

Santos in late October to witness what I knew would be a momentous fiesta.

Thanks to a thriving black market, liquor flowed freely at the fiesta, and La Seguridad only apprehended the belligerently drunk. Nevertheless, what was most noteworthy about the 2008 fiesta was the role taken on by a rebellious, returned migrant named Martina. Traditionally the climax of the fiesta happens on November 1, when groups of men, who have been drinking and dancing all night at large public parties, race horses in an all-day event called *la corrida*. It is a race without clear winners; managing to stay on your steed while staggeringly drunk is the main challenge. Throughout the week the town was abuzz with gossip about Martina and her plans to become the first woman to ever participate in *la corrida*.

Although many men were openly hostile to Martina (the mayor, for example, initially tried to block her participation), most women and girls were clearly very excited by her feminist stand. When the riders rode into town for a welcoming ceremony on the morning before *la corrida*, all of them were visibly intoxicated, but only Martina openly brandished her bottle of contraband *aguardiente*. At her mobbed party that night, she took charge of the dance floor, refusing to dance until all the obnoxiously drunken men had cleared the floor. This strategy was less successful the next day at *la corrida*, when Martina refused to ride until the other teams were cleared from the race track, a task which proved impossible. Even though she did not actually race on November 1, on the day after, the Day of the Dead, she paraded through the cemetery in her fiesta finery, followed by marimba players and a large entourage of supportive women.

This was a very different side to Martina than the one I saw when I first met her in 2007, shortly after her deportation from the United States. That day she had tearfully recounted to me how agents of the Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) came to her home late one night and tore her young daughter from her arms before deporting her. She described how difficult it was for anyone, especially a woman, to find any kind of wage labor in Todos Santos, and how life for women in her hometown was both very hard and soul-crushingly boring. Although it is unclear what her intervention will mean in the future, at the fiesta a little more than a year later, Martina's life was far from boring.

Please send any comments, suggestions and ideas, including photos for future columns, to Annelou Ypeij at j.lypeij@cedla.nl or to CEDLA (Centre for Latin American Research and Documentation), Keizersgracht 395-397, 1016 EK Amsterdam, Netherlands.

Society of Lesbian and Gay Anthropologists

DAVID LR HOUSTON, CONTRIBUTING EDITOR

A Tolerance Manifesto

"For the times, they are a changin'." Bob Dylan's call to change three decades ago remains a

powerful "call to arms," a kind of touchstone both to an age past and an activist agenda. Times *have* changed, but our needs and methods are not what they used to be. Now, *change* has changed. The inauguration of a new US president in January 2009 ushered in a paradigm shift. For the past eight years, our lives have been characterized by secrecy, an "opacity of state" that in turn fostered a peculiar dulling of the senses. We can see the extent of this opacity when we look at the predominance of the word itself in the political landscape: "change" has moved from mantra to *modus operandi* in the past 18 months. What does this mean to those of us in the margins?

The ascent of self-appointed culture war militias over the past decade has deeply scarred our collective sensibilities. The assault on same-sex marriage continues full tilt, and the vociferous railing against homosexuality and any other form of non-heterosexuality (or even conformity) has scarcely diminished. That these attacks engender a strong reaction by many of us is no surprise. In a moment of change, is this what we want or need?

The passage of Proposition 8 last November surprised those who worked hard to stop it. Without clear answers as to what happened, the aftermath, it seems, should be a time to reflect on changing attitudes, to seek ways to understand rather than exacerbate existing divisions. It is disturbing to discover the emergence of eightmaps.com, a melding of technologies that pinpoints geographical locations of Proposition 8 backers along with the dollar amounts they donated in support of the cause. The result of efforts like eightmaps.com is, regrettably, a wash of abusive, often threatening email and postal mail, the latter sometimes containing mysterious white powder, directed against these individuals. This is disturbingly akin to the same kind of hysterical overreaction we've endured for the past eight years. We don't need more of the same. It is time to change tactics. It is time for a new activism.

Changing minds must begin with changing hearts. As a first step, the collective "we" of the queer community (I'll use the term "queer" here as shorthand for LGBTQ) must redouble our efforts to *listen*. There are many hateful and intolerant voices out there whose idea of a perfect world means "kill the queers." Those who profess affiliation with any stripe of the queer "community" have suffered, and will continue to suffer, at the hands of the intolerant. But if change is *now*, if we truly hope to effect a shift in the thinking of those whose support we need, but whose opposition is *not* grounded in the same fervent ideologies of the past but instead in the grounding of their lives, we must understand what their beliefs mean and why they support measures like Proposition 8. To do so requires careful listening.

One hallmark of extremist ideologies is irrationality. Rather than a measured response, there is a strong overreaction, often followed by a rapid and unconditional assault in an attempt to seize victory and drive a stake into the ground. Often characterized as emergencies, these "situations" must be dealt with, no matter what. Never

mind reason, just do it now. The new administration brings something important back to the political and social arena: *calm*. Remaining calm in the face of a *real* emergency is not easy. We now have role models to draw upon. The queer community must begin to adopt this as standard practice. We must eschew panic and overreaction in favor of quiet thought and measured, calm response.

Activism is a vital part of how a democracy functions. As was suggested to an audience at a conference I attended recently, it is useful to remember that there are times when we must *choose* to disobey laws. This is not to suggest that civil disobedience be the primary recourse to oppressive conditions or used against any law we happen to disagree with. Refusal has its place. But this kind of activism has its limits; it is no guarantee that minds will be changed, even less that hearts will follow. Achieving a society where equality means equality for all, and expressing one's identity without encountering hate, begs compassion and tolerance.

Join us. SOLGA wants you! Visit www.solga.org for news, mentors, listserv and more. Please send any comments, suggestions and ideas for new columns, or just say "hi" to David Houston at dlrh+an@uvm.edu.

Society for Linguistic Anthropology

JAMES STANLAW AND MARK PETERSON,
CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

Language and Social Justice: Report from the CfHR Task Group

By Laura R Graham and Ana Celia Zentella

At the 2007 Annual SLA Business Meeting, Laura Graham (chair, Committee for Human Rights Task Group on Language and Social Justice and AAA EB member, Linguistic Seat), asked the SLA to endorse a proposal that she and Ana Celia Zentella (task group member) are making to the AAA Race Project. Their proposal asks the Race Project to supplement its current material with additional information and resources on language discrimination. This proposal furthers work that the task group has been doing over the past several years. In this brief summary, we review what we have done so far and lay out some ideas for future activities, which we hope will include the involvement of SLA and its members.

The Task Group on Language and Social Justice formed in 2005 when four SLA members served concurrently on the Committee for Human Rights, or CfHR (Charles Briggs, Laura Graham, Marco Jacquemet and David Valentine). For the 2006 AAA meeting they organized a Public Forum on Language and Social Justice. Presentations by Leanne Hinton, Marco Jacquemet, David Valentine, Ofelia Zepeda, and Ana Celia Zentella generated vigorous discussion among linguistic anthropologists. As part of her discussion, Zentella presented a draft



proposal of a resolution asking the US Census Bureau to make changes to language questions on the US Census. She also presented this at the SLA Business Meeting where it received positive support. Misty Jaffee and Bonnie Urciuoli joined Graham and Valentine in writing an AN article explaining why anthropologists should oppose English-only legislation in the US (48[1]).

Over the next several months, in 2007, the task group consulted other linguistic anthropologists (including Jane Hill and Leanne Hinton), refined the resolution, and sought endorsements from other professional organizations. Endorsements followed from groups like the Conference on College Composition and Communication, American Association of Applied Linguistics, and AAA sections. Resolution #5 of the Hispanic Advisory Committee to the Census subsequently urged the Census Bureau to adopt our resolution's suggestions concerning language questions (without naming the AAA) and Zentella continues to network to expand our coalition of supporters.

As part of the effort to increase understanding of linguistic discrimination among AAA's general membership, and to prepare them to vote on the census language resolution that the task force was preparing to present at the annual business meeting, Laura Graham coordinated a three-part series in AN, September through November 2007. These articles (1) explained why the current language-focused questions on the US Census are problematic and do not provide sound data that can be used as the basis for making important policy decisions about the allocation of resources; (2) suggested that anthropologists need to find more effective ways to communicate anthropological ideas about language and linguistic diversity to non-academic audiences; and (3) argued that the English-only movement recalls the linguistic and cultural violence of the Native American boarding-school experience and undermines support for language-immersion programs.

At the 2007 AAA General Business Meeting, Graham presented the Proposed Resolution on Language Questions in the US Census to AAA's general membership and asked for a vote. With a few positive changes, the resolution passed unanimously (see www.aaanet.org/issues/policy-advocacy/Language-in-US-Census-Resolution.cfm).

Graham and Zentella then began working with AAA staff to bring the AAA and our allies' concerns directly to the attention of the US Census Bureau. After informing the Census Bureau of the AAA's resolution, we are now seeking to put the issue of language questions on the appropriate Congressional committee docket. Copies of our letters to committee members can be viewed at the CfHR website (www.aaanet.org/cmtes/cfhr/index.cfm). We also plan to contact the African American and Asian Advisory Committees to the Census, to urge them to support the Hispanic Advisory committee's Resolution #5 (mentioned above).

In 2007, we also initiated discussion with AAA Race Project staff to see how project materials might engage more directly in the ways that

language is implicated in racial constructions and in the perpetuation of racism and racial discrimination. Although project materials are now finalized (and thus not editable), we seek to develop supplemental content that emphasizes language issues, such as web resources, teacher-training materials and a list of expert speakers who could lecture in association with the traveling exhibit. We are moving forward in conversation with Yolanda Moses (the project's advisory board co-chair) and AAA staff.

In addition to these supplemental materials, we are in the very initial stages of considering other resources that AAA could develop to educate broader publics on the subject of language in contemporary society, especially linguistic discrimination. AAA President Setha Low and President-elect Virginia Dominguez are enthusiastic about this possibility, and we hope SLA will be as well. Toward this end we are asking SLA President Joe Errington to present several ideas to the SLA board for their endorsement. These ideas include (1) making the Task Group on Language and Social Justice a joint SLA/CfHR working group; (2) designating 3-5 additional members to join the task group and promoting volunteer involvement through an advisory group; (3) asking the Task Group to outline a plan for AAA outreach to educate the broader public about language issues; and (4) seeking the support of all AAA sections and committees that share a commitment to issues of linguistic justice.

Please send your comments, contributions, news and announcements to SLA contributing editors Jim Stanlaw (stanlaw@ilstu.edu) or Mark Allen Peterson (petersm2@muohio.edu).

Society for Medical Anthropology

KATHLEEN RAGSDALE, CONTRIBUTING EDITOR

Native Elder Mistreatment: A CBPR Approach

By Lori L Jervis (U Oklahoma) and the Shielding American Indian Elders Project Team

For some time now, American Indians have called for partnership in research conducted in their communities, and Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) is gradually gaining respect within funding agencies and the larger scientific community. We describe here an ongoing effort to collectively develop and pilot a survey on Native elder mistreatment. This topic, woefully understudied in the general population, is an even greater scientific enigma in American Indian communities. Our research team proposed to develop and pilot a culturally relevant survey that could be used in future detection efforts with urban and rural tribal communities, with funding from the National Institute on Aging (NIA 5 R21 AG030686-02, LL Jervis, PI). The goal of the project is to use what we learn from developing and implementing the pilot study to inform a set of recommendations

for identifying the phenomenology and extent of elder mistreatment among American Indians.

A core component of the study is collaboration between two groups: (1) a culturally and geographically diverse panel of 13 community experts with backgrounds in Native elder advocacy and abuse intervention; and (2) an interdisciplinary team of six researchers with expertise in American Indian communities. Key to this collaboration is a series of meetings between community experts and researchers, who together comprise the project team. At the first meeting, the project team extensively discussed the desirability and feasibility of conducting a prevalence study of Native elder mistreatment. Once the group determined that such a study was of interest, various possibilities with respect to qualitative and quantitative measurements were discussed, as well as possible host communities.

Many important themes emerged in the first meeting. Among these were the following: (1) elder abuse receives much less attention than does child abuse or domestic violence in tribal communities, due to competing priorities in the face of scarce resources and ageism among some; (2) there is no centralized mechanism for collecting or obtaining data on elder mistreatment in Indian country; (3) criminal justice in this area is inadequate due to a number of systemic problems; (4) determining the prevalence of Native elder mistreatment is important in that it can help to secure programmatic funding; (5) existing definitions of elder mistreatment may not fit in Indian country (eg, what qualifies as abuse); and (6) qualitative approaches are crucial, in that so little is known about how elders themselves understand mistreatment.

Following the first meeting, the community experts wrote questions that they themselves would ask if they were trying to determine whether an elder had been mistreated. Using those questions as a base, the researchers developed a new measure designed to capture unique aspects of Native elder mistreatment. This instrument, along with several existing measures and a series of open-ended questions, were field tested with a small group of older American Indians in order to determine if other modifications were needed. This modified measure was reviewed in a second meeting and further modifications were made.

Once the survey was finalized, several Native communities were invited to partner with the project team as data collection sites. In the urban community, several Indian churches were directly approached, while in the reservation community the main point of contact was the tribal institutional review board (IRB). We are looking forward to beginning interviews in the near future, having just secured university IRB approval.

Although data collection has not yet begun, some of the challenges associated with implementing CBPR research in a relatively short time span have already emerged, especially in terms of the multiple approvals required from university and tribal IRBs. First, university IRBs typically have little experience with a collabora-