

Transcript of the Presidential Panel on the topic of “Should the AAPA change our name?” held at the at the 87th Annual Meeting in Austin Texas (Saturday, April 14, 2018).

Transcribed by Leslie Aiello, President, American Association of Physical Anthropologists

Leslie Aiello: [00:00:00](#) This presidential panel of the 87th annual meeting of the AAPA (that may not be the AAPA much longer) is about our name, the American Association of Physical Anthropology. Whether or not it continues to be the AAPA is up to you. I'm really happy to see such a large audience because what I want to do is talk through what is possible, what the procedures are, and also discuss some of the issues. But before I start we have to give credit for the photo to Jon Marks who has been passing out little slips of paper with it throughout the meeting. If you don't recognize the guy he's Alex Hrdlicka who was the founder of both the American Journal of Physical Anthropology and of our association.

This panel is going to have a very loose organization. I'm going to start out by setting the parameters for the discussion and give a very short introduction to the issues. Then we will have a few of our members give short statements. The first will be Leslea Hlusko who ran our Pollitzer Prize competition when the question was, “Should we change our name.” She will give us the student's perspective from those essays. She read a hundred and eighteen of them. So I think we should really thank her for going through all those.

Leslie Aiello: [00:01:44](#) This will provide us with a good perspective of the breadth of what some of our younger members feel about the issue. And when she finishes talking, we're going to have Milford Wolpoff and Jon Marks give comments for why we may not want to change the name. This may not be their personal opinion, but they've offered to give the counter argument. And I don't imagine this will take more than, half an hour or so because we want to give you as much time as possible to express your opinion and please don't be shy! The executive committee will use the results of our discussions here to inform us as we move forward.

Leslie Aiello: [00:02:48](#) So, we want to hear everybody's opinions and this is not a time to be embarrassed if you have a counter opinion to what maybe you think the majority of the audience thinks -- we want to get a breadth of opinion on this issue. We've decided to audio record the session and this again, is to inform the executive committee as well as members who aren't able to attend and, parts of the discussion but also be posted on the AAPA website. And we're going to also transcribe the, meeting. So, your participation in

the discussion is your agreement for the association to use the audio recordings in these ways. I wanted to make sure it was totally clear that we are audio recording the session.

Leslie Aiello: [00:03:52](#) When you make your contribution, please begin by identifying yourself. And because we are audio recording the discussion, please come up and use the microphone, in the aisle because you won't be picked up on the audio recording unless you go through the microphone. OK? Now, at the 2016 annual business meeting, there was an ad-hoc committee appointed to consider the implications and ramifications of a potential name change. We were supposed to have this panel last year in New Orleans, but it was postponed by the March for Science. And so what we're doing is picking up from the recommendations of the committee. The committee was charged with looking into three areas in relation to name change. First are the legal issues and potential real costs of a change in the name. Second, there are the intertwined issues of the Association and Journal names, and third are the opportunity costs of actually changing the name of a historical association.

Leslie Aiello: [00:05:11](#) I'm not going to talk too much about these, but to inform our discussion, we need to be totally clear about the issues. First the legal issues and potential real costs of a name change are not insurmountable so, the logistics of a potential name change should not hamper us. But the name can't be changed instantly. A name change would require a bylaws change of the association. And we have procedures in place to change the bylaws. The executive committee spent quite a bit of time on Wednesday talking about procedures moving forward. And what we've decided to do is post information from the panel in a user friendly condensed form and also the entire transcripts of the discussion.

Leslie Aiello: [00:06:14](#) Early in the fall when people are back from field work we are going to run a non-committal general survey of the entire membership. One of the reasons we're doing this is that only full/regular members have voting rights in the association and we feel that it's very important for us to survey the entire membership, including our large number of student members to see what the opinion is. We held a past presidents' discussion on Thursday morning and the unanimous opinion of 10 past AAPA presidents was that our association is in the hands of our young members.

Leslie Aiello: [00:07:16](#) Seriously, you are the future of the association. And what we want to do is make sure that we know what the opinions of the entire membership are. So this will happen in the fall and we

will notify you through the, newsletter and through the social media and will go out of our way to make sure everybody knows what the schedule is. Based on the results of the survey we have a procedure for the executive committee to initiate a change of the bylaws. Any change has to be initiated from the executive committee who brings it to the next business meeting which at the earliest will be Cleveland 2019. The executive committee has decided that their decision to move forward will be based on a vote of the eligible membership and this will be taken before the Cleveland meeting. Again, we will notify every one of the schedule.

Leslie Aiello: [00:08:27](#) So if the membership votes to move forward with the name change, then we will initiate the process according to our bylaws. Again a bylaws change must be presented at one business meeting and then confirmed at the next business meeting. So we can only move as rapidly as our regulations and rules allow. The earliest that a name change can be affected, if that in fact was what we decide and what the membership agrees would be at the business meeting in Los Angeles in 2020. So this is what the procedure will be all. Are there any question?

Matt Cartmill [00:09:23](#) Yeah. Matt Cartmill from Boston University. I don't have a copy of the bylaws or the constitution, but it's my recollection that there are in fact mechanisms for initiating changes in both documents from the floor of the business meeting. They still have to go through the two year procedure but it doesn't have to come down as an approved a motion from the executive committee. Is that correct?

Leslie Aiello: [00:09:53](#) My understanding is that motions are initiated from the business meeting. I think that we want to use the procedures described because our bylaws specify that at the second meeting, the change can be confirmed by a majority of the individuals attending the business meeting. The opinion of the executive committee is that this issue is too important to rely only on those individuals who are at the business meeting. We wanted to really make sure that we are moving on the opinion of our entire membership. So this is the procedure that the executive committee has established.

OK, now the second issue, which is perhaps one of the most serious issues is, the issue of the Association and the Journal names because some of you, in particularly our younger members might not realize that the association does not own the Journal.

Leslie Aiello: [00:11:07](#) The Journal is owned by Wiley. And in fact we have Paul-André Genest, our publishing manager from Wiley here. And he's our liaison and we also have him to thank for the wonderful, 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebration activities we've had this year. But any name change of the journal would have to be in association with Wiley and since Wiley owns it, they would have to be in agreement with it. And this is an unknown right now and it would be a complication as we move forward. So we, able change our name. We also own the title of the Yearbook of Physical Anthropology, so it would be within our remit to change the name of the Yearbook of Physical Anthropology, but not the journal.

Leslie Aiello: [00:12:08](#) There are also opportunity costs of changing a historical association or journal name. And one of the things that we do need to consider and I think will come up in the discussion is a hundred year legacy that we have of this name. And the value of that in relation to the value of changing the name and bringing this association into the 21st century. So these are the areas that I want you to think about when you respond and also listening to the presentations now. The main issue is basically should "physical" be removed from our name.

Leslie Aiello: [00:13:08](#) The second issue is what would be a desirable replacement name to characterize the discipline. And I think Leslea is going to talk about some of the various names that have been suggested in the student essays. I think the executive committee naively thought it was only a question between physical and biological? There are other possibilities that have been suggested. It was also quite a surprise to us that American should be removed from our title. And there were many people who suggested perhaps it should be international or we just drop a geographical location completely. The third issue is that if the decision is taken to change the name of the association, should we also pursue a name change for the journal?

I'll call up Leslea and she can start the discussion and then we'll go to the counter argument.

Leslea Hlusko: [00:14:31](#) Hello. Thank you. It's, an honor to get, to have the opportunity to speak for 118 students. These are the 118 students who participated in last year's Pollitzer competition. Are some of you in the room? Anyone who wrote a 2017 Pollitzer? All right. So thank you, thank you.

Leslea Hlusko: [00:14:55](#) I will do my best to attempt to summarize some of the highlights out of that, but if I don't represent your particular thoughts on this or if you think I've misrepresented something,

please definitely speak up afterwards. This is a heavy job. So as, as Leslie had said, we decided to remind the students that the National Science Foundation changed the name of the program to a biological anthropology. The question was whether this something that we should do as an organization? And if we did change our name, what should we change? Our name to, and maybe it was because it was in New Orleans, but we had an amazingly diverse draw of students who participated in submitted essays.

We usually have somewhere around 76 or so. And as I mentioned, we had 118 last year, so it brought a lot of diverse voices and I loved that it included almost all the four fields of anthropology in this. There was definitely a cultural anthropology strain that ran through this. Someone, at least one of the students had brought up a comparison to the British Social Anthropology versus American Cultural Anthropology as another time within anthropology where terminology was an issue and carried with it meetings larger than just a dictionary definition. Of course, following on that, there were lots of linguistic analyses. So some students brought up that the word physical, comes from the Latin word word Physica, which relates to nature, whereas biological is from the Greek word bios for life.

Leslea Hlusko:

[00:16:47](#)

So then whichever way they went with it, it was all over the board. Some students argued that basically there was not much difference between those two words and that both of them encompass what we do. And so you could either argue that there's this order, this law of priority, which is like taxonomy, right? So whichever was the word you had first was the one we should stick with because there's not enough difference. But then other students would argue since they're interchangeable, we should use biological because of a more recent context around that term. Other students had brought up this idea that one of those words is more static and one of the more dynamic and reading into it that physical is a more static term. And they were seeing biological as a more dynamic term and they were thinking that our discipline has moved from being more of an analysis of static variation to this, this now an investigation, these more dynamic processes and that, that would justify or require this shift in name from physical too.

Leslea Hlusko:

[00:17:56](#)

Biological, there were actually a few students who thought that physical is a broader term because it would include the physical sciences in it as well, but there was disagreement over whether physical was too narrow or whether it was broader than biological. So the meaning of words -- words have meaning --

was definitely a theme that resound through all of the essays. They also noted -- at least one of them noted --that acronyms have meaning as well, that if we did change our name to the American Association of Biological Anthropology, our acronym would be AABA and there was a little concerned that that sounds a little too much like a Swedish music dance party.

Leslea Hlusko: [00:18:47](#)

But more seriously there was a very common theme that the word physical evokes an antiquated, dark and embarrassing passed. And I quote, we have changed. We have changed and our name must change as well. Another quote, if we are going to change the name of the discipline, it only makes sense to also change the name of the association. Many of the students noted that when we introduce ourselves to people many of us call ourselves biological anthropologists, mini departments or biological anthropology courses, textbooks, all of that. They also brought up other organizations and what names they have. So there is the British Association for Biological Anthropology and Osteoarchaeology, the Canadian Association of Physical Anthropology. There's the Southwestern Association of Biological Anthropologists, etc. And so the majority of those, especially the ones that have been named more recently, have gone with biological

Leslea Hlusko: [00:20:09](#)

So I'd like to read a couple more quotes than for you. Today's biological anthropology is not your grandfather's physical anthropology. And then this one kind of resonates.

Leslea Hlusko: [00:20:27](#)

It sends shivers down my spine when I read this. One is that physical anthropology refers to a narrow bit of the discipline of which I am ashamed. And I think we all understand that sentiment in the past. Then the question is what do you do with that? So if you change the name, as one pointed out, changing the name of the field is an attempt to formally distance it from its seedy past Is that a good thing or a bad thing? So some students took the approach that if we try to whitewash history, we are getting rid of that past and pretending like it didn't happen so we shouldn't change the name so that we keep that as a reminder of that quote unquote seedy past. But most of the students actually thought that that was exactly why we should change it because if some people are finding it offensive to be constantly reminded of that, that the some of the racist language and racist research that happened at the beginning of our discipline that that we should get rid of it and redefine ourselves with a new name.

Leslea Hlusko: [00:21:35](#)

It also reminded me very much of arguments in taxonomy where before with physical versus biological, the idea was, is

there too much variation that we should change the name in accordance with the variation in what we were encompassing under that term, but then you also get to these ideas about cladogenesis versus phyletic evolution. So has there just been a lot of phyletic evolution, but you want to stick with the same species name or have we actually had a whole cladogenetic event that would require a name change in order to not be paraphyletic?

Leslea Hlusko:

[00:22:13](#)

They did not get into that nuance. There were really two critical points that kept coming up for the students. It was the 1951, Washburn definition of the new anthropology. And then there was Agustin Fuentes' 2010 paper. Both of those were cited in probably almost every single one of the essays. These were incredibly thoughtful and well researched essays. I have to say I was very impressed, but I do there was one student that started their essay with a quote that they had pulled from a Hrdlicka 1921 paper and it was so shockingly racist that I literally almost jumped back in my seat when I was reading it and that was when I decided that I absolutely agree with the majority of the students, solidified my opinion that it's probably time to change the name.

Leslea Hlusko:

[00:23:12](#)

Here are the counts on how the students tallied in terms of their opinions. So again, there were 118 essays. Ninety nine of them made a really strong case for a name change. Eighteen of them made really strong cases to keep the name and one student said it kind of depends on how hard it is to change the name. So only two students brought up the issue of the journal name as possibly being really difficult to change and that we should consider that. There was also the student who was like, oh, changing the name of the journal is super easy.

We had a lot of recommendations for a new name. Seventy-two suggested the American Association of Biological Anthropology. But I'd like to read you some of the others. Give you some ideas. It's nice when you just leave it open. Students are very creative. So there's:

- The American Association of Anthropological Sciences,
- American Association of Bio Cultural Anthropology,
- American Association of Biological Anthropology,
- American Association of Evolutionary Anthropologists,
- American Association of Integrated Integrative Biological Anthropology.
- American Association of Physical and Biological anthropology.

- Association of Biological Anthropologists,
- Biological Anthropology Association
- Society for Biological Anthropologists
- Society for American Biological Anthropologists.
- International Association of Biocultural Anthropologists
- International Association of Biological Anthropologists
- International Bio, Cultural Anthropology and Outreach Association
- International Conference for Biological Anthropologist
- Biological Anthropology Association of North America
- Biological Anthropology Association of the United State

I'm actually in a department of integrative biology. I do not suggest adding in the word integrative because no one knows what it means. Just saying, even my Dean is like, I don't know what you all do.

- American Association of Physical and Biological Anthropology: three students actually suggested that one as a solution to the problem.
- Association of Biological Anthropologists
- Biological Anthropology Association
- Society for Biological Anthropologists
- Society for American Biological Anthropologists.

So there were actually a few students who took up the whole point about American and what exactly did we mean by American and, and felt that since our organization is more inclusive that the name of the organization should also be more inclusive as. And so some of the names I already read get rid of the American, but I'll read some of the other ones that are more specifically addressed. That one suggestion was the International Association of Biocultural Anthropologists, um, International Association of Biological Anthropologists, international bio, cultural anthropology and outreach association, International Conference for biological anthropologist. And then there's one student did this really beautiful walk through of all the different things that we might be meaning when we use American in our title and came up with some suggestions for names that would better reflect what you maybe intend. And one of those was biological anthropology association of North America or do we mean the biological anthropology association of the United States? And I thought both of those were really pushing it because they do make us reflect. What do we mean by the term America and American?



There were, we're also quite a few students who had this same sentiment, and I'll read you a quote, "...don't use a name change to wipe our hands of our field's racist past without also taking steps to confront and address racism and our own roles in perpetuating it today."

- Leslea Hlusko: [00:27:00](#) Another quote. AAPA has been a leader in championing inclusivity. Changing the name of the organization complements that. So to summarize the 2017 Pulitzer essays in response to the question that Agustin when asked in the abstract of his 2010 yearbook article, which I mentioned was much cited. The question is, "...are we biological anthropologists yet?" The students reply with a resounding, and I quote, "...we have arrived at the destination."
- Leslie Aiello: [00:27:46](#) Thank you Leslea. Next, I'd like to call Milford Wolpoff
- Milford Wolpoff [00:28:24](#) I'm Milford Wolpoff. I'm from the University of Michigan. I joined this association I think in 1965 and I have grandchildren. I have to say I enjoyed your presentation. I agree with large parts of it. And the only thing I would even dream of correcting is Washburn's paper in 1950. It was on the new physical anthropology, but that does raise some issues and I'm going to try to address at least a few of them. Not too many.
- Milford Wolpoff [00:29:04](#) I think the main thing is I agree with Leslea about many things, but the important one for me was, I think we've mostly made this change. It's a funny. Everybody hasn't made it. Of course not --- we couldn't agree on the time of the day. We all have watches in front of us, but I think most of us self-identify as biological anthropologist for whatever that's worth. I think it's true.
- Milford Wolpoff [00:29:28](#) We have to take that into account, but also be with the students who said our history is racist. The question is whether we want to change the name – physical anthropology – which is associated with the racist past of our field? So this is what I want you to think about because if we are who we are and we don't think we're that anymore, maybe it's a good idea to keep the name. Keep the lineage. So I want to say today that a case can be made for not changing the name.
- Milford Wolpoff: [00:31:07](#) [Milford continues singing] Because of our traditions, we've kept our balance for many, many years. Here at the AAPA – not, please, the AABA -- we have traditions for everything: how to give papers ... how to measure skulls ... how to make our results sound like they MEAN something ... when they don't. For instance, we always wear a little name tag on a string

-- and we turn it backwards so no one can read it. This shows our devotion to truth above personalities.

And because of our traditions, we all know who we are. We just look at the backside of the name tag.

Who are we? We are PHYSICAL anthropologists. Not like our so-called colleagues (LONG PAUSE) -- the SPIRITUAL anthropologists. We have a HARD science, because we deal with hard objects. PHYSICAL objects. Remember that word: PHYSICAL. And that means BONES. And nu, maybe also some teeth.

Who set the aims and title for our science,  
Started up our meetings, trained our greatest minds?  
And who brought the metric indices from Europe,  
Filling up the journal he began?

Milford Wolpoff [00:33:24](#) Love to take credit for these wonderful words, but they're not mine. They're Matt Cartmill's. He wrote them for me. Brilliant and I deeply appreciate it, but Matt, once we just say this, we have no intent of offending anybody in this presentation, but if there's any offense, it's on me. It's not on Matt.

Milford Wolpoff [00:33:43](#) and I think Karen [Rosenberg], who found the karaoke accompaniment. Look, I will only say one more thing and that is I think there is a compromise here that at least saves part of the tradition and saves the journal name and that is the journal now says this, the Journal of the American Association for Physical Anthropologists. I don't see why it can't say it's the Journal of the American Association of Biological Anthropologists or something along those lines. So maybe a compromise. We can be like the fiddler on the roof and balance.

Leslie Aiello: [00:34:31](#) Thanks you -- and before we open up the discussion, I think John Mark's would like to make some comments -- before the session he told me to just tell him which way to argue and he would do it!

Jon Marks: [00:34:51](#) No, I should never try and follow Milford. But this clearly is the sunrise of a biological anthropology association and the sunset of the physical anthropology. But my name is Jon Marks., I'm a professor of some kind of anthropology at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. Let me just start off with some historical notes. You know, our journal and our association was founded by Hrdlicka --- and Hrdlicka was a dick!

Jon Marks: [00:35:37](#) The fact of the matter is that he would not publish anything in AJPA while he was editor that had statistics in it. When Sherry Washburn wanted it to publish his early research on the evolution of the skull bones, Hrdlicka would not let that experimental work into the journal because he felt it had nothing to with physical anthropology or human evolution? In the 1990s I actually brought this topic up, a physical versus biological anthropology to distinguish old members of our association. Both Sherry Washburn and Ashley Montagu favored biological over physical as a better description of what the field has become since the 1960s --- for example, primate behavior and genetics are biological subjects without necessarily being “physical,” in the sense of “bones” which are still a dominate subject in the field.

Jon Marks: [00:37:00](#) I would like to mention that I don't think we need to change everything at once. We have three entities with names to consider – the Journal, the Yearbook and the association. The yearbook didn't originate at the same time as the journal (in 1918) but in the late 1940s and became integrated in the association in the 1950, when it was edited by John Buettner-Janusch -- And if you don't know who that was, you really ought to find out. But apparently we do own the name of the Yearbook of Physical Anthropology and we could change that in a heartbeat as a first step towards moving towards a new identity.

Speaker 4: [00:38:36](#) Those are the principal issues that I have. I think we can change the name of the Yearbook probably first and then work on the journal and the, and the association.

With the journal – tradition is important – and it certainly did publish a lot of racist work. In a large sense we invented the scientific study of race in the modern age. But you know, if you go back to the American Naturalist in the early decades of the 20th century, that stuff was there too. There was a lot of overlap between the biologists and the biological anthropologists. Some of you may know Charles Davenport, the eugenics physical anthropologist from the 19 teens and twenties. When he died in 1942, he was the sitting president of this association. So there is a lot of overlap. We are not alone in having an ignominious past. I think that biological is the way to go to represent the current membership and the direction that the field is taking. Certainly this is the way that the textbooks are going.

- Leslie Aiello: [00:40:37](#) I don't want to put anyone on the spot, but I'm going to call on Agustin Fuentes because he has been quoted so profusely. Do you want to start off the conversation and the discussion?
- Agustin Fuentes: [00:41:15](#) There's nothing in our field as wonderful as realizing that someone actually read something you published!
- Agustin Fuentes: [00:41:25](#) All right. I feel extremely strongly about the name change for all the reasons that have been outlined -- and I think reflects what we do. I've tried as have many others to outline what it means to do biological anthropology, -- we are the most dynamic, the most active and probably the most important cluster of researchers I think in the contemporary area. I think we lead in the 21st century in what we do and what we have the potential to impact, not just in your own studies but actually more broadly in public fields and in other disciplines. We are better positioned. We have a broader methodological and theoretical toolkit and we're actually training students to draw from diverse methodological theoretical context and apply those in novel ways.
- Agustin Fuentes: [00:42:16](#) I can't understand. I cannot envision what I've just described under the term physical anthropology and I think for that reason we should change. There might be some hassles, but I think it better and more accurately reflects who we are, who we want to be and better describes us for the world and for the public where we need to be much more active -- where all of us need to be much more active. The term physical anthropology carries a specific weight and as pointed out here, not just racist, but it's actually boring. People hear the word physical anthropology and like, Eh, let me go talk to an economist or a psychologist or a cognitive scientist and I'm like, we do all of those things better than they do, so we should get the recognition.
- Jon Marks: [00:43:13](#) I just want to add one more word, not just seconding Agustin which I always do. Um, but also Eugenie Scott mentioned to me that it is important to remember that we did publish bad things on race early on with the journal, but in the last few decades, of course we have represented very progressive views on race and human variation and especially teasing apart race from human variation. And uh, you know, if you're reading the current literature, for example, that's coming out of the field of human genetics right now and ancient genomics, David Reich's book with Harvard. There is a lot of misunderstanding that is from the 1920s in physical anthropology that is now being used to interpret a 21st century a genomic data, which is kind of scary. We're the ones who should control that discourse.

Leslie Aiello: [00:44:13](#) We're gonna call on one middle-aged man and then we're going to open it up to a greater diversity.

Speaker from the floor: [00:44:26](#) Well, after that introduction, I guess I have to speak for my generation.

When I was in high school, I decided I wanted to be a biological anthropologist or not that term. I wanted to study human evolution. I wanted to study biology and evolution and I went to Penn and in 1971, which was 47 years ago, and at that time Carlton Coon had just retired. But you know what, nobody was teaching Carlton Coon anymore in 1971. That racist view was already out of the instruction that I learned at the University of Pennsylvania, so there are many people dating back 50 years now who have wanted this to happen for a long time. When I was an undergraduate, I decided that someone couldn't understand bone biology, human evolution without studying biology, so I studied chemistry. I studied physics, I got all the courses for biology major along with my anthropology major, and then when I went to look at graduate schools, I went, I looked at a lot of anthropology schools, but ultimately decided to go to a department of Anatomy where there were a number of biological anthropologists to learn more biology in.

My advice to students over the years has always been learned more biology, learn more chemistry. These are the advances that will be made and I have to say during the first 20 years or so of coming to meetings here, a lot of times I didn't think there was all that much science in a lot of this stuff I was looking at, but I have to say that in the last 10 or 20 years, things have gotten a lot better here and when you look around at all the wonderful science and all the things that are being done here. This is not physical anthropology, this is just not, it is modern science. When I was in the anatomy department at the University of Chicago most of the department was not studying of physical anthropology. A few people were, but those of us that were other people would say, well, why are you doing that? That's not quite science. So. And where would you go to see science? We'd, I would go to the morphology meetings, which at the time were the American Society of Zoology meetings, other types of meetings, trying to integrate this stuff together. And there were many other people in this association trying and to do that too. So looking at this and at the big picture over a hundred years there are people here who have wanted that change

Speaker from the floor: [00:47:29](#) Hello everybody. It's actually, I am just am just so new. That name needs to change. Look at this room. So there is no

diversity. What is causing that? There are only white people in this room. So how do we change that first before actually talking about changing names. What's causing that? We do not have diversity in this room when we are doing anthropology in general sense.

Leslie Aiello: [00:48:09](#) Would our committee on diversity like to reply to that.

Leslie Aiello: [00:48:15](#) Nope. OK.

Speaker from the floor: [00:48:18](#) My name is Jorge Contreras I go to community college. It's not so much a matter of if you should change the name, but when, because we know that you need to adapt and things are changing. So in order for that to happen, there will be a change, in order for the organization to survive. So it's not so much a matter of if you could change it, but when, excuse me. So I believe it will, it will change. And thank you.

Speaker from the floor: [00:49:10](#) Hi, I'm Jessica at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign and I'm used to speaking to people about things that infect and kill them. So forgive me please. I'm a little nervous. I had to write everything down. We talk a lot about inclusivity. We're talking a lot about diversity. If we want people who aren't white here, we have to start thinking about what we are. I mean obviously we're thinking about here about what this name means. Maybe this name is a confederate statue. Right.

Leslie Aiello: [00:49:49](#) OK,

Speaker from the floor: [00:49:51](#) We shouldn't neglect ongoing problems that we have. It's not like we have just a racist past. We have a racist president, So I would like to humbly suggest at the front of the Journal we have a statement specifically addressing what we've been and what we're trying to be. May leave the language to people more eloquent than myself.

Leslie Aiello: [00:50:26](#) Thank you.

Speaker from the floor: [00:50:32](#) I am so glad that Jessica used the word de-colonize before I did. So I don't have to say it first. So I'm Becky Ackermann. I'm from the University of Cape Town born American, but I've lived in Cape Town for almost 20 years. One of the things that I'm happy to talk about the race, but I think a lot of people will do that better than me. What I really wanted to say was something towards the American part and I think it's quite telling that we just had multiple people before me come up and talk who had

accents that showed that they were clearly not from the United States and are coming from overseas. So in the same way that we've been talking about physical anthropology not reflecting what we do American doesn't reflect what the society does either.

Becky Ackermann: [00:51:29](#)

And you know, I could give lots of examples of the way that people from Western countries treat people in South Africa, the way black people are treated. I've had students stand up at this meeting and be shot down and be actually told that this is a meeting for Americans. And I think we've got to get over that. And you know, just as Jessica was saying, you know, words are symbols to write. And so we have to realize that saying that we are the American association is saying that we still want to be a western society and we still want to be in this position of being colonialists. I would suggest that we take "American" away in our name.

Leslie Aiello: [00:52:20](#)

Thank you.

Speaker from the floor: [00:52:27](#)

Hi everyone. I'm [inaudible]. I'm a professor of anthropology at the University of California in San Diego and my expertise is in neuroscience. I would only like to address this one thing. I think a change in our name and also in our attitude about how we envisioned the future, how we incorporate cutting edge technologies and new fields into our questions is very important. We have diverse students in the neurosciences. I'm also part of the graduate program in the neurosciences. So I would support a change in the name and the attitude in terms of what we want to do and achieve in the future things.

Leslie Aiello: [00:53:18](#)

Thank you.

Speaker from the floor: [00:53:26](#)

The real reason we're not diverse is that people don't want to come near as were toxic -- our history makes us toxic and people and some won't let their kids take our classes because of it. I talked to a native American probably 20 years ago now who said, I want to do this. I wanted to do what you're doing, but the tribal elders say, I can't. I think that happens in a lot of places, so we have to get rid of the toxic nature. It's not just an inappropriate name, it's a name that carries with it a horrible history. We have to teach that history. I'm not suggesting for a second that we stopped teaching it. I think if we don't teach it, if we don't address it, and every one of our classes, it's not that we're going to repeat it, it's just that we're never going to get this cloak off of us. Yes, preach it, but don't carry the burden of the name.

Speaker from the floor: [00:54:44](#)

Hi, I'm Cathy Willermet and I teach anthropology at central Michigan University. I'd like to echo what a number of people have said. I'm very concerned about the history being perpetuated in my minority students. I have students who are black students who are native students who are Latino students who are Chinese, particularly Chinese. They say to me, this is not a field that I am comfortable in because of the history. And so what do you do with that? Well, but that's not what we are now. Really. So changing the name is, is actually a really important step. I think also I want to echo two other points. One about the issue of colonialism. Where are most of our materials from -- I can speak for myself. They come from Mexico and so I want to work with Mexican scholars who don't feel like this is their institution because it's the American institution of physical anthropology.

So I would like to drop the American and I also think that changing to biological is helpful. But there has to be the third piece and the third piece also has been mentioned and that we have to own it and we have to, we have to present that information and whether that's a piece of paper, like a sheet in the very beginning of, on every page of the journal that says this is our history and is our future. It should be on our website, it should be in our mission statement and all of that stuff should be there so that if we're going to take the name "physical" away, we want to make sure that we add in the knowledge that the past is still there and that we are actively working against it. Thank you.

Leslie Aiello: [00:56:49](#)

I would like to add that the executive committee is starting a history project and we realized that we'd been very deficient if we did not present the full history of our association in this process.

Speaker from the floor: [00:57:11](#)

Sorry, one more white male voice, but I totally agree with the sentiments that I'm hearing and I can remember starting graduate school in 1975 in a program that was already then called biological anthropology and I'm thinking that this physical anthropology stuff was very quaint in 19th century and then I learned more about the history of the discipline and became even more appalled. I just like to say two things. One, I don't think we should worry about the name of the Journal until we've first decided the name of the association. I think we should decide what we are, what we want to be, and then we can handle cascading consequences beyond that. Secondly, I'd just like to put in a word for a different name. I'm glad to drop American and all that stuff, but I'd like to suggest, not that I



think its going to be popular, but just as an alternative, something to think about.

I like the term evolutionary anthropology and I want to tell you why. I think it is because we have a particular theoretical underpinning to our discipline that Sherry Washburn was able to help us pivot away from a past towards a future that was based even as the modern synthesis of evolutionary theory was forming around concepts population thinking and like a new appreciation of variation and like the forces that shaped our past and shape our present. So, I think it's important for that reason. I also think it's important because if, as long as we're thinking about the societal implications of our name, there's another societal let, perhaps less important, but another societal, battle that some of us have been waging over the last 20, 30 years. That relates to Milford's whimsical notion about the society of spiritual anthropologists. And that has been, you know, that we live in a society at a time in which the importance of understanding evolution as a process that has shaped the world shaped humanity, but shaped the ecosystems that we live in, the biological diversity around us. It's just really important. I think we shouldn't shy away from embracing that and taking refuge in something that's much, you know that nobody would object to biology. Everybody couldn't believe in biology. But I think I would just urge us to think about embracing the evolutionary science that I believe is really at the very core of our discipline.

Speaker from the floor: [01:00:29](#)

Hi, I'm Katie Hinde. I'm at Arizona State University. And I think most people know that I strongly agree with everything that's been said this afternoon. But I think that there's an overwhelming body of argumentation in favor of changing our name. And so I ended up sitting here and spending a lot of time thinking about one of the early slides you saw, which were some of the arguments that people have posed about why not. It'll take a long time, it'll take a lot of work. It will cost money and I think about all of us in this room are academics and I don't think any of us signed up for something being fast, easy or lucrative.

These aren't arguments that we should carry lots of weight. We are here because we want to do hard work. We're here because we want to grow our own science and our discipline and our community and the title of our society and eventually the publications that all of us spend a great deal of effort, volunteering to support and maintain it should reflect who we are now and where we're going in the future. Not a problematic past. Thank you.

Leslie Aiello: [01:02:03](#)

Thanks.

Speaker from the floor: [01:02:14](#)

Hi, I'm Laurie Fields. I'm a PhD student at Texas A&M University. I am Navajo, Paiute, Shoshone. I am an aspiring primatologist. I just wanted to say that I am one of those native Americans whose family and tribe does not support me being here for all the reasons that you are here. I do support the name change and if you want more native students there, they are out there, they are interested, but there's a lot of work here that needs to be done first. So if you have native students and you want them to be here, I've never met another native American primatologist, but I would love to meet one. If you have students, please contact me. Thank you.

Leslie Aiello: [01:03:01](#)

Thanks.

Speaker from the floor: [01:03:10](#)

I'm a Lyle Konigsberg. I'm at the University of Illinois and I am a current editor of the Yearbook of Physical Anthropology, which doesn't have American in the title. So I just wanted to point that out.

Leslie Aiello: [01:03:29](#)

Thanks.

Speaker from the floor: [01:03:38](#)

Hi. I'm Miriam Belmaker from the University of Tulsa and I wanted to give up the point of view of somebody who has lived in both America and Israel. My first time I joined the AAPA was for the Philadelphia meeting, which I don't remember how many years ago it was, but at that time I was a graduate student in Israel and a friend of mine said, you can't be a physical anthropologist. And I said, why not? And she goes, well, you do paleoecology and human evolution and they do, but you don't do dead people like anthropology bones. And that's the, the prevailing opinion I think outside of here that physical anthropologist only do human anatomy. And I was so excited to see when I filled out the application form, there was a nice rubric, record check, Paleoecology paleoecologist human evolution in general. So I think for the inclusiveness, not just of a Western people and to increase the inclusiveness, we asked to consider a primatologist that other places are not, again, physical anthropology or biological anthropology. Again, people that do other sub-fields that together are the biological anthropology or evolutionary one that Peter mentioned.

Leslie Aiello: [01:05:12](#)

Thanks

Speaker from the floor: [01:05:23](#)

I'm Susan Antón and I'm the chair of the AAPA Committee on Diversity. I'm hearing a lot of support for a change from

“physical” to something else. I think that's great. I'm in complete agreement with that. I'm in agreement with a lot of things that people have said during the course of this conversation about moving away from, while still acknowledging, a racist past. So I don't want to derail the conversation from our mission, which is about getting a sense of the room and how people are feeling about the current name.

I do want to say something that I think is a little bit uncomfortable, which is that even if we changed the name, which I think we should, and even if we acknowledge that the reason that we're doing that is about our racist past or at least in part about that. And even if we write an elegant mission statement about where it is that we aim to go, it's not just a racist past. Our present is incredibly problematic. And so if we think that we can simply change our name, make that statement, pat ourselves on the back and go home -- we haven't changed anything.

So once we do the hard non lucrative business of making this change I call on each and every one of us to really interrogate the way that we are living in the world, the way we are interacting with our students, what we are making visible and invisible, impossible and impossible. Because without that we haven't done a damn thing.

Leslie Aiello: [01:07:39](#)

Thank you.

Speaker from the floor: [01:07:48](#)

Rita Kaestle. I'm at Indiana University and we've been talking a lot about the public and attracting students and accepting members from all over the place. And I think all of that is great. But I also want to point out that our past has also colored how our colleagues at the universities we work at see us. On many occasions I have encountered people in the Biology Department or Psychology Department, Sociology Department, History Department and administrators who see us as those people who do that racist stuff. And this, of course, colors all of those interactions you can have with your colleagues outside your department and as Agustin said, our whole field relies on being interdisciplinary, for lack of a better word, and especially with the pace of all of these new technologies coming down the pike and so on. You want to maintain those relationships with people in other departments, programs and so on. And if they see us as this backward racist science, that's much more difficult. And so I think that's another aspect of calling ourselves physical anthropologists that we haven't really talked about yet. So just wanted to raise that issue.

Leslie Aiello:

[01:09:32](#)

I also want to circle back to whether we retain American or we do away with American is I've been quite surprised in this conversation. I haven't heard anyone bring up the hegemonic nature of being the International Association. If we renamed ourselves the International Association of Biological Anthropology we must be cognizant of the message we're sending to our colleagues in the rest of the world that we are taking over their international voice. This is an issue that is very big in social anthropology and with my hat from the Wenner-Gren Foundation, I've been involved in a number of discussions about this. I would be amenable to dropping American from the association's name, if that was what the membership wanted. However, I would be very, very troubled by adopting international and imposing ourselves on the numerous different voices in our field coming from India, coming from Latin America, coming from Africa, coming from everywhere else in the world that has a vital, vibrant, academic environment. So please think very seriously about the implications of this aspect of the name change.

Speaker from the floor: [01:11:12](#)

The Committee on Diversity had a meeting this morning and the general feeling was to drop the American but don't replace it with international.

Speaker from the floor: [01:11:35](#)

Another option would be, and I don't know if it's time to do this yet, would be for us to partner with similar organizations in other countries and maybe it's time to truly form an international association.

Speaker from the floor: [01:11:49](#)

I think that's another step I, I hear what you're saying. There are international associations, of course, in other disciplines.

Speaker from the floor: [01:12:02](#)

Hi, my name is Michelle Cameron. And as one of the people representing diversity in this room, I felt compelled to come up. Aside from my academic work, I've spent a not inconsiderable amount of time doing public outreach work. And I admit the part of what drove me to do that was knowing that my image as a person of color is underrepresented in this field. But I love this field and so I mirrored a lot of the thoughts that have come up in this room, but encourage people to continue to take those steps, not just with institutions, not just with students, but with other venues where you can find the chance because not only does that give us a broader purview outside of the work that we're doing in a lab or in an office, but it also puts us back in the world and helps us improve our language when we go back to reintegrate with either students that we're trying to attract to the program families that I work with, coming into museums,

asking me questions about how anatomy in anthropology interact and start to keep that broader perspective in mind.

Leslie Aiello: [01:12:56](#)

Thank you.

Speaker from the floor: [01:13:08](#)

Hi everybody. Uh, I'm Kim Congdon. I'm at Touro University, Nevada. Just to quickly circle back to the international versus American versus non regional issue and our racist past and our racist present. And what will be our racist future if we don't take care of our races present? This is in my very strong opinion, a package deal. We have to be addressing the issues of diversity in our membership, the issues of diversity in our publications, the issues of diversity in our funding, the issues of diversity in our students at the same time as we're addressing both aspects of the name. We can go from physical to biological and say that we recognize our racist history, but we have just taken a very insidious path to translating that history into a racist present by making it much more westernized and centralized and, and talking about how it's the value of the science without really addressing how marginalization impacts the access you need to produce that science. And so I don't think that we can change one or the other when we talk about changing the name if we're not changing both, we're just finding another way to hide the current problems we have and we'll be having this conversation in another five or 10 years wondering why the room is getting smaller and smaller.

Leslie Aiello: [01:14:31](#)

Thanks.

Speaker 13: [01:14:51](#)

Hi everyone. I'm Michelle Singleton from Midwestern Ohio University. The point that's been brought up about the necessity of changing ourselves within our institution, but we also have to take it out in the world. And someone said something really interesting to me last year at the sign making party for the science march was that individual was a little bit reticent. Did we really want to politicize our science? But I feel like if anybody is going to do it, it's us. We have been on the front lines of trying to be the change in ways maybe we don't recognize as evolutionary biologists. We'd been fighting back against the creation deniers as Paleoecologists and geologists. We've been fighting back against the flat-earthers. And now as we're dealing with climate change, we're finding ourselves on the front line in there as well. Why? Because we're primatologists and we're human biologists who see firsthand every day in our research, the impacts of climate change on communities, on human communities, and what's going on in the world. We are the people who are best suited to go out and address these issues.

Within our own society and in the broader society through our science, into our social activism.

Leslie Aiello: [01:16:31](#)

Thank you.

Speaker from the floor: [01:16:50](#)

I am Varsha Pilbrow from the University of Melbourne. I came here as a graduate student as an international student. I never was an American and after finishing my degree I went off to Australia and I'm from there so I'm still not an American, but I did come here because this was the place to study anthropology and it was the place and it still is, but I'm coming from now so I keep coming back to the meetings with my students because we see these meetings and this place for anthropology. I feel that the most reflective group of anthropologists, I in fact here. So I am really in favor of this being an anthropology association has never been for me the American Anthropology Association. And I'm just that one thing. So I'm totally in favor of changing the America thing. And the second thing that I find in my position as being a non-American, practicing anthropologists is that many times we look to principles of ethics, bylaws, everything from the American Association to guide many of the things that happen in many parts of the world. So it's useful I think, as an organization for us to be aware that that is a big role that we do play and that's something that we need to be reflective of when we make changes. Thanks.

Leslie Aiello: [01:18:18](#)

I am going to put Susan Antón on the spot because what we haven't discussed yet is whether a name change --- from Physical to Biological – might have an effect on our recognition as a stem discipline. And I'm doing this because she and the Committee on Diversity have been involved with this issue.

Susan Anton: [01:18:58](#)

I'm back. Hello, I'm Susan Antón. I'm from New York University. Certainly the change from physical to biological will make us more readable. As many of you know, I attend the Society for the Advancement of Chicanos and Native Americans in Science. It is a stem diversity conference. It brings undergraduates and graduate students to present their science but also to talk to different kinds of disciplines and we've been going there for about four years to raise awareness with people who are into biology and might not necessarily have been exposed to physical anthropology and I have a big pop up sign that says the American Association of physical anthropology and it's got DNA and it's got primates and it's got bones and people are like, --- it would make my life a lot easier to say biological anthropology, you know it.

It's biology, right? I think the question that the international scholars have been working on, and in fact Dennis O'Rourke worked on years ago, was to try to get physical anthropology, biological anthropology, recognized as a stem discipline by our government in order that it has downstream consequences for visas that are possible, how long post-doctoral visas can proceed. Whether or not changing to biological anthropology helps us do that -- I have no clue because the process of doing that seems remarkably capricious and opaque and we have for the last, I want to say decade, been filing forums to try to get that recognition and that has not happened so I'm not sure that changing the name to biological is going to change things, but I am going to turn it over to Maja Seselj who has been working on this for a while.

Speaker from the floor: [01:21:10](#)

Hi, I'm Maja Seselj. I'm at Bryn Mawr College. I was here as an international student and my opportunities for being able to stay in the US were always shortened by the fact that I was in an anthropology department. There's a code for every single academic discipline and those, some of those codes decided by the Department of Homeland Security are on the list of stem disciplines. They don't care what the NSF says, they don't care about what scientists say. It's completely nontransparent random, and arbitrary process at the Department of Homeland Security. There are options to change it within each institution. There are codes and the ones currently for physical or biological anthropology, it's one of the same. In that sense probably doesn't make much of a difference in terms of potentially writing letters and petitioning to get the change that might make some matters simpler. The one thing that we were trying to make and provide some guidelines and figuring out ways how, and this is where also the name change might be helpful for biological anthropology to use a code switch that a lot of the interdisciplinary programs use that are evolutionary biology codes or biological sciences, other codes. Then it can be a much more straightforward argument for using those kinds of codes that would directly help international students.

Speaker from the floor: [01:22:49](#)

Hi everyone. I'm Marcella Benitos. I'm a post-doc at Georgia State and I've greatly enjoyed all the conversation going on here. One of the things I want to bring up is that the parents of the students who are telling them not to go into biological anthropology or journalists are not in this room so our discussions here don't go far. I think an important thing is to consider how we get this to the public. We have 118 student essays [the Pollitzer essays]. Is that right? They are beautifully written. I'm sure that they are publishable and it doesn't have to be in our journal. Let's send them to the media. Let's talk to

NPR. Let's do podcast. Let's get the public involved knowing that we're talking about this so that when it happens, it becomes something more on the public level. I'm thinking right now,

Nat Geo just took responsibility for the racist past. They published their most hurtful pieces and I think that's something we consider doing with the name change is potentially bringing those things up again so we can actually own them in a way and really get the media kind of involved in this process so that they know that we're making those changes.

Speaker 2: [01:23:51](#)

Good ideas.

Speaker from the floor: [01:24:05](#)

My name is Katie. I'm going to be super short and sweet, but uh, I think that changing the name is really super important. Dropping the American and definitely switching out physical because this is a place of belonging for a lot of people and especially like I'm American Indian and I'm a mix. My Dad and then my mom's white. And so like my whole life I grew up not fitting anywhere. The first place somebody told me I belonged was an intro to biological anthropology course. That was the first place I was like fully allowed to exist. And that was really cool. Thanks. Yeah.

Speaker from the floor: [01:24:49](#)

I'm Anne Stone and I am the outgoing history and awards executive committee member and Robin Nelson is taking my place, but we've recently just started an initiative to think about the history and in particular to kind of think about the outreach part of this, which I think was very, very eloquently brought up. I think that Wikipedia is probably the first place that almost everybody goes to. If you look at the American Association of Physical Anthropology entry, it is two sentences long. And we figured out that we think it was probably most recently edited by a white supremacist from Atlanta or from Alabama. So we're going to fix that. But I mean, you know one of the things I'm going to be doing this year in and with Robin is really trying to link to all our past presidents and think about this history, warts and all.

And so I'm going to be calling on a lot of people to volunteer to look things over. And if you have classes that involve Wikipedia editing please let us know. I'd love to talk to you about ways to improve the profile of biological anthropologists not just in the US but around the world. And I think we could, that's a really important public way to think about this.

On a completely personal level I'm totally in favor of the name change and I really appreciate all the comments. This is sort of



separate and they're not in the room anymore [the representatives from Wiley], but I'm also in the next few years going to have to think very closely about where the journal is. I'm not sure Wiley is the right place.

Leslie Aiello: [01:27:02](#)

Thanks.

Speaker 8: [01:27:08](#)

Hi, my name is Rick Potts, from the Smithsonian institution, and I walk the halls that Hrdlicka walked. But, I got my degree in biological anthropology, the same university that Peter Ellison did, and then moved to a university where it was physical anthropology and then to the Smithsonian where it's the division of physical anthropology and physical anthropology certainly does feel like a division. I allowed me to do what I do, study human evolution, to study and do geology in the field to study the behavior, traces a variable in the human field called archaeology to go into paleoclimatology when I needed to do that, to answer some of the questions that I needed to answer. Biological anthropology is liberating. And if we changed the name of the association to biological anthropology, I will try my hardest to change the name at the Smithsonian. The halls will seem a lot less eery. Thank you.

Leslie Aiello 2: [01:28:47](#)

Thanks.

Speaker from the floor: [01:28:52](#)

My name is Jon Marks again, at University of North Carolina at Charlotte. I just wanted to say a word about this interest in the history of our field, which is fascinating to hear because historians of biology have generally been transfixed by Darwin and not really gotten into a biological anthropology, um, but there are in fact professional historians who are currently working on the history of our field. It would be useful I think to engage them. And on that note, I did mis-speak bit earlier when I said that the yearbook began in the fifties with Buettner-Janusch, but the yearbook began in the forties by Gabriel Lasker.

Leslie Aiello: [01:29:45](#)

Thanks for the correction, Jon.

Speaker from the floor: [01:30:38](#)

My name is Brian Padgett from the Ohio State University. Many organizations value international membership. Can you see that reflected here? It's very obvious. The name of the Association is the American Association of Physical Anthropology, not the Association of American Physical Anthropologists.

We have to reflect on the ideas of what we're seeing here. America is founded on the idea of inclusion. Despite the

tortured history, despite the current political climate, those ideas are reflected in the pedestal, the Statue of Liberty in our documents. We welcome the international community to our doorstep at least ideas and we have to look at that. Here in the association, we are saying that all people, all anthropologists, every interest in anthropology is welcome in our association.

I feel that we would lose something by losing that name. We are reclaiming standing forward. We are reclaiming the ideas of America in the association by keeping the name. Is the association going to surrender something that we don't have to give up? The idea of inclusion almost even though we're trying to reclaim that many organizations favor international membership. I'm a member of the Japan Society for archaeology, but because of my membership it doesn't mean they have to drop the part of Japan in that society. So I think it's important not only for our past but our future to show that we are inclusive, that we reflect the ideas of the nation in which we start in which we are founded and we currently sit. Doesn't mean we are excluding anybody else. Thank you.

Leslie Aiello: [01:32:56](#)

Thanks.

Speaker from the floor: [01:33:06](#)

Hello everyone. I'm a Susan Pfeiffer from the University of Toronto and I'd like to put in a plug for the word evolutionary anthropology. I'm glad that Peter brought it up. We recently at the University of Toronto changed the name of our graduate program to a graduate program in evolutionary anthropology because we wanted to celebrate the fact that we're the only aspect of anthropology that actually has a paradigm and since we actually have a set of hypotheses built in that drives our science. What I was surprised to find after we changed the name of the graduate program was that people who didn't come out of biological anthropology wanted to be with us, that we immediately built better links with the archaeologists, better links with the geneticists because we were using a word that included them. So if we were to become the Association of Evolutionary Anthropologists, which I think would make us a more of a magnet for like-minded people. Thank you.

Leslie Aiello: [01:34:29](#)

Thank you.

Speaker from the floor: [01:34:37](#)

Hi, I'm Susan Frankenberg. I am speaking in favor of biological over evolutionary simply because outside of this room and a few of the circles that we move around in evolutionary anthropology as opposed to biological anthropology has additional baggage that goes with it, particularly the ways in which the term evolution was coopted historically within the

halls of anthropology and also just in terms of perceptions of the parents to whom students have to explain what they're doing. So I think that in a sense we may be taking on an additional heavy cloak by considering that term despite what we do, being evolution,

Speaker from the floor: [01:35:43](#)

I'm Rachel Caspari from a central Michigan University and I would also like to echo what Susan just said in terms of supporting biological anthropology as opposed to evolutionary anthropology -- evolutionary anthropology also has additional meanings. And I'm speaking now as the past president of the biological anthropology section of the AAA. As many of you may know, there is also an evolutionary anthropology section of the American Anthropological Association and it doesn't only include biological anthropologists. There are many people that we would consider cultural anthropologists and self-identify as cultural anthropologists who are also evolutionary anthropologists. So the term evolutionary anthropology does not necessarily reflect our membership.

Speaker from the floor: [01:36:46](#)

Hi, Leslea Hlusko from the Department of integrative biology at UC Berkeley. I don't recommend using the term integrative. OK. I actually just have a question for those of you who are also in the American Anthropological Association. Has that association considered what to do with the term American in its name? I'd be really curious to hear what that association, thinks of that.

Leslie Aiello: [01:37:15](#)

OK. We just happened to have the executive director of the American Anthropological Association here in the audience. Ed Liebow, would you like to comment?

Ed Liebow: [01:37:26](#)

I'm Ed Liebow from the American Anthropological Association. Officially, no, we have never considered removing American from the name of our organization, although I'm furiously taking notes as I'm listening to this fascinating and productive discussion. In particular, I think the reason why it's never been a point of formal consideration is for a reason that Leslie mentioned before. We're very careful of our position in the world of anthropology and the accusations that have been leveled against us of intellectual imperialism and linguistic hegemony. And there is of course a network of national associations of anthropology whose membership is open to all and we happily joined that constellation of associations that are based in particular countries and happily collaborate across national boundaries with what's now becoming the World Anthropological Union.

Leslie Aiello: [01:38:40](#) Thank you.

Speaker from the floor: [01:38:45](#) Hi, my name is Anna [inaudible]. I'm another international student in this room and I would like to speak for all my other colleagues. They're not in this room and say that please bring this discussion outside this room because I think it's very important for us to remember that doing science is a political act. It is not just about science and we have to get rid of the "don't blame the scientist" argument. And so please do speak to your students. Do you speak to your colleagues? And remember always doing science is a political act.

Leslie Aiello: [01:39:33](#) OK, we have about five minutes left and so we'll definitely have your comment and we'll see how much time is left before we wrap up.

Speaker from the floor: [01:39:43](#) OK. So it's a little risky. I'm international and I'm junior and I appreciate the patriotism that's been expressed around the name American. But I don't -- I'm not here for American values. I'm here to do science. The largest group of people doing this, that kind of language cuts me out. I'm very proud of where I'm coming from. I'm sure I'm guilty of the same crimes promoting Canada. Go team. I don't even know really what American values are. I guess. I don't know this mythology when it's expressed like this, it's very isolating especially now. So I just want to put that in as a vote against the American if you guys are chill with that.

Leslie Aiello: [01:40:43](#) Thank you. Does anyone want to have the last word? The last comment? Going once. Going twice. OK.

Speaker from the floor: [01:40:53](#) OK. Hello everyone. My name is Maya. I cover a lot of the diversity in this room. I'm African. I am international and black. I'm a woman. So I was going to comment on the evolutionary versus biological anthropology name. Like what was said before, I think that evolutionary would cut out a lot of people from even listening to us. I believe that the science is so important for the way people see each other in the world. I do my hardest, God knows how much outreach I have done at my university, but I try to make sure that people outside this room, people that looked like me understand that they have a place in the science, but everyone comes with some preconceived notions. People have faith, have issues with evolutionary anthropology and my thing is we need to do our best to even get those people in the room to listen to us. And I think the evolutionary will just sort of cut them out at the door. They won't even be willing to listen. And I think it's important that we really do our

best to try to get everyone to understand the value and the importance of our work. Thank you.

Leslie Aiello:

[01:42:27](#)

Thank you. I think that's an excellent place to end this conversation, but only temporarily. I was sitting here thinking perhaps we should continue the conversation in an online forum as we move towards our decisions on changing the name and the direction we're going to go. And as a very quick summary I think we're fairly unanimously agreed that it is perhaps time to consign "physical" to history.

Leslie Aiello:

[01:43:16](#)

I see more division in terms of what the new name should be. We plan to hold a non-binding survey of members in the fall and we will definitely have questions on the survey about what the new name should be. And I also think that the point of deciding on the name of the association before worrying about the name if the journal is extremely well taken.

So I would like to thank you for your well thought through comments. It certainly helped to focus my mind and I hope all of your minds on where we've come from, where we're going, and how we want to move into the 21st century. So please don't be shy to be in touch with me if you have anything else you want to add. My email contact is on the AAPA website. You can also contact any of the members of the executive committee. So thank you again for making this a really exciting meeting and thanks to Milford for getting this off on the right foot.