many of them were, by any definition, applied anthropology, albeit without conscious intention or even acknowledgment on my part at the time.

Hanging out with a kindergarten class in a community where most children still came to school speaking only Cree led, in due course, to language revitalization projects with teachers from a dozen northern Alberta communities and preparing community-specific curriculum materials with them. Today I would call this "collaborative anthropology." Language was not yet a political issue in the Harold Cardinal years, so for the most part I worked with women and children pretty much under the radar. In retrospect, that was a blessing.

I especially enjoyed a Cree adaptation of *Sesame Street* (with Barbara Burnaby for Saskatchewan New Start) that incorporated culturally appropriate forms of etiquette as well as direct translation of pedagogical content (Darnell and Vanek 1972). Our sponsors insisted on a script, which I dutifully wrote. But the old man we borrowed as storyteller for some Cree kids from a boarding school in Prince Albert while their parents were on the trapline, blithely ignored it. He confidently told the children he would tell the story again in Cree: "You'll like it better that way." One child declined to draw Wisahketchak because he was the eye through

which the story could be seen—a standpoint theory of access to traditional knowledge, to be sure!

I got mad when I learned that the University of Alberta in 1969 taught Ukrainian but not Cree. So I found some fluent Cree speakers and taught the language and culture alongside them, moving the course over several years from non-credit adult education to an anthropology reading course to a calendar course that I got departmental teaching credit for every second year. Again, it was a collaborative enterprise, with Native students sharing their knowledge and experience and going home on weekends to consult grannies (or occasionally other relatives) whenever we were uncertain about anything. The Cree language program model, developed with the help of several communities in the region, had at least a small part in the establishment of a Faculty of Native Studies at the University of Alberta in 1985. After 15 years, I had finally put myself out of a job, handing over the course to the son of a woman who had been one of my own early Cree language teachers. Capacity-building is a major tenet of applied anthropology.

In those years, I often found myself a mediator with social services on behalf of women trying to keep or reclaim their children, in court as a character reference for language consultants (who were, after all, professors at the university) or providing transportation for collaborators who wanted to visit friends and relatives in more or less nearby communities ("It's just over there," they would say, gesturing vaguely, and we were off on another unpredictable excursion). Participant observation as a methodology has a tendency to relegate the "research" part of what anthropologists do to the interstices of the ongoing flow of everyday life. But that's how you come across the things you'd never have thought to ask about. I learned to say, staring politely into undifferentiated mid-space, "I've always wondered about ...," while interlocutors acknowledged my wondering. Then I waited until they raised the subject again, often satisfying my curiosity, although sometimes only years later.

Ontario Defamiliarization

When I moved to Ontario in 1990, I had no idea what to expect on the Aboriginal front. But it was axiomatic that I would again seek research and collaboration with local First Nations communities. I wanted to live and work in the same place, as I had been privileged to do in Alberta. More things were familiar than I expected, though others proved new and profoundly local. The co-presence in southwestern Ontario of Anishinaabeg, Lenape and Haudenosaunee traditions and the relative proximity of these communities to urban centres lent an initially peculiar contrastive character to my internalized sensibilities. But by now I had become a storyteller, and I carried stories across Canada as I added new ones. People in southern Ontario wanted to know what things were like out there in the Prairies. Working with language consultants much older than myself, I carried stories of spiritual teachers who were highly respected in my new home. I have chosen not to write about many of the things I learned while facilitating these early revitalization programs, although they have contributed immensely to how I understand things that I do feel authorized to share in public. The ethical stance of non-disclosure is also, I believe, an application of our anthropology.

Discourse and Resource Exploitation

I got mad again, this time because Indians who lived in the city, spoke English and ate pizza were dismissed by academics, the media and the general public alike as assimilated, therefore no longer legitimately Native. My then-colleague Lisa Phillips [Valentine], later Allan McDougall and I spent the next 15 years trying to understand and catalogue the forms of discourse that carried over from traditional languages, mostly Anishinaabemowin (Ojibwe), into English. We documented multiple Indian Englishes that varied in systematic ways from so-called Standard English, ways that arose from both the structures of traditional Native languages and the etiquette underlying their use in interaction across a variety of genres. Cross-cultural miscommunication, too often unrecognized, is a rich and largely untapped field for applied anthropology.

In the course of making explicit why and how the ten thousand or so Native people living in London, Ontario, maintained their sense of identity, I moved gradually from a discourse-centred approach to a more ethnohistorical one, and my fieldwork came to rely increasingly on explicitly collaborative methodologies. Oral tradition presupposes a time dimension for the transmission of traditional knowledge. It constitutes history "from the native point of view," to use the phrase that formed a recurrent mantra in the writing of Franz Boas.

I have been talking for some time now about what I call "nomadic legacies," the cultural patterns of relationship between people and resources, particularly land, that developed out of a hunter-gatherer mode of subsistence but persist in contemporary practices of residential mobility (Darnell 1998, 2008, 2011). I argue, contra my erstwhile colleagues in demography, that the numerically stable urban Indigenous population in London is dynamic, reflecting a constant movement of Native individuals and families back and forth between the city—in search of education, employment and social or medical

services—and the Reserve, the home place to which people retain the right to return. I understand mobility in this context as non-random: an effective strategy and a mechanism of community strength, a pattern of (re)-distributing disparately located resources, rather than as an obstacle to citizenship or participation. Such a sustainable pattern of resource exploitation is potentially applicable beyond the bounds of the Aboriginal community.

Because over half the members of a given Reserve community may not be in residence at any given moment does not mean that they have ceased to be active members of that community (though of course some have). "Where are you from?" is the first question in an encounter. This—not "Where do you live now?"—is the first step in establishing a new relationship. My ongoing work in this area integrates nomadic resource exploitation with the flexible and personalized strengths of oral tradition, producing a relational ontology of face-to-face interaction of living beings that conflicts as strongly with the mainstream privileging of literacy as mobility did and does, when settlement is accepted unproblematically as the *sine qua non* of civilization.

Medical Sciences

More than a decade ago now, I was invited to join colleagues in Western's Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry in developing a program in ecosystem health that would feature a distinct Aboriginal focus in southwestern Ontario. We established a Memorandum of Understanding with Walpole Island First Nation to document the human health effects of pollution from Sarnia's chemical valley upstream from the community. This partnership remains ongoing across multiple generations of graduate students and faculty. The core personnel (Jack Bend, a toxicologist from Schulich; Charlie Trick, an oceanographer from the Department of Biology; and me, an anthropologist from the Faculty of Social Science) were senior faculty who could afford to invest time, skills and energy in a long-term program. Graduate students and young scholars rarely have this luxury. To draw them into ongoing projects constitutes another variant of applied anthropology through capacity-building. I suppose that all of us who teach do this kind of applied anthropology.

My collaborative work with colleagues in the medical and health sciences has been the most challenging of the fieldwork projects I have tackled over my career. The assumptions of biomedicine do not always blend well with traditional Aboriginal understandings of well-being. Medical practitioners, whether researchers or clinicians, find it difficult to hold in abeyance the entitlement of privileged access to "truth" acquired along with their professional socialization to medical "science." I do not intend a critique of particular colleagues. The Ecosystem Health team has come a long way together, and we have all stretched our understandings of what we do and how it relates to those with whom we work, both within and beyond the university. Nonetheless, a gulf remains, and constant vigilance is necessary to maintain an accessible crossing.

Some characteristic sticking points in conceptualizing well-being include the following: (1) Algonquian traditions privilege a time perspective of seven generations in both directions from the speaker. Such a time frame transcends the proximate health status of the individual medical patient and requires placement of the individual within a biographical and social context of family and community. Research projects rarely have the luxury of a longitudinal perspective, of history understood through the perspectives of those who live it. (2) The inclusion in many contexts of plants, animals and the environment more generally on a par with human persons is taken for granted by Native people but often greeted with snorts of impatience from those trained in biomedicine: "Don't tell me about that stuff. I am only interested in people." (3) Incorporation of traditional healers in medical practice is increasingly common, but rarely is such practice given the respect of equal validity in a domain of its own. Further, medicine plants are rarely acknowledged by medical personnel for their therapeutic efficacy as attested by community experience. For First Nations consultants, however, efficacy requires establishing a relationship to the medicine plants. This is incomprehensible within the biomedical model of cause and effect. (4) Continued access to traditional foods not contaminated by pollution over which communities have limited control is a high priority. The most common question in public presentations of our research results has been: "How much fish can I feed my family?" The answer requires locally relevant parameters; one must pause to wonder, "How many people will a five-pound fish feed?"—the culturally appropriate answer at Walpole Island First Nation is "one." Local control of the food supply is paramount. Carrots and potatoes, as well as medicine plants, were described as "traditional" foods when grown in a community garden regardless of their introduction by settlers (Bekeris 2012). (5) Local control of resources in relationship to the environment is also at stake in the parallel established in authoritative discourse between endangered species and language revitalization, illustrated by a Walpole Island First Nation translation of biological and botanical research results into Anishinaabemowin (Ojibwe language) (Darnell 2006,

2007; Jacobs 2006). Our preliminary epidemiological study based on biomonitoring of hair and blood samples for heavy metals, mercury and cortisol (as a measure of stress) combines well with ethnographic investigation of traditional knowledge, given a respectful attention to local protocols. There is enormous potential for synergy in the amalgam of knowledges. (6) Medical colleagues have had trouble acknowledging that blood samples do not bother people who deal matter-of-factly in everyday life with diabetics' needles and the dressing of fish and game, whereas hair, with its capacity for growth, holds the essence of a person and can be used against a person by someone who intends them harm.

The applied anthropology in this series of projects has been twofold: on the one hand, it has proved possible to construct a bridge of sorts between two very different traditions with shared goals of health and well-being—valorizing the local, experiential and longitudinal knowledge of the community alongside the more formal "scientific" methods of biomedicine. On the other hand, the results of such collaboration are available for community use in ongoing land claims and resource management negotiations with federal and provincial governments and industry. (The third hand requires considerable adjustment of medical education. But that is a challenge for another occasion.)

More recently, I was invited to participate in developing Western's new Interfaculty Master of Public Health program with some of the same colleagues but with considerably more extensive institutional resources and infrastructure. (The medical school has resources undreamed of by social science programs.) As the pet social scientist in the program, I sometimes feel quite marginalized. Nonetheless, my cross-appointment and participation have ensured that cultural and social questions remain salient. In 2013–14, my anthropologist colleague Gerald McKinley and I co-taught "Social and Cultural Determinants of Health," using WHO criteria, and "Aboriginal Health." The substantial international background of our first cohort facilitated sharing of students' cross-cultural experience as practising health professionals and greatly enriched our case-based pedagogy.

I optimistically conclude that at least part of the culture of the medical school is moving in the direction of a more anthropological appreciation of culture, context and history or time depth. I have had to do some fancy scrambling to learn to speak the medical language, but, so far at least, the response to this applied anthropology has been rewarding both for the Master of Public Health program and for the participants, even though every head in the room still swivels to me whenever the word *culture* is mentioned. Further, the Aboriginal health prong of the curriculum has been showcased by Western as an important form of institutional "branding" for the nascent program. Both pedagogically and in the development of interdisciplinary and cross-cultural research, this is applied anthropology at its open-ended richest.

The Applied Anthropologist in the Academy

Wisahketchak must have figured out that someone needed to take the university in hand. And since I was there, I found myself applying my ethnographic experience to my workplace. There are good reasons why so many effective administrators have been anthropologists: we know how to attain consensus, depolarize, take account of underlying agendas and motivations, treat our partners with respect and put together a workable plan with others. I consider two bouts as president of Western's Faculty Association, along with work on faculty workload and pay equity studies, the Research Ethics Board, University Strategic Plan Task Force, Board of Governors, and so on, to be part of my applied anthropology. Some of these in-house commitments have been closer to my professional expertise: founding director of First Nations Studies (again dedicated to putting myself out of a job—it only took me three years this time); facilitation of language programs in both Ojibwe and Mohawk; hiring of local cultural and linguistic experts to teach in the interdisciplinary First Nations Studies program; donation of my personal First Nations library to the program on behalf of students who spend their book allowance on groceries. Most of us have done these things or their equivalents. Most of us have also served beyond the university in various professional organizations, building infrastructure for the training of anthropologists and the dissemination of anthropological knowledge. Although universities largely devalue such activities as merely "service," I am convinced that we apply our professional skills in service to the world around us across the domains of research, teaching and service—with the same activities often contributing simultaneously to all three.

History of Anthropology

History of anthropology has remained a constant thread in the work I have done over the last four-plus decades. But I do it in a different way than when I began, largely because I have learned how important this knowledge can be, politically for communities and individually for friends and collaborators, to transcend boundaries of culture, status, economic or educational background, and so on.

The late George W. Stocking, Jr., who was on my dissertation committee during his single semester at the University of Pennsylvania, is still widely quoted for his unflattering early-career characterization of anthropologists as incapable of historicism, of separating themselves from their own standpoint (Stocking 1968). He did change his mind, gradually, after he joined the anthropology department at Chicago, but the early dichotomy remains for many a convenient straw target. Even then, I self-consciously wrote for an audience in anthropology and a desire to articulate disciplinary history and practice. It seemed to me easier to teach archival methods to anthropologists than to teach historians to think from non-mainstream standpoints.

The dangers of refusing to separate standpoint from research results are considerable, however, when we venture to apply our anthropological knowledge beyond the academy. Mr Justice Allan MacEachern, for example, concluded in the Degamuukw' case that anthropologists could not be "objective" if they followed the ethical imperatives of their professional association, the American Anthropological Association. CASCA did not then, and still does not, have its own code of professional ethics, out of deference to the lack of consensus among divergent positions within the association on the consequences of an advocacy position for our scientific credibility or the potential of "taking sides" to generate conflict with powerful political and economic pressures in fieldwork sites. Both in reading our own history for its applications and cautions in the present and in listening to the positions of others grounded in different relational ontologies, it is my own position that perspective or subjectivity or standpoint, when applied judiciously, becomes an invaluable tool rather than an obstacle. We must educate interdisciplinary colleagues as well as judicial, political and educational institutions.

The Language and Method of Science

Over the past few years, I have been thinking a lot about the need for anthropologists to reclaim the language and prestige of science for our qualitative and ethnographic methodologies and for the theories that arise from them. As an example of what I have in mind here, I have talked about "generic narratives" in which Native speakers, even in English, relate personal experience so that it will resonate effectively with generational, family or community experience (Darnell 1998, 2013). What is unique is less reportable. The stories are not all the same, but the variation is not random either. When one reaches a point where new *types* of stories do not appear, the "sample" is large enough. This is reliability. Then we may turn to distinctive features that explain the variability among types of "generic narratives" (e.g., gender, both my own and the speaker's, in residential school stories). I understand validity in qualitative research to be attested by internal consistency, historical trajectory, feedback from research collaborators and convergent evidence from as many sources as possible. There is a considerable difference between the merely anecdotal and what literary critic Kenneth Burke (father of anthropologist Eleanor Burke Leacock) called the "representative anecdote," the story that makes it all make sense.

Even among our own colleagues, there are those who do not know how to listen to a carefully chosen story. I once gave an invited lecture in which I used a single narrative to illustrate the organization of traditional stories in Plains Cree (later published as Darnell 1974). The first question, from a senior colleague who should have known better, was, "Is that the only story you've ever heard?" How could one choose a representative story without drawing on a reservoir of shared stories? To identify the proper, the persuasive, story to tell is to capture the generalization embedded in the particular. Such narratives, ideally framed alongside more formal evidence, are the things that persuade, that are remembered, that make a difference in the world.

The Boas Project

Finally, let me turn to the project with which I am most thoroughly preoccupied these days and argue that it too is applied anthropology. I hold a SSHRC Partnership Grant as general editor of *The Franz Boas Papers: Documentary Edition* with the American Philosophical Society (APS), the University of Nebraska Press, the University of Victoria, the Musgamakw Dzawada'enuxw Tribal Council and several descendant community collaborators. This might seem, at first glance, to be a research-for-its-own-sake sort of enterprise. On the contrary, however, this project has tied together disparate threads of practising and applying anthropology over my career: history of anthropology, narrative analysis, oral tradition, language revitalization, residential mobility, resource sustainability, collaborative fieldwork.

Boas was a man of his own times for whom science held paramount value and justified ethical positions that would be utterly unacceptable today. Despite his obvious limitations when evaluated by contemporary standards, however, Boas was an applied anthropologist, although he was other things too. The first volume of the *Franz Boas Papers* stands as the framing document for a revisionist history (and practice) implicit in Boas's stature as public intellectual (Darnell, Hamilton, Hancock and Smith, 2015). The subtitle identifies theory, ethnography

and activism as three arenas in which Boas has been misread by self-interested successors attempting to replace the mentalist elements of his paradigm with a more positivist and objectivist stance (Darnell 2001, Darnell, Hamilton, Hancock and Smith, 2015). The documentary project returns to his original words in professional correspondence, contextualizes them for a new generation and aspires thereby to set the record straight—at least in relation to the contemporary anthropology of the early 21st century.

The Canadian research team (including, at CASCA 2014, Michael Asch [in spirit only, since he was at the last moment unable to be present], Rob Hancock, Sarah Moritz, Brian Noble, Joshua Smith and Peter Stephenson) is augmented by an international advisory board, primarily American and German. Boas crossed national traditions with a vengeance. That he did his fieldwork in Canada has been virtually invisible in Boas scholarship; this in turn has deepened the rift, with a consequent lack of access of the people who produced them to the original documents.

The Boas Papers (APS n.d.a) are currently being digitized by the APS. Both digital repatriation and community capacity-building are fundamental goals of our Aboriginal Advisory Council, designed to advise on the proper treatment and dissemination of culturally sensitive materials. The Boas Project applies endangered language protocols being developed at the APS under the leadership of Tim Powell, director of the nascent Center for Native American and Indigenous Research. By seeking the advice of descendant communities, the APS is breaking new ground for archival stewardship of First Nations and Native American documents in collaboration with communities to interpret and make them accessible to a variety of publics and useful to source communities.

The synergy across interrelated projects, institutions and national traditions is already adding up to more than its constituent parts. I return to the metaphoric non-linear resilience of the rhizome, epitomized by the Crabgrass Collective, with its solid roots in CASCA, a scintillating amalgam of theoretical volatility and pragmatic commitment to applying anthropology in the political sphere broadly defined. We live in interesting times. The Chinese proverb bills this as a curse. But it is also a challenge in which I believe anthropologists of wildly diverse stripes are well situated to intervene, to apply our knowledge. I invite all of you to join me.

Regna Darnell, Department of Anthropology, Social Science Centre, Rm. 3326, University of Western Ontario. London, Ontario, N6A 5C2, Canada. E-mail: rdarnell@uwo.ca

Note

1 I particularly thank Joshua Smith, Robert L.A. Hancock and Craig Proulx for the nomination and generous introduction. I am proud to have been a sometime and continuing mentor to each of them. It is impossible to enumerate all of those who have contributed to my thinking on the issues discussed in this essay. I am grateful for so many opportunities to engage in wide-ranging dialogue. Anthropology is a collective enterprise of colleagues speaking respectfully to one another across permeable borders of culture, gender, academic discipline and professional generation, then taking their insights out into the world. I also acknowledge generous support from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for many of the projects discussed here.

References

American Philosophical Society (APS)
n.d.a Boas Papers. Mss.B.B61. Philadelphia.
n.d.b About the APS. http:/www.amphilsoc.org/, accessed March 15, 2014.

Bekeris, Leanne
2012 A Seat at the Table: A Nonconformist Approach to Grassroots Participation in the Articulation of Health Standards. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Departmennt of Anthropology, University of Western Ontario.

Canadian Anthropology Society (CASCA)
N.d. CASCA: A Brief History. http:/www.cas-sca.ca/, accessed March 15, 2014.

Darnell, Regna
1974 The Social Context of Cree Narrative. *In* Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking. Richard Bauman and Joel Sherzer, eds. Pp. 315–336. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1998 Rethinking Band and Tribe, Community and Nation: An Accordion Model of Nomadic Native North American Social Organization. Papers of the 29th Algonquian Conference: 90–105.
2001 Invisible Genealogies: A History of Americanist Anthropology. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
2006 Residential School Discourses and Discourses of Self-Government: Political Resonances of Language and Land in Algonquian Narrative. Proceedings of the 37th Algonquian Conference: 149–160.
2008 First Nations Identity, Contemporary Interpretive Communities and Nomadic Legacies. Arcadia 43(1):102–113. http:/dx.doi.org/10.1515/ARCA.2008.009.
2011 Nomadic Legacies and Urban Contexts. *In* Aboriginal Peoples in Canadian Cities. Heather Howard and Craig Proulx, eds. Pp. 39–51. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier Press.
2013 The Nature of Knowledge: Calibrating Discourses across Cultures and Finding Common Disciplinary Ground. Journal of Canadian Studies. Revue d'Etudes Canadiennes 46 (2):20–44.

Darnell, Regna and A.L. Vanek
1972 Two Trails: A Proposal for Cree Educational Television. Prince Albert: Saskatchewan New Start.

Darnell, Regna with C. Stephens
2007 Species at Risk: Reflections on Translation from Walpole Island First Nation. Proceedings of the 38th Algonquian Conference: 129–142.
Darnell, Regna, Michelle Hamilton, Robert L. A. Hancock and Joshua Smith, eds.
2015 Franz Boas as Public Intellectual: Theory, Ethnography, Activism. The Franz Boas Papers: Documentary Edition vol. 1. Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press.
Harrison, Julia and Regna Darnell, eds.
2006 Historicizing Canadian Anthropology. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
Jacobs, Clint
2006 Species at Risk on Walpole Island First Nation. Bkejwanong Territory: Nin.Da.Waab.Jig Heritage Centre.
Latour, Bruno
1987 Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Partington, Angela, ed.
1996 The Oxford Dictionary of Quotations. Rev. 4th edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Preister, Kevin
2014 Using Our Field Experience to Build Theories of Applied Social Change: Why Do We Not Do More? Journal of Northwest Anthropology 48(1):1–10.
Radcliffe-Brown, A.R.
1958 The Meaning and Scope of Social Anthropology. *In* Method in Social Anthropology: Selected Essays by A. R. Radcliffe-Brown. M.N. Shrinivas, ed. Pp. 96-107. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Stocking, George W., Jr.
1968 Race, Culture and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology. New York: Free Press.
Weaver, Sally M.
1972 Medicine and Politics among the Grand River Iroquois: A Study of the Non-Conservatives. Ottawa: National Museum of Man.
1981 Making Indian Policy: The Hidden Agenda, 1968–1970. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.