An SfAA Oral History Interview with Court Smith

Natural Resources, Applied Anthropology, and Citizen Engagement

Anthropology, as a discipline, has been very welcoming to entrants from other disciplines. Smith says that this is how he came to anthropology. He came from engineering, which is very appropriate for applied anthropology. Engineers are the practitioners for the physical, chemical, and biological sciences. As there are electrical, chemical and biological engineers, so are there marine, economic, and ecological applied anthropologists. Smith taught introductory graduate courses. In addition, he collaborated with many from other disciplines throughout his anthropological career, published in many non-anthropological and interdisciplinary journals, and spent much of his time doing research with non-anthropologists. Smith started anthropological coursework in 1964 at the age of 24 in the University of Arizona's graduate program. He spent most of his career at Oregon State University [1969-2003]. In retirement, he continues his interests in public engagement in natural resource decision making, perspectives of workers in natural resource industries, environmental and economic justice and equity, and how human well-being changes as a result of resource use and economic development. The interview was conducted by Shirley Fiske and was edited by John van Willigen and Court Smith.

Interview Narrative – In the Beginning

Fiske: This is Shirley Fiske and I'm here with Court Smith. Courtland L. Smith is his formal name; he prefers Court, and we're doing an oral history project for the SfAA. The date is April 3rd, 2017, and we're in Santa Fe New Mexico, right after the SfAA meetings. We're going to start with taking from his earlier memories and associations and how he got into anthropology and begin from there and then go into the rest of the questions [SfAA Oral History Interview Suggested Topics] as we go through the development of his extraordinary life.

Smith: Okay, thank you very much. First off, I'd just like to lay a really broad context, because I perceive my association with anthropology as only part of my career, and I've really spent part of it in anthropology, mainly with the Society for Applied Anthropology, but a very large part of my career I've spent with the American Fisheries Society and other interdisciplinary organizations that work on various natural resource topics. So, I don't want to give the impression that I have a lot of experience in the society. I've been to many meetings, and I've been to many in the American Fisheries Society, but I have not participated at the same level that many of the people who are giving these interviews are.

I got into anthropology in a very backdoor way, in a way that's very fatalistic. I just took options that were available to me and, if it looked like it was fun, I'd try it. So, we'll start with my college; I graduated as a mechanical engineer.

Fiske: Where were you?

Smith:From Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute in Troy, New York, and I graduated in 1961, and I had a bachelor's in mechanical engineering, and I worked briefly for United Technologies as test engineer—testing jet engines, early in the jet engine process, and we were learning a lot about some of the problems with them for commercial use. But, I was only there for a short time, and then I had a commitment in the military.

Fiske: What does that mean?

Smith: The commitment in the military was that I was an ROTC student when I was an undergraduate, and as an ROTC student, you had to spend two years in active duty. and I chose that rather than spending four years as an enlisted person—you get to spend it as an officer in active duty. So, it was somewhat an avoidance of military responsibility. So for my military post, I went to Fort Lewis, Washington, and when I was in Fort Lewis, you could take courses at the University of Puget Sound, and I think Pacific Lutheran University, for very low cost; like five dollars a term or something. I took three courses—psychology, sociology and economics, and I enjoyed them a lot. I got married in 1961 to a woman who is very artistic, she's a writer, and she was always encouraging me to do something other than engineering, although I have to say I enjoyed engineering a lot. She was encouraging me to try other things, so that's why I took these courses. Well, as part of our stay in the military, my sister's husband knew an anthropologist that is well-known in the Northwest, maybe not everywhere else, Erna Gunther. She is the person that identified the first salmon ceremony and published in the *American Anthropologist*in the early 1900s about that ceremony and the importance of it to Native Americans and their concern and religious beliefs relative to salmon. Anyway, we were at a dinner one night and I was a young person, I was about 21, 22, and I knew everything, and so I was pontificating about Native Americans. We, my wife and I, had been to national parks and stuff like that and learned a few things, but we didn't know very much, and so I was mouthing off all the stuff that I knew. I thought I knew a lot, and so Dr. Gunther was very kind to me, and she said well, you ought to go into anthropology with your interests. And I said, well, that sounds interesting, I'm looking for something else to do.

My wife and I had talked about getting master's degrees and then going and teaching together in a private school or in a small town. So, it sounded good. Dr, Gunther said well, you should apply for the University of New Mexico, University of Arizona, University of Hawaii, and University of Chicago. The thing that encouraged me probably more to apply for anthropology were kind of two things: one is I really liked economics, but the economists kept saying well, you have to go back and get all the undergraduate courses, and I didn't want to do that. I said I got an undergraduate degree, I want one of these graduate degrees. So, I really didn't want to go backwards; I wanted to go forwards, and I was looking for a graduate program. The second reason for looking for a graduate program is I could get out of the military three months early, and I did not regard myself as a great asset to the military, so I was happy to do that, and I managed to get out almost exactly three months early.

I made these applications. Well, Chicago and Hawaii turned me down right away. So, those were not a choice. New Mexico accepted me, but they said well, you've got to go back and get some undergraduate work and, to get out of the service three months early, you had to be admitted into a graduate program, so the University of Arizona admitted me into their graduate program and said well, we want you to sit in on these courses, but you can begin taking graduate courses. So good, I was out of the military and we could do that. When I went to Arizona, I'd had only four courses in liberal arts in engineering [at Rensselaer]. I had an economics course, an architecture course, a reading course [reading several novels] and one other one course. That was all I had—I've never had a Western civilization course, I've never had an anthropology course in high school or a sociology course, so I really knew relatively little. Not relatively little: I knew nothing.

When I got into Arizona, … I remember taking notes, and this one sticks in my mind, that I—they were talking about Kroeber, so I wrote down C-R-O-B-E-R. Well, that's not right, but I had never seen Kroeber's name printed. I did read several books before I went to Arizona.

I went through Arizona, finished the course work, and a master's program [consists] of course work and then some kind of a thesis, so at the end of the course work, you take an exam to qualify. I think it's called a qualifying exam. And so, I took the exam and I passed it, which is fine, I thought well, now I'll do the thesis and get my masters. But, I learned that masters, as a degree, really wasn't worth too much, and it was kind of for people who actually failed their qualifying exam and didn't go onto a PhD. I didn't want to do a master's thesis if I'm going to get—have to get a PhD to get in

anthropology. So, I never got a master's degree; I went right onto the PhD. And, I don't think either one of—either an engineer going to Arizona or going directly from no anthropology to a PhD program is possible in the current setting. I mean, I see the programs creating huge barriers to people moving between disciplines. So anyway, I got the degree there and I found anthropology very interesting.

Awareness of Applied Anthropology

Fiske: So, I think the first question is, when did you first become aware of applied, or how did you see yourself as an applied anthropologist or practicing, but the main question is, like other people that I have interviewed, you never—at first, you never thought of yourself as an applied anthropologist, even though you were working clearly on applied issues in your thesis and had two very applied mentors and professors, and so let's talk a little bit about your graduate [studies].
Smith: That's very true, and I never saw myself at Arizona as an applied anthropologist. I saw myself as more of the classical academic anthropologist who learned my theory areas and that. One of the things, for me, about anthropology was I had difficulty thinking about myself as imposing my research on other cultures. I thought that if anthropology has something to offer, I ought to be able to use it in my own culture, so I was really more interested in taking anthropology and using it in my own culture.

So, I went through the PhD program and I worked on a very applied program, which was whether you [could bring] water from California—from the Colorado River to central Arizona, as part of the Central Arizona Project. And I worked with Harland Padfield as my major professor on that. It was one of the first grants that came out of the Water Resources Research Institute, which is a, I think it was—

Fiske: It's federal or state?

Smith: It was a program under the USGS, and so I think it was one of the first funded programs, and it actually funded my dissertation. And the basic question of my dissertation, while the overall question of the project was the economic value of bringing water from the Colorado to central Arizona, which ultimately happened, was how urban areas use water. And one of the assumptions was that as you urbanize you use more water; more people, more showers, more houses, more green lawns, all that kind of stuff, and so that was one of the assumptions, and then the other thing was that in the Southwest, a lot of people who originally populated the Southwest came from the Midwest or the upper Midwest, and they brought the kind of northern

green lawn, use water for plants and have lots of big trees and so on. So, they brought that to Arizona, and that really wasn't the ecology of Arizona, but that's the way people built their houses. So, if you go to the older, central areas of Phoenix—I don't know if they still have this—they'd [grade their yards as] these big bowls, which they'd fill with water, and water this Bermuda grass, so sometimes the roots would go down 10 feet because they'd get this irrigation water. So, people thought well, we're using much more water in the city than we're using in agriculture, so as we put water from agriculture into the city, we're going to need more. Well, it turns out the opposite was the case, and that was a finding that I made. The second—

Fiske: So, how did you make this finding? I mean what methods did you use and how did you find out? And that seems to me to be a relatively important finding.

Smith: Well, it was relatively simple. All I did was look at the water use for Phoenix over a period of time and compared it with population [This was incorrectly stated in the interview. I compared water use on urban with farm lands over time. See pp. 90-95 (1972); "Less water is used in the shift of farmland to urban uses."], and so, you know, and I was calculating for the whole area of the Salt River Project, and so there was—it was a very simple regression that I did actually with the first course that I took as a graduate student, because I had been an engineer, was a statistics course.

Fiske: Right.

Smith: So anyway, I put that to use.

Fiske: That's great. So, and the bottom line is that people—the urban areas use less water in total than do rural areas—
Smith: Right.

Fiske: The Central Arizona Project, and then also Harland Padfield's role and your relationship with him, and then Spicer, because all of these folks were pretty important in your graduate career.

Smith: Okay, so the Central Arizona Project was to build an aqueduct to take water from the Colorado River and give it to Phoenix, basically, and ultimately it was supposed to go down to Tucson. I actually don't know right now where the water went. I know the canal was built, the water goes at least to Phoenix, maybe it gets down to the Tucson, but I never paid a lot of attention to whatever happened after that. But the second conclusion, I think, was also important, and that was that the

water—Phoenix was organized initially into a Water User's Association of Salt River project, and they controlled the water. Now, they needed money to get this water to their farms, so how'd they make the money? Well, they built a hydroelectric power plant in Roosevelt Dam, and they became a major power producer for the urban area. So, what the urban area did is it gave the farmers money to subsidize their use of water. I called this the reclamation principle—and the farmers were then subsidized by the water [power] users. So, those are the two conclusions.
And actually my relation with Harland was that he had graduate students who worked with him, and he divided us up into three different problems, and I took the Salt River-Phoenix area, E. B. Eiselein took the [nongovernmental] organizations advocating for and against the Project, and I think it was Nick Houser had a third one. He only I think ever got a master's. E. B. finished a dissertation. But anyway, so Harland was my major professor. I had good relationships with him. Harland is—he was the president of SfAA, he—

Fiske: Right.

Smith: --was very noted—was very applied in his work in *Farmers, Workers and Machines* in agricultural labor. When I was at Arizona, he had just done a study of a—I think it was one of the aircraft plants in San Diego and how the workers were treated. It was during the sixties and it was lots of things about racism and so on; he got into all that kinds of stuff. He worked with a black man by the name of Roy Williams. They wrote a book together, and so he was very—he was a newly minted PhD but kind of really on the move, and because he was really on the move, he didn't pay much attention to me, so I kind of ran my own show. And actually, I was up in Phoenix, I lived in Phoenix; we lived in a travel trailer, and at that time we had two children. We had one child in the military, and then a second child we had when I was going to go on to my PhD. And we had—we had a travel trailer which we had lived in, in the military, which is another kind of side but interesting story, but anyway, we lived in this travel trailer and lived in it up in Phoenix [Tempe] and I did my field work. So anyway, I did my field work running around Phoenix on a little motor scooter.
But anyway, so my relation with Harland was that I would go—I was up in Phoenix, I'd go back and see him every once in a while, and he would kind of check me out, and he came up to Phoenix once and I took him around to some of the places I was studying and so on. But, he didn't pay a whole lot of attention to me, so I had quite a free rein and a free rope. And then I came back and wrote the dissertation and the theory was kind of Redfield and evolutionary and stuff like that. It was kind of, you know, old, typical anthropology theory. Spicer was Harland's major professor, so Spicer was on my committee; a very wonderful, gentle man with great knowledge

and great vision. And so actually, I'd like to, in talking about Spicer, introduce what I feel is the basis of practicing anthropology. Spicer started, I think, it was called the Southwestern Association for Practicing Anthropologists [probably the Society of Professional Anthropologists. Though Spicer was involved the leadership came from students Barry Bainton and Margaret Knight] while I was at the University of Arizona.

Fiske: I remember that. Boy, this brings back a lot of memories.

Smith: Okay. And that was the first of what he envisioned [as] many organizations that would be around the country. Then, I participated with Shirley in the Washington Association of Practicing Anthropologists when I was in Washington D.C. in 1984-85 for a year. That's when we met.

Fiske: Right. So, the Southwestern one, give me the name of the Southwestern one again.

Smith: I think it was called the Southwest Association for Practicing Anthropologists. I think all of them were to be called Associations of Practicing Anthropology or Anthropologists. I think probably Anthropologists, I am not exactly sure.

Fiske: Okay.

Smith: And I think the Southwestern one was the first one he formed, and I think some of the graduate students in Arizona were involved in it. My—and I don't know this for sure, because I never talked to Spicer a lot about this—but the impression I got is that Spicer saw a lot of anthropologists being trained to go out and actually do practicing. And I make a distinction between applied anthropology and practicing, but practicing anthropology in Spicer's mind, I think was people were going out and actually working together and collaboratively with Native Americans, with people who were ethnic minorities, anyone that needed help, and so—and he, I think envisioned that they needed a group that they could kind of talk to one another about [their experiences], maybe even develop some standards and be supportive of these people who were nonacademic. He didn't see that the American Anthropology Association or the Society for Applied Anthropology at that time were necessarily—in fact, at that time, the Society for Applied Anthropology was kind of having trouble being applied versus being a more academic journal. So, I think he was thinking of practicing anthropology as a course in which masters, probably more masters, some PhD students, actually went out and put anthropology to work in helping out, making

the world a better place. That's my vision of what I think he was doing. I thought he was a tremendously visionary person.

Now, I never even paid any attention to these activities. And Spicer did ask me, when I graduated, if I would work with him on an education project he had with the Navajo, and I was so—well, two things: one, I was so into the academic anthropology, I was thinking well, I'm going to get a job in a college and teach anthropology. I did not see myself as going out in the world and affecting things. So, I said no, I'm going to go, and I got a job in Pittsburgh at Carnegie Mellon University. So anyway, that was my association with Spicer. Spicer was very kind to me, but I don't think he ever really knew me that well. Harland was a rising star and Spicer was, probably the most well-known faculty member at Arizona at that time, because Emil Haury had retired recently. So anyway, Spicer, [Edward] Dozier and Haury and physical anthropologist, [Frederick] Hulse, were kind of the really big people in the faculty at Arizona, and then they had some other, newer people. Ken Hale came in, Dr. [Raymond] Thompson came in and several others that began to fill out the program. Actually, the program was fairly small when I went there. I would say it was like Oregon State when I went there; there were about eight faculty and they had gazillions of graduate students and not a lot of time to work with them. They were very busy.

Carnegie Mellon

Fiske: Sure, absolutely. So, I didn't realize that you had gotten a job offer at Carnegie Mellon, and did you—go back there and pick up with Oregon State and that transition.

Smith: My first position in my—I finished my dissertation in August of 1968, and so I spent the spring of 1968 looking for a job, and I was successful getting a job at Carnegie Mellon University. I have to say that this is another very temporarily fortuitous time. I got into the graduate program because of the Vietnam War, and they're taking a lot of people into graduate programs. I don't know why Arizona ever took me, to be honest with you, because I really—my undergraduate grades were nothing stellar. I was like a 3.0, 3.2 undergraduate, I was an engineer, I don't know, they took a risk on me.

Fiske: They did!

Smith: And so, at that time there was a tremendous need for faculty in state universities, because students who were enrolled in college had a better chance of not being drafted. In other words, they didn't go into the draft pools. So, there was a

real need for faculty, and so I didn't get a first-rate university job; I went to Carnegie Mellon, which is a great university for engineering and business and art and theater and so on—

Fiske: That's what I think of it as.

Smith: And I was in what was called the Margaret Morrison Carnegie College in business and resource management, which is something that Carnegie Mellon had taken over. And actually, I was there with another very well-known—well, someone who became a very well-known anthropologist, Peggy Sanday.

Fiske: Yes.

Smith: Yeah, she went to the University of Pennsylvania. And she became, in anthropology, I think a very well-known person. Actually, I haven't heard much about her, but I have to say, going back, a lot of my time is not spent focusing on anthropology and what happens in it, so I have weaknesses in my knowledge. So anyway, we were there together, and I went there, I thought I was going to become an urban anthropologist, because the cities were burning up and I thought well good, this is great, I can get in here and use my anthropology and help out. So, it turned out that the Mellon family had given Carnegie Mellon 10 million dollars to start a program in urban studies, or studying these urban problems. Well, it turned out the—I think it's called GSIA, the Graduate School of Industrial Administration or something like that with—those who know systems theory have heard of Herbert Simon, who was their kind of a guru. He is—I don't know if he ever won the Nobel Prize, but he is on the ilk of Nobel Prize winner—really great mind in business management and systems.

Fiske: Yes, I have heard of him. I used to teach in a school of public administration before I came to Washington.

Oregon State University

Smith: So when it became clear that there wasn't going to be much an opportunity at Carnegie Mellon for what I went there for, I called up Harland again, and this is where he really helped me. He said well, there's a job at Oregon State, why don't you apply there. And so, I did apply and was successful in getting the job, and that—I was working there on another applied project where—

Fiske: There?

Smith: At Oregon State. I went to work with a fellow by the name of Tom Hogg, and he had another Water Resources Research Institute grant from USGS to study the community of Sweet Home because the [Corps of Engineers was] building two large dams there. And the ideas at that time were that these dams would bring economic growth to that community and it would be much better off for having them nearby. There'd be recreation opportunities, there'd be, you know, the community would grow because there'd be lakes there and so on. So, I went to work with Hogg on that, and I got the job because Harland had recommended me for it.

Fiske: What discipline was Hogg?

Smith: He was also an anthropologist. He was the head [Buck Davis was head at that time,] of the department at that time. We were—when I went there, there were four anthropologists that were in the department and they added two more, and this was all Vietnam driven, because we added two the year I came, two more the year after, and we had plans to add two more, but as Vietnam wound down, we couldn't get any more money for—so we had about eight faculty.

Fiske: Remind me, what was the mechanism of being Vietnam driven? Were people avoiding going into the military?

Smith: Yeah, they were going to college to get out of the military at that time—

Fiske: So, that meant that you needed to hire more faculty to teach.

Smith: Right. I believe at that time—I'm not totally sure of this—but if you were enrolled in a college getting a bachelor's degree or any other degree, that you were exempt from the—they had a draft lottery, and so you were not put in the draft lottery. So, a lot of kids were coming to college, and a lot of them were interested in the social sciences. This was the sixties, you know, the—people wanted to solve the social problems, so they came to college to do that. In fact, we did the Sweet Home research with undergraduates. We had 30 undergraduate students that were like field workers going up to Sweet Home, which is about, oh, a 45-minute drive, probably 50 minutes to an hour at that time, from Corvallis. And so, they would go up and they would do field work, and Hogg had organized the whole study, and he had—he was very Boasian, so he divided up into all the categories that Boas would say you had to do to study culture, and so I came into that program with that study.
Fiske: Yeah, great. Okay, so now we're at Oregon State—

Smith: Right, and I still have no thoughts of applied anthropology. But I'm doing this [project].

Fiske: You were doing all this applied anthropology.

Smith: Well I, you know, I was like the rest of the people of the sixties: I wanted to do things good for humanity, so.

Fiske: Well, I think what struck me, looking at the notes that you wrote up in advance for this, was the number of projects that you had or that you experienced over the course of your time at OSU that were all applied and all inter—and most of them were interdisciplinary, like most of the students at the time that you were going to grad school and then entering into the academic workforce were used to the traditional model of working alone or in the field, but your background was almost entirely interdisciplinary and applied. And so, let's just talk about those years and any—

Applied and Practicing Anthropology

Smith: Well, I want to preface that in a general sense, because that is what I liked most about my career in anthropology, was the ability to work with people in other disciplines, and the further away from anthropology the better; engineers, biologists, ecologists, chemists, mathematicians, I've worked with them all. I loved that opportunity. And I'm less interested in working on interdisciplinary projects within anthropology, or even within the social sciences, and I have some biases about that. But anyway, I love the collaborative nature of things.

So, I want to talk a little bit more about this Sweet Home project as it relates to applied anthropology, because there was a real applied outcome from that project. Now, Hogg had divided things up into the Boasian categories, and I was, again, more like my Salt River Project work: so what are some of the big issues here that we can point out. One of the issues at that time was this issue of economic growth; we build these dams for economic growth. Now, the other part of that issue was we build these dams, we destroy the ecology of rivers. So, it was important at that time, because they were doing what they called benefit-cost analysis, to show that, okay, that benefit did come to communities. So, I worked very hard with some of my undergraduate students, and we found no, that didn't happen. What happened was the community went through a boom and bust cycle and they got no benefit, no real benefit out of this. In fact, they actually went into debt. They improved their water system, and they built more schools. They improved their road system and all that, and the people

didn't come. So, when they got done, they were more in debt and they had not gotten anything.

So, now that finding was picked up by groups like the Sierra Club and environmental organizations; they'd say look at it, you know, this water resources stuff is not producing the benefits you think it does, because in the benefit-cost analysis, they take all the benefits and weigh them against the costs of the dam. And there was a lot of criticism because there a lot of dams being built in the 1960s and 70s, particularly in the Northwest, and there was an organization called the Pacific Northwest River Basins Commission, and they had a plan for the next 50 years, and it was hundreds of more dams and revetments and everything, and people said no, no, we're—we've done enough of this. So, this kind of work helped create the argument for let's stop doing this, and actually the dam building stopped in the 1970s, and I think this work had an impact on it.

Now, it was applied in the sense that we did the basic research that was able to be used by other people who went out and actually put it into practice, and that's where I make my distinction between applied anthropology and practicing anthropology. It seems to me that practicing anthropology is about the people who are out in the trenches working every day, and applied is more people thinking about, you know, what are the ideas, what's the data and that kind of thing. And this is probably a gradation, but I see my—I saw myself more as the applied anthropologist, but at that time, still I didn't see myself as an applied anthropologist.

What forced me to see myself as an applied anthropologist was if Oregon State was going to become—have graduate programs, and in Oregon at that time, the universities were separated as to what kinds of programs they could have, and there was an allocation system. Now, in the sciences, the allocation system didn't exist as much, because everybody needed science, but not everybody needed social science. So, Oregon State had no graduate programs [in the arts and social sciences], and we were very—we came from universities that had graduate programs, we thought we needed to have graduate programs, so we wrote a—the first year I was there—a proposal for a PhD program. It's kind of very optimistic of our talents, but anyway, we wrote it. But we had to separate who we were from the University of Oregon, so we began to identify ourselves as applied anthropologists, and Hogg was quite an entrepreneur in this thing. We created a Maritime Institute for Marine …something of—what would be the E—anyway, we created an institute [Hogg liked MIME as an acronym. It stood for Man in the Marine Environment]. We did things that would try to make us look more applied. And so, as time went on, I began to see myself and

began to participate then in the Society for Applied Anthropology and see myself more as an applied anthropologist.

But, at the same time, I was also heavily interested in other areas, and when I went to Oregon State, I went to work on the Sweet Home Project. Kind of a great name for a project, Sweet Home. It's a real name; you don't have to have as euphemism for the town. But anyway, I went to work on that project, but shortly thereafter, I guess maybe my anthropological training said well this—these people are [water] resources people; they're not really very interesting to the public, and so what might be more interesting? And so, I got involved with a guy by the name of Dan Panshin, and he encouraged me. Dan said I'm doing this TV program on marine recreation. It was an early morning TV program on one of the Oregon stations, one of those things that back in those days, there weren't as many cartoons for the kids, so they'd let these public service programs on.

So anyway, he then introduced me to another issue that was interesting to me, which was the fisheries. And see, this was a time when one of the big problems in society was that—can we grow forever, you know, and the whole limits to growth debate was on then, and I was really taken up with that. That was really fascinating to me. So, I was very into limits to growth, and so what better topic to study than fisheries, because here you've got a population that is finite, you've got people that want to catch more and more of it; there's limits to growth and you learn all about it. So, I became very interested in fisheries, not so much because I never—I don't fish at all; I would rather leave the fish in the ocean, but I was very interested in this problem of limits to growth, and what I could learn from studying fisheries that might apply to the limits to growth issue. I was like very much into the Meadows and the world growth model and all that kind of stuff that were—they were making predictions, and the economists were critiquing them, and then I was thinking of it as a social scientist, you know, why do people continue doing things like they do so, that got me into it. Garrett Hardin's article I think was out at that time. But I was—I think I discovered Garrett Hardin later. What I really was looking at were Jay [Wright] Forrester, the Meadows [Donella and Dennis], all the people doing the Limits to Growth modeling.

Fiske: Okay.

Smith: And you see, when I started studying the fishery, the issue was limits to growth issue, it's called limited entry, and the question was should we limit the number of licenses that we can give out so that we don't fish down the resource. My first project was to go out and find out well, what do fishermen think about limited entry, and I

found out that they didn't like it very much, but I also found out that the legislature wasn't going to pass any of the enabling legislation, so it was a dead issue in Oregon. And so, that kind of turned me into looking, well, what about the history of this fishery, how did we get here.

And so, a very fortuitous thing happened; I was at the Oregon Historical Society and they were helping me—I was looking for some of the history stuff—and [a librarian] said you know, we have this whole bunch of stuff from what was then the predecessor of—Bumblebee Seafood at the Bybee House where they—this where the Oregon Historical Society, which is in Portland, kept a lot of their records—they said, we have these boxes of stuff from Bumblebee; are you interested in looking at it? Oh, yeah. So, I started looking at that, and what I began to see was the same language and discussion over the fisheries in the 19thcentury as was happening when I was watching the 20thcentury. They were talking about well, there's too many boats fishing, there's not enough fish, and so on. And so, it became a very fascinating problem to me, and so then I kind of focused more on the—or on the more historical, but I kept studying fishing.

The applied issue for me was limits to growth. There was another issue in which my colleagues in the Society for Applied Anthropology were very interested; Jim Acheson, John Poggie, Rich Pollnac, Bonnie McCay, Mark Miller…who's the guy at Duke?

Fiske: Mike Orbach.

Smith: Michael Orbach, yeah. So anyway, it was a whole bunch of us; it was probably maybe 20 of us, and particularly a set of us, Bonnie McCay, Pollnac and Poggie, and there were some Canadians as well. But anyway, we were studying fishermen as to why they fished. And so, that led me to, you know, do some more work with fishermen and continuing interest in what sparked them to fish. And so, they had a set of questions that they asked in surveys, and so I used some of their questions, some of mine, and we were finding roughly the same thing, that there was a joy to fishing that was noneconomic, and so that's why they fished, and that's also why the stocks would continue to go down even if you could find out what the maximum sustainable yield was and cut the effort to the number of boats; people would still fish, because they liked it and it didn't matter whether they made a lot of money or not. So, that's—what came out of that the satisfaction bonus kind of stuff that really came out of Lee Anderson at Delaware and the marine economists.

Fiske: Great. So, we're transitioned now sort of to fisheries from water—

Smith: Yeah, I got out of water resources, went into fisheries, and I was not in water resources very long, and went into the fisheries. So, that brought me two major professional identities, one in applied anthropology, one in the American Fisheries Society. But I also did other things with lots of other anthropological and non-anthropological organizations, lots of other non-fishery organizations. I mean I feel that probably I have interacted more in my professional life with people who are not anthropologists and professionally not anthropologists than I have with anthropologists.

Modeling Human Systems

Fiske: Right. Okay, good. You have a whole list of projects that I don't know much about: NOGERO, NETS—I'm just going to read them—EvoLand as a precursor to ENVISION, but then there's also—

Smith: I'd put those into one context, because one of the contexts of my career has been to be more quantitative and—you know, there's a big debate on methodologies in anthropology, about qualitative versus quantitative methods, and in my entire career, I tried to put the two together, but I always have wanted to have some kind of quantitative piece that I use to help. I felt that the qualitative helped inform the quantitative, the quantitative helped inform the qualitative; they were—I get very upset when graduate students come through and they say, I'm a qualitative methodologist. I think that's fine, but there's much more to it than that. So anyway, so this is an effort to build cultures in—

Fiske: Which is an effort?

Smith: The simulations: NOGERO, ENVISION, all that, that's an effort to build cultures in a simulation, computer simulation programs.

Fiske: Yeah, okay.

Smith: And so we used NOGERO as an educational game for undergraduate students. There, we were trying to point out to them that—again, this was in the seventies—limits to growth. So, we had them actually play with the simulation model, and so they'd play the simulation model and they'd destroy the fishery and they'd all die off, and so oh, look it, there's limits to growth. And they're driven by our values. I

mean the point was that our society pushes us to want to have more and more and more, and that push is what leads us to overexploit. It's a very simplistic thing, to overexploit the resources. So, we showed this, but we then built a simulation, there was another simulation …

Fiske: NETS, NOGERO…?

Smith: NOGERO was built as foragers, and so it was really built on the model of a foraging society. NETS was built on a model of trying to replicate a trawl fishery, and both of them, the outcome that came for me was that if you want—because there was an argument about limits to growth that you could have stable equilibrium, and so that if you planned the economy right, you could kind of have—this is the whole notion of sustainability and so on. And so, the lesson that I learned was that's impossible. What is happening: if you put enough pressure, you go through a cycling, because what happens is you will get more people coming to the resource, the resource declines, people leave, it comes back, people come back, and so on. So, it seemed to me that as you scale that up to bigger and bigger models, you basically come to the fact that kind of cycling in limits to growth was an outcome that I thought would happen.

Dr. Smith Goes to Washington

Fiske: I met Court in Washington D.C. when I was employed at NOAA in the policy office, and Court was showing up in the corridors; interesting looking person, you don't see many people like Court; he'd have a vest on, you know, leather vest, and maybe some fringe on it, but—

Smith: I was going to wear a vest today, but I didn't.

Fiske: [Laughing], so I was immediately attracted to talking to him. Turns out he was an anthropologist, and I was delighted, because I was the only anthropologist I knew. And so, although I always had anthropology in the background whenever I did a study for the administrator, it was always with ethnography, using an ethnographic technique. So, I got to know Court, and it turns out he was there as a temporary rotator in the government, who was working at the behest of the administrator of NOAA on a special Blue-Ribbon Fisheries Commission—the first anthropologist, real live anthropologist, that I had met who was invited as an expert to advise the government in the whole fishery management process.

Smith: What I had was a sabbatical with Sea Grant that year, and I came to Washington for 1984-85. I was there mainly because Sea Grant didn't really have anybody that was of social science background to be a reviewer for the social science projects. Tom Murray, I think was the person who was doing that, and he was basically more ecologically oriented, and so they wanted someone that could help with that. And so, I went there with that expectation, and I went out on reviews and would review projects and give my insights, and I would talk to them at the meetings about possibilities of things that could be done on the social science side and stuff like that, trying to give them suggestions. So, what happened was, this was during the Reagan years; the Magnuson Act was being [re-evaluated]—every, I think three to five years, it has to be reauthorized, so it was in a reauthorization period. The Reagan administration was very much into private enterprise; they thought there were private enterprise solutions that could be included in fishery management policy, and so they put together what they called this Blue-Ribbon Panel, and it was mainly a group of very successful business people in the fishing industry, or related to the fishing industry. They were brought to Washington to have these meetings, to make recommendations for things that should be changed or added in the reauthorization. I got on it, you could think that maybe it was because I was so well known and so important; I got on it because I was a social scientist, the only one that NOAA had in the fisheries area at that time that they could put their finger on and who was there, was cheap, and could be a participant in this committee. And so, I participated—

Fiske: That may be a little bit…

Smith: No, no, it's absolutely true—but anyway, I have a facility to see things differently than the rest of the world. But anyway, I was involved in this committee, and we tried to come up with suggestions on—and so we did come up with some of the arguments about how you could limit effort, and I was much more interested in a new area in actually anthropology, among applied anthropologists, because at about that time, I don't think the books were out yet, but Jim Acheson and Bonnie McCay were working on what they called cooperative management; so was Evelyn Pinkerton, so was Peter Fricke, and there are a bunch of people that where kind of coming up with this cooperative management framework, which is a very interesting frame—the idea was that communities could work with managers to maybe do a better job of managing. So, I tried to come up with some little solutions along this line for the Magnuson Act. Now, none of that ever really got into the Magnuson Act, but I at least learned a lot about this idea of cooperative management really was something coming out of the Society for Applied Anthropology. We had a lot of meetings, you know, we were brought in as groups to meet on this, we had meetings when we went

to events like Santa Fe, you know, there would be—we'd get together and give papers. And so that was a very strong—and in my affiliation with the Society for Applied Anthropology, that group was the one I tended to most interact with, and it was a very strong through many years. I don't think it still exists so much, because I think the interests have spread out more. [Richard] Pollnac, for example, was very interested in international fisheries, so a lot of applied work is being done in the international area. And there still is some being done—actually I think this has led to some anthropologists—well, I know—has led to anthropologists being hired to do work, and it is actually a rather substantial body of literature being developed now that was shown in these meetings with Patricia Clay and that brought in a lot of this work that's being done by contemporary applied anthropologists. But in those days, we were kind of peripheral to the economists who were the primary ones, and so on the Blue-Ribbon panel, I tried to make some of the more communitarian, how can we accomplish these.

I went back [to OSU] with a solution that got published in a book chapter but never got much attention. I mean there were some coastal people who thought it was neat, but I was going to have these coastal—on the Pacific Coast, you have these kinds of enclaves of like fishing ports like Astoria and Garibaldi and Depoe Bay, Newport, Charleston, Brookings, and so my idea was you could create these into these little community government organizations, and so I suggested that, and actually some people liked the idea, but it never took off. It actually—and I have no relation at all to this; it was all by the people in Port Orford, but they ultimately got there, I think it would be a marine protected area that was associated with the people there. And so anyway, that's another area that I have not spent much time in, because I—what happened with me is I left the fishers in the 90s and went into the forests for—

Collaboration

Fiske: Went into the what?

Smith: Well, went into watershed restoration.

Fiske: Well, thank you for that explanation, and also—yeah, go ahead.

Smith: Okay, well anyway, let's say a little bit more about the simulations. The simulations were, for me—let's back up: as an applied anthropologist, who am I trying to apply my material to? And I think for me probably the first group are students, and I feel that's my major population that I've had any effect on, and what is most fulfilling

is to have a student come back saying yeah, I've been using my anthropology, or you know, I found that your course in this helped a lot. So, that's one group, and so the simulations were partly to help the students. Other things weren't' simulations; they were things using the Human Relations Area Files to help students to learn about anthropology. But that's part of my effort to make the courses more interesting, to tie the students to the library at Oregon State, they bought the Human Relations Area Files, and no one ever uses them, so I made the students use them. And then, I had a statistics course that used the Human Relations Area Files.

So, that was on the education; then secondarily I felt that I had a large population of people I work with—these interdisciplinary colleagues, and I was helping them understand anthropology and what they might be able to use anthropology for, and then I saw myself as having a kind of a broader interest in the community, and that some of what I did would help the community understand, like I would give [Oregon Council for the Humanities] Chautauquas on the history of the salmon fishery and why it turned out as it is and stuff like that. So, and then later in my career, probably I—actually I did some of this early, but I got more involved in actually practicing in my own community and closer to places where I had some impact.
Fiske: So, you would say that one of your—your primary area where you feel you've had an impact is in your teaching and students—

Smith: I would say that is where, if there's any impact, that would be the major one. And actually, I'm criticized for being self-effacing, but anyway, I have been disappointed in my publication side, as not having very much impact. It has a relatively low impact score. I mean this is statistically provable. But anyway, I'm kind of disappointed there, because I had tried to offer a number of ideas that were interesting to me, but, ideas don't grow—one of the mistakes that I think, or one of the changes I've observed is that what gets done now is by teams of people in collaborative kinds of situations, and in education, at least Oregon State is becoming much more collaborative. They're building the buildings to make them more collaborative, the students recognize that they have to work with people from other disciplines, and that's what I enjoyed most. And so anthropology, when I went through it at Arizona, we learned about, you know, all the icons, Mead and Benedict and Harris and all these people who have really—and you know, there've been a group of us living together for this meeting, and we're going back to all these old—Greenberg and all these old folks. But you see, when I took anthropology, you learned it by these people, and you didn't learn it by the theoretical threads so much. My expectations were misled that I could become well-known as an individual, but

really where I get my most enjoyment and probably have had the most impact is with teams of people, and the Blue-Ribbon panel is an example of that.

Actually, I remember one of the funny outcomes of that was we're writing up our report in the last day and John Harville were, and I were, looking at it, and we said, we have nothing on habitat! And so, we wrote up a whole thing on habitat, and that probably had more impact on the [report than] anything else we did for the previous for the 90 pages or whatever it was.

Fiske: It did. It became a big thing that you had to protect it. So, you were talking about that you think that the best way to have—looking back, the best way that you had an impact was as part of a group or part of a team effort, and you also said, as the disappointments question, that I don't think that my efforts led to any substantial impacts: what I learned is that one person alone achieves little; groups of people from different disciplines achieve more, which I think was Spicer's point. And I think that that we do see. I certainly, in my experience as a practicing anthropologist, somebody who's working for the government as a career, that's what I saw too.

Smith: Right.

Fiske: It's not just one person, you're never part of one person, and especially on the Hill, in Congress. It's never one senator's or one person, member's efforts; it's the combination of a lot of different people, sometimes working as a team or working as a network.

Smith: Right.

The Sense of Equality

Fiske: Do you want to talk about any of these other—let me just raise these topics before we go on and see if you want to talk about any of these. We talked about teaching innovations, which is wonderful. These are the other ones: measurement of inequality and the causes of it, the Oregon Sea Grant adapting to change project—I'd love to hear about that, or course—work with and promotion of Oregon's Watershed Council experiment, working on emphasizing the value of public engagement and outreach, and processes to enhance that.

Smith: Well, I would like to talk about the inequality piece. My career, the big focus I've been on is the relationship between ecology and economy, and so when Reagan

became president, I was very concerned about the economy, what was going to happen, and my view of what was going to happen was that our society would become incredibly more unequal. And so, I started working on that problem and spent most of the 80s and early 90s on that, which had nothing to do with Sea Grant. I couldn't find much interest in anthropology about it, and actually the whole project resulted in one of the things I put my most work into and got the least out of. I ultimately wrote a book; I rewrote it four times, and I—one background fact that probably would be helpful is that as someone who has never had a lot of humanities, I never did a lot of writing, and it turns out that I'm also a very slow reader, so my reading is somewhat limited, so I think because of that—and I've been criticized for my writing as I tend to like shorter, more declarative sentences, I don't like to write long sentences—so anyway, when I wrote these books, I was trying to use a kind of evolutionary anthropological approach, because I got interested in this actually—I went on sabbatical to Woods Hole in 1975-76 is when I—I went to Woods Hole and I wrote my *Salmon Fishers of the Columbia*book (1979), and then, you know, I could do most anything I wanted, so I would go up to the Tozzer Library at Harvard about once a week, and then I started looking into ethnographies, and I started in fisheries because I looked at when they had ups and downs at fisheries, what happened to the distribution of catches. And so, that led to well, what happens to the distribution of wealth when you have growth and decline.

Fiske: Yeah.

Smith: So, I then started to look for historic examples of both change through time and also villages in anthropologist terms, you know, bands, tribes, I used [Elman] Service's, bands, chiefdoms, states; what were their wealth distributions. And so, in anthropology it's always been very common to talk about how there's egalitarian societies, which would lead you to believe that things are pretty equal, and then there's the modern states which are very unequal, and actually what I found out there with all these data—I gathered data for hundreds of communities—I found that no community has an egalitarian distribution where everybody is the same. All of them are different and they just vary in terms of how normal or lognormal the curve is. That's very kind of technical, which probably most people don't even understand, but anyway, it means that you have a very large number of people who are in a lognormal distribution who are relatively not well-off, and a very few people who are very well-off. So, I was predicting, in the Reagan administration, we're going through where this tail [of the distribution curve] gets longer and longer and longer. And ultimately that was—is—the case. I mean, I think it's pretty clear now that— [contemporary wealth holders are millions of times richer than most people].

Fiske: You mean that trickledown wouldn't work?

Smith: Well, yeah, and the trickledown notion, the whole notion—and the evidence for this seems to be overwhelming—putting money in at the top of the system, like with tax cuts and all that kind of stuff, that's not going to make the economy better. And it seems to me one of the big lessons of the great recession and the Obama effort to deal with that is that the thing that did the most to help us out of that, at least from the Congressional Budget Office's point of view, was the social security holiday that we gave people where they never really noticed that the money was being given back to them in [reduced] social security [taxes]. And it was only a small amount, it was 15, 20, 50 dollars a month, but that was the most effective thing in starting us out of the great recession, if you look at the Congressional Budget Office's analysis. And that's not the only one, there's not—there's a good bit of economic literature that says if you put money in at the bottom, you're going to get much more growth than if you put in at the top.

So anyway, so that was my belief at that time, and so I went, like not a very good scientist, to prove my belief, and what I came up with is saying that what we do with inequality is we waste a whole lot of talent that lives in this bubble at the bottom where there are all these people that don't have the resources to get good educations, to use their creativity, to contribute to society as they could. And so, it was kind of a very warm-hearted argument that no one really bought. And I don't think people buy it today.

Fiske: What was the name of the book or article—

Smith: The book was called *The Sense of Equality*, and sense was meant in two ways; but the idea was it's the monetary look at inequality and it makes sense to have equality. And so, the whole point was I thought we would be better off if we had more equality. And you can see this in some of the current discussions with guaranteed minimum incomes, and actually some places are beginning to experiment with that.

Fiske: It's totally relevant.

Smith: And I'm totally behind that, but you know, I'm…

Fiske: And who was the publisher for the—

Smith: Well, the book never got published. That was what I regard as the great failure. I did publish an article in *Human Organization*(1995) that kind of summarized the overall theory, I published one in *Social Indicators Research*, and so I took the chapters apart and published a few of them, and that was about as much as I ever got out of that, but I spent a huge part of my career in the 1980s and early 90s working on that. I would work every summer on it, I'd spend a lot of time on it. I was collecting data. I have data that I never analyzed on communities that—the book was accepted a couple of times, but then the editor would move, and I remember one editor writing me, you know, you write so badly that we can't publish your book.

Fiske: [Laughing] love it.

Smith: I think the point is that in a career you can spent a lot of time working on something that doesn't go anywhere, and you could still have an enjoyable and successful career but still spend a lot of time—and I've spent a lot of time on things, like you can go back to those like XCULT and CULMAP. I spent hundreds of hours digitizing the map location of cultures, so we could map out where cultures were, because I thought well, we could use the Human Relations Area Files, and we'll find some new insights, and I'll have all my students working on this in this course on statistical applications in anthropology. Well, we found nothing. So anyway, nothing other than what's already been found—

Fiske: That's worth writing up, I mean—

Smith: Well you see, there's been articles about this, that writing up negative outcomes is not very popular with journal editors. But anyway, so I spent a lot of time on this inequality thing, and it was very important to me, and it still is, but it was something I could not configure in a way that caught attention. So, that's what I mean, you know? You can work on things and not achieve, and a lot of my publications, I just had the idea well, they don't like this, this journal doesn't like it, I'll go over here. In fact, Rich Pollnac would tell me, you just change a few things, make the reference list look like the journal you want it in, send it off to the next journal, and I would do that. And sometimes I would send things to journals that I just wanted them to critique me on. So, I remember sending some of my economic articles to my economic—I did have one in *Economic Development and Culture of Change*; that's where one of these early articles came out from my inequality work—just to get their feedback as to whether I was on the right track or not. So anyway, that was a real time—big piece of my career that really yielded very little.

Watershed Restoration

Fiske: Good. I love your honesty, or your—I don't [know] if it's honesty; it's self-assessment, anyway. So, I do want to talk about the next project on the list, which is Oregon Sea Grant's adapting to change program. Before you start, a preface and truth in transparency, I was the program officer who okayed and promoted that project, probably unknown to you, but I always—I'm so glad that you did that project, and when I saw Court's name on a project, I knew it would have great applicability and great outreach components. But, I use it always, since then, as an example to sort of explain how anthropology works with respect to marine resources, because people would say, you worked in NOAA? Why, or how, and well, how does that work with your cultural anthropology? So, that project really, to me, is one that's helpful to industry, understands the industry—I'll let you explain how you saw it, but I just want to say that it was a—it is still—a great project, and I think a good applied anthropology project.

Smith: Well, I didn't know you supported it, and thank you very much. It was a very wonderful experience, and it led to a lot of things that I thought were quite useful. There was a case of probably I got out more out of it publication-wise than I did in terms of the time I put into it, but it was a very good and enjoyable project. It's one of the few projects I did that was all social scientists in the group of collaborators, pretty much all social scientists—

Fiske: Oh, that's right.

Smith: But they were great social scientists; Susan Hanna, a wonderful economist, who was also an outstanding anthropologist, and she and I did work and surveys and studies of groundfish together. And I'm really proud—like you, I had some influence in her early career, because she was really down on getting publications out after she just finished her dissertation, so we worked together, and I helped her get a few early publications out, which we did as joint publications, and she's just really taken off and become a wonderful contributor and had a tremendous impact on actually the Pacific Fishery Management Council and how they affected fisheries management—so anyway, she was on it—

Fiske: So, the background to the project, what was the problem or issue that—summarize it.

Smith: The purpose of the project was at that time, there was a closure of the Oregon Coho fishery, which meant that a lot of small-boat fishermen could not go fishing, and so what was going to happen to them, how can we help them. And there were good efforts to help them. There were people in family development and human sciences, along with like Ginny Goblirsch and Flaxen Conway, they actually help people understand the role of women in the fishery and how they help the men and they supported them—

Fiske: Keep families afloat.

Smith: Yeah. Well, not only kept families, they kept the fishermen afloat, and they did a lot of the work that was required to keep the fishing business going. And they helped women learn about the relationships they had with their husbands, men being away at sea at times and not being at home, and then, coming home and wanting to take over the family and being kind of the top dog when the women had been running things. Flaxen and Lori Cramer did some community work, and my particular focus was the fishermen, how they adapted to this, and I guess the surprise for me there was that…they won't like me to say this, but they did a really great job. They were really very adaptive (2000). And this is part of why I've always advocated that fisheries not be talked about as like the salmon fishery, the trawl fishery, the shrimp fishery, because that's very biological. We should really be talking about them in terms of human categories: roles that people take in the fishery. And so, there I studied, basically, these small salmon fishers and how they adapted, and they adapted because they had these multiple jobs, and so they put more emphasis on these; the wife would do more of this, and they would do their best to get through it. They weren't happy, they thought they got screwed, they were very angry, they wanted someone to do more for them. And so, actually NOAA did do more for them, and it came up with I guess quite a few million dollars to enable them to become people who started doing some of the early watershed restoration work, and they would do the watershed surveys and do some initial work to figure out what the issues were in different watersheds. So, a lot of the salmon trollers actually got jobs as what they called "jobs in the woods," "fishermen in the woods." And so, first off, I studied how they adapted and then saw that they were taking these jobs—

Fiske: Interesting.

Smith: And then Oregon, at the same time, because the Coho fishery had collapsed, pretty much, they were under pressure to improve it, so they had to figure out a way of doing it, and so they did it by creating watershed councils, which is kind of a

brilliant innovation of actually not me, or any social scientist, but it was an innovation of Governor [John] Kitzhaber and Jim Martin, and particularly Jay Nicholas, who were not social scientists, but they were biologists who could think very—and so they created these watershed councils. And so, I got interested in them and started studying them, and that all came out of this adapting to change project. And so, we did publish an article in *Fisheries* about how the salmon fishermen adapted. It basically showed how their values and attitudes differed from that of managers and biologists— because the fishermen couldn't figure out why they couldn't have more hatcheries, and the biologists wanted to get rid of the hatcheries, and the managers didn't understand the ways the fishermen were adapting and would make rules that made it even harder, because the fishermen were only allowed to fish during particular seasons, and that became less safe—that was another thing that came out of the project, was the management rules created safety hazards for the fishermen and there was a need to get medical care, and I think Ginny and Flaxen worked on that. So anyway, that was a really, I thought, very applied, very productive project with very talented people like Flaxen Conway who was here today, and she's moved into the marine science teaching at Oregon State, she heads up the Marine Resource Management program, and she's doing a great job—

Fiske: I just saw her at the meetings.

Smith: Yeah, she had a lot of her students at the meeting giving [papers]. I think she's done a great job. And so, she was one, and Susan Hanna and Ginny Goblirsch, who was an Extension agent. And so, we'd meet and talk about this project, and out of it came my movement more into looking at watershed restoration and doing some work there with the watershed council concept, both in Oregon and in the whole Pacific Northwest. And actually, being applied and working with watershed councils, for example, the Long Tom watershed council is wanting to know how to evaluate their meetings, so I said well—and they wanted to have a long questionnaire—I said no, no, you don't want to do that; what you want to do is ask them these two questions: what do you like most about what we do, what do you like the least. And they still use that to this day as their measure of—way of getting feedback.

Fiske: It's open-ended, but they figured out a way to analyze that.

Smith: Yeah, and they get specific comments of what they can do. And one of my graduate students wrote the history for the Long Tom watershed council's assessment. Then I wrote an application for an *Ecology and Society* (2009) to get the Long Tom Council the practice award, and so they got a thousand Euros for that. So

you know, so that was more actually practicing, getting out and helping promote the watershed councils.

And then, I retired in 2003, and so I've been retired for a long time, and I probably retired earlier than I wanted to, but that was due to the way Oregon was talking about reconfiguring the retirement program.

I stayed on with the simulation work, trying to do these watershed simulations. And there was another kind of big learning point for me, and that is I was very into incorporating values into the simulations. You know, people have values about what they like about—you know, how they want the environment to be, and so I wanted to put that in there. And I did get it in there, but it turns out that the people who used the model didn't care about the values. They wanted just to know if you do this to the watershed, what's it going to do to water temperature and other things.

Fiske: They were only interested in the ecological, or…

Smith: Yeah, they really only wanted to—they figured that all the social stuff, they didn't need to know. And there was another kind of big learning point for me, and that is I was very into incorporating values into the simulations. You know, people have values about what they like about—you know, how they want the environment [is], and so I wanted to put that in there. And I did get it in there, but it turns out that the people who used the model didn't care about the values. They just wanted to know if you do this to the watershed, what's it going to do to water temperature and other things. So anyway, so that was kind of disappointing to me. I had put in a lot of effort into—that was another thing of big effort with low return. So, that didn't go anywhere, but what I figured out was, if you wrote the policies that went into the model, then you could incorporate your values (2008), and so I did that, and showed that, you know, you could have—

Fiske: That's brilliant.

Smith: And, you have salmon streams that would bring salmon back if you put more trees next to them, stuff like that (2008).

Fiske: Yeah, that's really brilliant, just you incorporate your values, or a set of values into policies that are options in the simulation.

Smith: Right, that's the way—

Fiske: That's just beautiful.

Smith: So anyway, then I kind of went off in other directions. My career has been influenced by someone coming up and saying, would you like to do this, and so I went off and I helped Ben Colombi in a book that he was doing on North Pacific salmon. I went and helped the Northwest Power and Conservation Council do something—it was suggested what they could do to better—well, I wanted to better integrate the public into their process, and they did too, but they didn't want to do things that I was suggesting, which was fine.

Fiske: [Chuckling] we have—go ahead

Smith: Well, it was a great project. I worked very closely with a fishery biologist by the name of Bruce Rieman, and he really had the concepts, and then I helped him flesh them out, but basically, we were talking about four things that they needed to do. They needed to get better engagement, and we gave them some ideas about how to do that. They needed to get better organization so that they could have more integrative work, they needed to have adaptive management, and I should remember the fourth one, but I can't right now, so that's where I was talking about earlier, my brain freeze [It was use the principles of ecological science.] (2015).

Fiske: Right. So, we're at a point where I think we have some residual big picture questions like disappointments, successes, although you've mentioned all of the kind of disappointing outcomes at certain points, but the success stories, the lessons, and other things that we might come back to. We've sort of done a chronological take. We've covered a lot of topics.

Method and Theory

Fiske: Talk about how our methods are.

Smith: Okay, we talk a lot about our methods, you know: they're qualitative, they're quantitative, they're using survey, they're using new techniques of GIS and stuff like—there's a lot of great method to do a lot of things; what I think, we are as a discipline [are] kind of a bunch of silos that are looking specific problems like the international people, what is it…INDR or something like…

Fiske: Yes, the INDR, people that are international UN.

Smith: And so I spent Monday going to their stuff and then I went the next day to the fisheries stuff, and basically it seemed to me they are talking about [the same] problems in different context, but for which there are theories that could apply in both areas, and we haven't done enough in anthropology, in applied, to bridge across those silos. The methods are common all across, we know all about the methods, but we don't know, for example, what are the theoretical insights. Like, we were talking about how values were not of interest to managers, but all the physical outcomes were; well, what you will hear fishery scientists and fishery managers say now is these are not biological problems, they're social problems, and we need to solve the social problem, and that was what we're trying to say to the Northwest Power and Conservation Council: you need to work on the social problems.

And, the thing I forgot was actually ecosystem sciences, you know, the science side. I'd had all these social, okay, they have adaptive management that's social, get better organization, that's social, get more engagement, that's social, and then knowledge was the fourth one. So, we need to figure out a way to engage people to get involved and solve some of these issues, and that's what applied anthropology can offer--how do you get people engaged, how do you deal with people think totally different than you do. And you know, I think we have…What I found in fishery science—and I think they understand it—is they thought that if we told people that this is what happens to the resource and this is the way the system works, then they are going to say oh, well, we're going to need to fix that, but no, they don't say oh, well we're going to stop fishing: they say oh, well that sucks, I don't like that, and I want to do something different. But if you approach them and say well, here is the problem, and what are we going to do about it, do you have some ideas. Well, the people become invested in it, and they probably will come up with some good ideas. So, I think that's one of the big things you hear in all these silos is, okay, get some engagement, get some diverse voices, get some, you know, that's one of the things we have to offer, and we have some techniques to do that.

So, I think that if we could work at synthesizing across the silos in applied anthropology and think about what are some of the really key insights that we have, that we can offer that would be valuable. And then we can go to people and say look, this is what the applied anthropologist can offer you, like in the adapting to change project: okay, here we can do—we can help you understand how the fishermen adapted, we can help you understand how these communities work and how you can enter in and provide them the kind of knowledge and resources that they need. Here are types of jobs that might have been even better than the jobs in the woods program, if you had kind of talked to them, what would they like. And actually some

of the fishermen went from being assessment people to actually making the fences and so on that blocked the cattle from getting in the streams.

But still, getting this more human component into it and then thinking about what is the organization—I mean one of the things that surprised me about watershed councils is it took them forever to get going. They wanted to do projects: we all need to do projects, we want to do projects, but they had to get their 501(c)(3) status, they had to get their insurance, they had to get their bylaws written, they had to get their assessment done, so there was all these beginning things that took a lot of time, which were all social. And so, —and I don't think anybody realized, starting out. They thought well, we'll have these watershed councils, we'll go out and do projects. Then, five years later, they hadn't done any projects, or they're just beginning. So anyway, I think we can offer some insights into that, and that it may take a while to get organized and it's expensive to organized, but long-term it probably is cheaper, and maybe you get a better solution (2002).

Fiske: I see that all over the place, you're absolutely right. I see it in Maryland in the Chesapeake Bay restoration. You know, there's just people that just aren't involved in watershed conservation or improving water quality through conservation, and NOAA and EPA, as the federal side, just don't have the money or the will to put into the community development and the community—understanding the communities, but that is where I see also the biggest bang for your buck.
Smith: Yeah, I agree, and it's actually relatively cheap to do, it's just that they have so much overhead in other stuff that they can't do it. And it's a really difficult kind of budgetary thing to make the change—

Fiske: Yeah, it's a big deal.

Smith: And it's not easy, and it happens very slowly.

Fiske: Maybe at a state level it might be easier to do that, because there is more trust and contact with state level and county level folks.

Smith: Well, in Oregon what made the watershed councils work was some people were bright enough—and I wasn't involved in this either—but some people were bright enough to say here, we have a lottery and this lottery provides umpteen dollars—pretty predictable amount of money per—

Fiske: Statewide lottery?

Smith: Yeah—per year. And so, can we take some of that money and allocate it for the resource? So, they had a ballot initiative—in Oregon they have an initiative and referendum process—and so they had a ballot initiative that said okay, so much proportion of this lottery goes into our salmon restoration program. So, they found a funding source for it. And that's another thing that if we get to people, we—you know, we say, we don't have enough money to do things, well go and talk to people and say okay, where are we going to get the resources to do this? How can we pool our resources? Are there ways we can change the way we do things to be able to accomplish this? And oftentimes, people have some pretty good ideas, and if they're part of it, they're oftentimes more willing to say well, maybe I'll be willing to accept a little higher tax on this, or whatever, to get it done. I mean, our examples were recreation fishermen, take charges on their gear, there's a tax on there, which goes to, what, Ducks Unlimited, and it goes back—to projects.

Fiske: Yeah, that's right…Yeah, one of the things you say is, my greatest successes were in the teaching context and the educational [activities]. I told anthropological stories to my students that they report remembering long after the course was over, and that's very touching. So, you enjoyed joint projects, interdisciplinary—the fishery management Blue-Ribbon Panel, the computer modeling that you did.

Smith: Well, this is part of the theory quest. I was asked by one of my students who was working on a project with me very early and he says, where's the theory here, and that sticks in my mind, because at that time, I didn't really have a theory. Now, I think in my career I have been very influenced by anthropological theory, and for example, as you look at fisheries, to be honest, I don't see a future for being a hook and line whatever, a small-scale fisherman. I'm sorry, but the evolution of society suggests that we are going to—if we're going to eat fish, we're going to domesticate them, just like we did with beef and chickens and all that. And so, I don't see fish being—if it's going to be an important food source, it's going to probably be domesticated, and salmon's going to be domesticated either in the farming of salmon or in the ranching of salmon. Ranching is hatcheries, let them out in the ocean, harvest them, farming them is keeping them in cages.

Fiske: Yeah, it's not domestication in my book, it's ranching or farming, yeah, which are slightly different. You don't domesticate a corn plant.

Smith: Well…yes, you do. I mean the corn we eat is domesticated from the plants that were grown here, and we selected characteristics that we want.

Fiske: We have.

Smith: And we do the same thing with fish. In fact, I have an article that argues that—

Fiske: You husband them.

Smith: Well, what I…I have an article that I wrote as part of this SAR [School for Advanced Research] book, which argues that because of our culture being so agriculturally based, when we think about fishery management, we do it in a very agricultural way. Why do we have hatcheries? Because we think we can produce more by getting into the, you know, like growing lots of carrots from seed and pulling out the small ones so the big ones thrive, that's very much, and we talk about fish culture, we talk about fish planting, when we put salmon out. So, it's a lot of very agricultural terminology and technology that go into fisheries, and so my long-term vision comes kind of from this evolutionary focus, is that we have taken natural resources and domesticated them. It started out with wheat, barley and so on, and then became corn, beans, and squash and so on. And so, the same was probably going to happen to fish—if fish are going to be an important part of our diet, and I think it's already happening (2012). And so, I have made—in fact, I had this—I went to this one conference and I said, salmon are the longhorns of the ocean, and that got kind of a play and someone made a salmon with horns. Anyway, maybe this isn't a success, but it's kind of how anthropology and theory have influenced my thinking.

Fiske: Yeah.

Smith: So, I could be totally wrong that in the long-term future things like salmon, probably carp, tilapia, already, will become the dominant species and they'll be basically farmed. And I think we can farm salmon healthfully, we can farm them out of the ocean so they're not creating waste. —

Fiske: We were talking about theory and how you've been influenced by theory or used it.

Smith: Yeah. And so anyway, the values, intentions and actions came out of my work with the Northwest Power and Conservation Council [and the Evoland simulation}, because I was trying to figure out well, how do we get the actions we'd like. And so, I went back to [Talcott] Parsons and [Edward] Shils and their theory of action. I built out of that and then I got interested in theory of mind, and actually the language is more out of theory of mind, but I think it's very compatible with Parsons and Shils; I think it's

very compatible with a lot of stuff, basically that, people have values—and I would say that's a vision—and I would say the first thing we should be doing, which is part of what anthropology is going to do, is create the vision. Seems to me we go into these problems backwards assuming if we had the right science and if people did things the right way, we'd get a result. I think we have to go in and say, what do we want to achieve here, what's the vision, and then move on.

So, from the vision, the values, come intentions—that are the plans—what are we going to do, what do we think would address this particular issue. And then come the actions. And so, that becomes then a cyclical process, which is kind of adaptive management. We learn. One of the things that I think social science contributes that's vitally important is that you cannot predict how systems are going to respond; you have to respond by adapting. So, for these climate change things, we need to think about, okay, what's the vision, what can we plan to do, what are the actions, and some of them we'll try, and they'll work and some we'll try, and they won't work. And so, I personally think we're going to try to revet the big cities of the world, and we're going to fail and the water's going to come around the other side, and I think it's a wasteful thing to even start to build great big structures to protect New York City. I think we should be moving away from the sea level rise, but I remember my Sea Grant—when I was at Sea Grant, I got interested in climate change; remember I gave a lecture at the end of the time about climate change? And I was going to go back to OSU and work on climate change. Well anyway, I was reading a document and it was about a group that had been invited to Hilton [Head] Island or something in South Carolina, and they were talking about climate change, and this was back in 1985. And, there was a quote there that says well, when the water gets up, we'll start to do something about it. And so, that's my vision of our approach to climate change, is that we're not going to do anything until it starts to happen, and then we're going to do some of these things that are kind of wrong, and that's because we're approaching this from the idea that we can kind of predict the future and figure out—It seems that human adaptation has been a very experimental process of trying things, learning from what we did, trying and so on. So, that's how I got to this values or vision, intention, action.

Fiske: And the title of the book is, for the record?

Smith: What book?

Fiske: Well, I thought you were describing a piece of work or a body of work.

Smith: Well, no, it's not, it's how I grope with trying to come up with—you know, we're really talking about how can we find theory across these silos, so that's what I was trying to come up with, and it seems to me that anthropologists are very into values. I mean the early work in the fisheries where we found that fishermen's values stimulate them to fish more, even if they weren't making a lot of money, so that's where values are. So, that creates the intention to fish, that creates the action to fish, which then comes back and has a feedback to a declining resource, so then you come back and say well, do you really want a system where the resource is always declining? How can we figure out how to change that?

Fiske: Right, at the meetings there were a lot of panels on water resources, as you said, resettlement and disaster and INDR and fisheries, and all of those do have those kinds of issues and problems and focus, and yet, yeah, they're not talking across. It's rare.

Smith: And that's right, where I was saying I went to one day: the international, they were saying the same thing as the fisheries and I, and you know, I went to several different sessions and felt that they had insights that they were coming up with over and over and over, and we haven't synthesized those and said, if you're going to hire an anthropologist, these are the kinds of things that they're going to emphasize. And I think we often are—go back to our methodology and say well, we do ethnography. Well fine, what's that going to do for me? Whereas, if you say, we can go out and help you get better attuned to the community that you're working with, that seems to me to be more important than ethnography. And we're going to find out why it is that what you think is the way things work, isn't. And you know, we can help you through understanding better how this system works. Not that we're doing qualitative or quantitative methods. It doesn't matter. But anyway, that's my view. But sometimes, I have not been able—like, you know, we wrote this for the Columbia River…Northwest Power and Conservation Council, and we gave a presentation to them—this is a council that governs—is mainly charged with [preventing the destruction of] salmon that are destroyed by the hydropower in the Columbia Basin, and it has representatives from—two representatives from each state, Montana, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington, and so, they're the ones that set the policies, and we were trying—Bruce Rieman and I and the rest of us, a group of very eminent more ecological scientists than—obviously than social scientists—trying to tell them how to go forward. It was very interesting that all the biological scientists bought into this fine, but then when it came down to presenting to the council, they said well, that's way too complex, or it's way too difficult for us to do, or we don't have the money, or we tried that, and it didn't work.

Reflections

Fiske: Right. Okay, two other questions. One is the words of wisdom for junior colleagues considering applied work, and then there's other reflections, and then recommendations for disciplines of anthropology, with regards to educating people to become effective in applied and in practicing social science. We could probably wrap all those up together, if you want.

Smith: Okay, well, frame the question you want me to answer. I like the first part of it best, I think.

Fiske: Words of wisdom for junior colleagues considering applied work?

Smith: I would say this is a reflection on my career: I have enjoyed the career, one, for the collaboration and, two, for the variety, but variety has somewhat of a cost to it, and I did not start thinking about how my career might come together as a whole, and if I thought about that—like I have a colleague who is very interested in Japanese women and how they're adapting, and she has been interviewing those women over a 30-year period, so I think that's really great stuff. I thought the stuff on the Columbia, the history that I found, was very useful. So, it seemed to me that if you have a vision of where you want—this gets back to the vision, intention, action—if you have a vision for your career, that you can kind of carve out an area of expertise that will be beneficial and interesting to you and contribute. I feel that I have, you know, done stuff here and then flitted over there and flitted over here and flitted over there, and to some extent that has limited effectiveness, perhaps.

Fiske: And so, what you're saying is that it would be better—or your advice to other people coming up into applied anthropology is to have an overarching vision or theory or direction within which you will interpret a number of different resource management or other problematic areas.

Smith: Right, and actually this is very much anthropology, because in anthropology, we have our people, so people keep going back to their culture, and so in applied anthropology, I don't think necessarily your people, but the question, and I have had questions, inequality, economic growth, those have been questions I have pursued and contributed with the large body politic to dealing with. And like [you] see in many of the talks, like I'm very interested in [C. S.] Hollings's Panarchy, and I got very heavily into that for a while and taught that, and you know, it was a very useful concept. Some of the presentations had to do with a group that runs the journal *Ecology and Society*,

and that has social ecological systems, and so some people want to call them natural-cultural. And that's another thing: we have kind of different languages and I think we can confuse people with the different languages. We talk about social ecological, natural cultural, you know, I'm kind of a lumper, I say, well it seems to me talking about the same thing, the relationship between humans and nature.

Fiske: Right, our terminology is…

Smith: Economists don't quibble about whether they're talking about utility or not, and I didn't quibble about, what it means in a particular situation, but utility is a concept that they talk about. Benefits, costs, you know. So, what are the big concepts of anthropology that we talk about, that are equivalent?

Fiske: Like inequality, I do see that as one. Health disparities.

Smith: Inequality like cultures and how people are organized, that adaptation is a process, it's not something that you can direct. I think there are some major conclusions or major ways of thinking which I think we try to explain with our methodology, but I don't think anyone outside of anthropology will understand, what does it mean to do ethnography. We need to put it in the language of our users and think about who we're trying to work with.

Fiske: That's very useful. I mean, I do agree that we need to put our concepts in the language of the users, and I think that traditionally we haven't, and that's always been one of the things that I have found most helpful about being a practicing anthropologist, is whenever I write or talk to people, I try to do that, not always successfully. I do think we have our own historical set of terminology and lexicography. Participant observation, ethnography, you know, people take from that what they want, but if we had some better way of using their language, it would be helpful.

Smith: I think we want to let people know that, we would like to interact—what is participant observation? It is I'd like to interact and learn how you do things. And I think why we have so many silos in society and in our discipline is we tend to want to tell people how things are rather than say well, how does it feel to you, what's your thoughts about this, and that seems to me what the ethnographic process is all about. It's I want to learn about your culture, I want to understand how you live. And so, when we take that into the problems of our own society, we don't come in as experts, we come in as saying, how can I help you work through the problem. And it's not

something that we're going to tell you how to do; it's something we're going to work through, through this value, intentions, actions kind of framework, or adaptive management or whatever. But then again, what I've come to realize is that people would rather not experiment with their societies. I mean, I'm much more willing to experiment, but others are not, and maybe it's because I live in a very favored position and the experiments may not destroy me as badly as others.

Fiske: Any other reflections, or have we left out anything in this conversation?

Smith: I think I got all the major points. I think maybe I'm a little disjointed in how I did it, but the…I think we've dealt with the temporal flow, which kind of refers to an evolution of how I've come to where I am now, and I think that…I hate to say it, but I think I am about done. I'm still very interested, I love to go to the meetings and hear people's ideas. I get frustrated because I think I've heard this over and over and over and I'd like to move on from that, but—

Fiske: That's a very interesting observation.

Smith: Okay. But anyway, I think there's a lot of good—

Fiske: Well, with the society in particular, you've been active in the American Fisheries Society and some other groups, and SfAA; what has it meant to have SfAA as one of your set of organizations for membership? As either emotionally or, I guess value-wise or role-wise.

Smith: Well, I think it's been very helpful to have a set of colleagues who we can talk about these issues. Again, I think the SfAA meetings are very valuable with that, the conversations, the site of the meeting. So, you know, there's been this cadre of people, and because I haven't kept up as well as I should, I don't know all the people now, but there is a cadre of people who have been interested in these natural resource, fisheries and other natural resource problems. I think I've always said that [for] an anthropologist [it] doesn't matter what the physical situation is, the same concepts apply, whether I'm studying water resources or fisheries or watershed restoration. The same issues and concepts come up to me every time. Anyway, that's consistent, and it's nice to have the colleagues you can talk to about that and share your feelings with it. It turns out that most of the—many—a very large proportion of the people that have interacted in SfAA that have been interested, particularly in fisheries, have also been active in AFS, the American Fisheries Society. Bonnie McCay, she's actually been one of the keynote speakers at the American Fisheries

Society. And there's a socioeconomic section, you know, Peter Fricke was the head of it for many years, and I was head of it at one point in time.

Fiske: I belonged at one point in time, too.

Smith: Yeah. Well, I still belong to it, but I think that's been a group I've enjoyed working with. I think anthropologists, some of them have a chip on their shoulder, relative to other social science disciplines, and particularly economics, and I have always wanted to be more open to other people's disciplines and understand them. And you know, I tried actually to bridge with the satisfaction bonus, the fisheries and wildlife concept of maximum sustainable yield and the satisfaction bonus, and then once I did that and I thought I had a pretty well hand, fishery biologists started to cannibalize their own concept of maximum sustainable yield and all that. So, it kind of was another effort that went kind of down a blind path, but it was interesting and useful. So anyway, but it's nice to have the colleagues to be able to have the support and someone to talk to.

Fiske: Absolutely.

Smith: I think that's very valuable. And I think the meeting planners, sometimes they're not as careful about understanding that they have a meeting of silos and that they tend to make it so that some of the silos are conflicting, not that you couldn't do it and it wouldn't happen anyway. But anyway, I've enjoyed the opportunities to—like at least for me, like I had what I would call an international settlement and displacement day, a fisheries day, a climate day and then the meetings, and pretty much…

Fiske: Right, I think that's really good advice for SfAA and for meeting planners, because I do agree with you.

Smith: And I really did enjoy your opening session. I thought that was outstanding, and it really was—it was very much what I'd like to see integrated. It brought a lot of people from different backgrounds and brought them together around an issue that related to this region, which was very, very good, very outstanding. And I thought the discussion then began to get into this kind of how can we deal with this, and you had a lot of people coming in with their ideas, and that was great. So, it was a good model for how to do things.

Fiske: I thought it was a good panel, too. I was really happy with the results, and the end point where we did talk about how people can get engaged, whether in their communities or a big community in general.

Smith: Yeah, I thought it was great.

Mentoring

Fiske: Before we end up with this session—and we may do another session—but before we end up, I want to say for the record that I was glad that you talked about teaching and mentoring as one of your success areas, because I was one of Court's mentees. Court was really instrumental in my joining of the Sea Grant program, which turned out to be a great career.

Smith: That's wonderful.

Fiske: And had I not been introduced by Court, I probably never would have gone there. Anyway, so thanks.

Smith: I really appreciate that, and actually I'm very proud that I was able to help you at that point in your career, because my perception was that you were in a difficult time, they were closing the policy part in NOAA—

Fiske: Oh, they were, yeah.

Smith: And so, you had to look for a place to go, and I'm really happy you went into Sea Grant and provided the leadership there that you did, and then provided the leadership in the Society [SfAA] and the Washington Association of Professional Anthropologists. I mean, you've become a much greater and better leader than I was, so I'm really happy with that.

Fiske: Yeah, me too.

Smith: And Susan Hanna is another case where I thought I helped in [her] early career, and I was really proud of that.
Fiske: Yeah, you should be. Thanks.
Smith: Well, those to me mean a lot, and those are what I feel are really enduring successes, and I'm very happy that you feel that way, and I'm happy that I was able to help.

Fiske: And glad that this—

Smith: And it's fine to get emotional about it, because I'm, as I would say, I would list that as some of my greatest achievements. Now, I would like to talk about the Tasaday a little bit.

Tasaday

Fiske: Okay, yeah.

Smith: And as an applied piece, because the Tasaday are a great conflict within anthropology. They're a group of people that were discovered in the Philippines about 1970, and they were a group of people who appeared to be a band-level society, if we take an evolutionary point of view. They were a foraging society, they lived in the rural Mindanao, and they were discovered by a guy by the name of Manuel Elizalde, who had a questionable reputation. I met a news reporter by the name of John Nance, and we became very close friends, and John was labeled by the American Anthropological Society as, you know, persona non grata. He supported the notion of the Tasaday and the notion that they were a—he got in trouble for calling them stone-age people, using perhaps language that wasn't appropriate, but we all use the wrong language sometimes. And so, I was kind of an advisor to him as he tried to come to grips with why anthropologists would not accept his story. And basically, I did accept his story. I might have used different language to talk about it. I helped him—he was very emotionally tied to the Tasaday, wanted to help them, spent a lot of money helping them. I provided him some—for me at that time it was a lot of money—trying to help them. We [Friends of the Tasaday Board] had an applied program: we're going to educate people, we're going to teach them how to produce products, we're going to help them—the education was to help them, so they could deal with the modern Philippine community; to develop production techniques so they'd have an economy, provide them medical care so they'd be healthy. So, we had a program to help them, and they have—I don't really know where they are now, because John died about five years ago and I lost contact. Cornell got all his archives, but the applied part, I never knew what happened to that.

But anyway, during his lifetime, we put a lot of effort into helping these people make the transition to a life that they would like to lead in contemporary society. And so, he was criticized because they wore Nike shirts, they had clothing that we wouldn't expect foragers to have, and a lot of things were taken out of context and moved around to create this…And I could be wrong, but these were a group of people who

apparently, as best I can determine from some of the work that's been done subsequently, were forced into isolation, and actually probably were a process of what [Clifford] Geertz had called devolution; they actually went back to a way of living that was what was sustainable for them, and they lived in this forest and were discovered as people tried to log the forest, and the Philippine government actually provided a reserve for them. The reserve became very valuable and others wanted to get in there for the mineral and the timber, and so, and they had to—the Tasaday—had to link up with others, and John helped them do that. So, that was a very applied piece, which I never went to the Philippines, which I dealt with as kind of advisor, which I felt we had a good program. But lots of anthropologists think that it's all a bunch of bologna.

Fiske: So, they were discovered by an anthropologist, Elizalde?

Smith: Elizalde was a very rich Philippine businessman who came across these people in about 1970, and so, at the time, he invited a number of Philippine anthropologists in to study them. They did do a lexicon of their language. In fact, you went to Stanford, right?

Fiske: I did.

Smith: Right, and there was a linguist that worked on this from Stanford, a woman. I'd have to look up the name [Carol Maloney]. But anyway, she did some of the language work there and determined that this was a separate language. There were other Philippine anthropologists that also did language work, but there were many people that—early on—that studied them. But Elizalde, I think correctly decided that he was having too much impact on them, so he said okay, we're going to stop contact, we're going to let them continue to live as they were. And so, they continued to make contacts outside the forest, because Elizalde had at least introduced them to something, another world out there. They began to marry their neighbors and began to become more involved with the outside, and then a news…

Fiske: John Nance.

Smith: Well no, it was another guy's name I can't remember right—well, I can look it up—but who was a news reporter from Europe [OswaltIten], and he went in there and found them wearing clothes and so on—because he'd heard about this story and he went in to check it out—and he found them wearing clothes and felt that they were a hoax. And then, so there was a—ABC had a 20/20 thing on this, and at least the way

John Nance tells it, they took his words, and if you look at the videos, took his emotions and kind of moved it around in the report so that it made him look very bad and made the people who were advocating for the—saying it was a hoax—very right on. And so, ABC did something, British TV, BBC did another one. There were many, several really high-profile videos done, in the, I would say late eighties. And this is one of the stories that I would tell in my class, and I would develop it with, okay, here's this, quote, stone age people, here they're a hoax, here they are now, what do you think, kind of thing, and I'd leave it open-ended for the students and I wouldn't tell them what I actually thought about it. But anyway, that was something that was very applied and which I used, you know, what I thought were good anthropological social concepts to help design a program.

Fiske: And issues, you know, because it really made the students grapple with—

Smith: Well yeah, and I—it was really probably for the students, it was made them grapple with, you know, what do you do in these situations, and were they—, how would you interpret this.

Fiske: Yeah, you did mention the Tasaday there. I must have already been in Washington. Well, so as far as the formal interview goes, should we take a break now? Have we got everything—? We—we can…

Key Citations

2015 "A Comprehensive Approach for Habitat Restoration in the Columbia Basin." Bruce Rieman (first author), Courtland L. Smith, R. J. Naiman, G. T. Ruggerone, C. C, Wood, N. Huntley, E. N. Merrill, J. R. Alldredge, P. A. Bisson, J. Congleton, K. D. Fausch, R. Lamberson, C. Levings, W. Pearcy, D. Scarnecchia, and P. Smouse. FISHERIES 40 (2):124-135.

2012 "Introduction: Cultivating Capture Fisheries: Lessons from Salmon Cultures and Culturing" in Keystone Nations: Indigenous Peoples and Salmon across the North Pacific. Benedict J. Colombi and James F. Brooks, editors. School for Advanced Research Press, Sante Fe, NM, pp. 3-24.

2009 "Social Infrastructure to Integrate Science and Practice: The Experience of the Long Tom Watershed Council." Flitcroft, Rebecca L. (first author), Dana C. Dedrick, Courtland L. Smith, Cindy A. Thieman and John P. Bolte. ECOLOGY and SOCIETY 14 (2):36 [online]
URL: https://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol14/iss2/art36/

2008 "Policy research employing agent-based modeling to assess future impacts of urban expansion onto farm and forest lands." Guzy, Michael R. (first

author), Courtland L. Smith, John P. Bolte, David W. Hulse and Stanley V. Gregory. ECOLOGY AND SOCIETY 13 (1): 37.

2002 "Assets to Move Watershed Councils from Assessment to Action." with Jennifer Gilden, JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION, 38 (3): 653-662.

2000 "Human and Habitat Needs in Disaster Relief for Pacific Northwest Salmon Fisheries." with Jennifer D. Gilden, FISHERIES 25 (1): 6-13.

1995 "Assessing the Limits to Growth," BIOSCIENCE 45 (7): 478-483 and "Response," BIOSCIENCE 46 (1): 6.

1991 "Patterns of Wealth Concentration," HUMAN ORGANIZATION 50 (1): 50-60.

1979 Salmon Fishers of the Columbia. Oregon State University Press, Corvallis, OR. 117 pp.

1972 The Salt River Project: A Case Study of Cultural Adaptation to an Urbanizing Community. The University of Arizona Press, Tucson, AZ. 151 p. Selected as a significant Arizona reference.