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Abstract

This article uses the method of ethnic stratification analysis and participant observation to raise questions about what appears to be one of the hidden ethnic transformations that has occurred in the disciplines of anthropology and sociology in the past two decades; the replacement of Jews. Jews, who were among the founders of and became “over-represented” in these disciplines, have now been replaced with other minorities through a process of selection based on “representation”. Along with the use of these disciplines for overall university quota filling, in order to promote statistics for hiring of under-represented groups, has come the loss of the empirical “scientific” approach of Jewish scholars and the idea of application of “universal” principles for social progress. These two phenomena appear to be related, raising questions about the actual social justice and social progress impacts of what was claimed as “diversity”. Under the veneer of apparent diversity, the costs to social science and actual social justice may outweigh the benefits. In today’s political environment, there seems to be an unwillingness to pursue and raise these questions.

Introduction

In 1938, in Hungary, the Bela Imredy regime began to implement some of the first contemporary “Jewish laws”. These laws imposed quotas to limit Jewish positions in different professions, particularly those of academics and scientists, on a banner of “equality”, “representation” and “democratic” concepts of social justice.

Much more slowly and with limited comment, with the participation of many Jews, themselves, as they retire and as they redefine the goals of the professions to fit with contemporary political correctness, a similar purge may have occurred in American social sciences over the past generation. Measuring it and drawing attention to the questions it raises today are difficult. This is an area where ethnic statistics are not reported. Jews, themselves, (unlike almost every other minority group) seem unwilling to discuss and pursue the issue. This author’s attempts to open up the issue have not been encouraged. Recent events, however, draw direct attention to the issue.

One of the first wake-up calls to Jewish scholars in the U.S. and to those in Israel occurred within the American Anthropological Association within the past few months. In demonstrating outrage at the policies of the Israeli government towards Palestinians, some 1,000 members of the Association signed a petition to ban interactions with Israeli academic institutions. The ban sought to target Jewish anthropologists in Israel for the actions of their government. Though many (perhaps even a majority) of Israeli Jewish anthropologists actually oppose the Israeli government’s racial policies and actively teach approaches to tolerance, the ban did not seek to enforce international human rights laws or to target
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political actors. It was an action by anthropologists to target anthropologists. The American Studies Association endorsed the approach.

Many legal experts say that the resolution, itself, violated the charter of the American Anthropological Association (AAA) and the association’s lawyers should never have even allowed it to come to a vote. But it did. If any legal review of the legal implications for the organization, as a publicly chartered non-profit under U.S. laws ever took place, it was never shared with members of the organization as U.S. non-profit laws require. Moreover, the Association offered no prior review of the potential impact of the resolution on its Jewish members. Nor did it review the status of Jews in the organization, though there were calls to do so.\(^1\)

The resolution ultimately failed, but by a razor thin margin of some 39 out of nearly 5,000 votes (some 0.8% of the total) in the spring of 2016\(^2\). The management of the AAA is now seeking to address the issue in other ways.

The ban was clearly targeted at Jews. Discrimination laws characterize such “selective enforcement” as “de facto” discrimination\(^3\). One can walk through the logic that courts use to establish discrimination to come to this conclusion. If its approach had been non-discriminatory, he American Anthropological Association would have set a general policy on dealing with human rights violations by its member anthropologists of all ethnicities and across all countries. Here, however, there was no effort to instigate similar bans against other countries with similar policies in violation of human rights of minority populations, nor against those countries who have supported (and/or armed) the Israeli government. Nor was there a call to make any of the ethical procedures or sanctioning powers of the Association enforceable so that reviews of discrimination or violations of the Association’s ethics codes could occur on a regular basis. This was not a “first step” towards such procedures. This was the only step. This was a specifically targeted ban.

- There were no calls for bans against academic institutions in the United States for the U.S. government’s (bi-partisan) support of these policies and other global military actions or violations.
- There have been no calls for bans on Stanford University because of its rehiring of Condoleezza Rice or to condemn that University’s connections to military industries though scholars and students at Stanford have raised such concerns.
- Nor were there calls for bans on the University of California for its employment of former White House lawyer John Woo to teach law, though many have also raised concerns there.
- Nor were there calls for bans against U.S. universities with Reserve Officer Training Corps (“ROTC”) military training programs.
- Nor have there been calls by the Association for bans against universities holding stock in military industries or oil companies or in companies that have been undermining land rights and destroying cultures and habitats in Latin America, Africa and Asia that are widely reported by human rights (and land rights) organizations.
- Nor were there calls for boycotting of anthropologists who work for the World Bank or for other development banks or donors that promote “resettlement” in ways that many anthropologists have long claimed, promote cultural genocide.

Supporters of the AAA’s ban sought to hold Israel’s Jewish anthropologists to a standard of professional responsibility that would require that they take direct action against the policies of their universities that are discriminatory or that undermine the rights of Palestinians. These requirements, according to Israeli academics opposing the ban, could have jeopardized their careers. The ban would have offered no process to evaluate the appropriateness of those actions and their actual impacts.

In short, when examined from the legal standard of discrimination, the boycott was discriminatory in its selectivity and in its impact. The approach singled out Jews in the profession without imposing any similar responsibility on any other group in any other place.

So that there should be no misunderstanding, it is important to offer the following disclosure in this article. The author of this article is not a supporter of the policies of the Israeli government towards Palestinians, nor of the ideology of “Zionism” that would place Israelis or Jews above international law.
Nor is the author of this article “nostalgic” for the colonial and imperial uses of social sciences in the past, to destroy the cultures of Native peoples and to discriminate against women and minorities of any descent (not only Jews, but all minorities). The author is a firm supporter of professional ethics codes and international human rights laws to protect cultural survival and individual rights of all peoples.

This article is not about the legitimacy of the boycott approach or about the legal obligations of the Israeli government or of failures of many Jews and prominent Jewish organizations to fulfill moral and international legal obligations of human rights and policies of peace and reconciliation with the Palestinians, the Bedouins and other groups in the Middle East. Many other articles deal with these issues. This article is about the status of Jews in the social sciences today and about the relationship between the position of Jews and the role of the disciplines in promoting high quality scholarship and applications in the area of social justice.

Questions Raised about Jews in Key Social Science Disciplines, Quantitative and Qualitative:

The point raised in this article is that the claimed goals of efforts to promote racial, ethnic, gender, and other forms of diversity in the social sciences have not been met and the means that have been chosen may have created other harms and impediments to achieving these goals. Among the claims of diversity was that it would serve as a key to promoting social progress for the larger society by stimulating social science to address humanistic concerns, to improve their models and methods, and to widen applications. It is now possible to test these claims. In this author’s view, the changes have not in any way followed the expectations. The changes in academic hiring may not have focused at all on hiring faculty to transform the social sciences, to change methods, to apply social science to society and to improve society, at all. Instead, the hiring may have simply been used to hire minorities who would avoid following those goals and would simply divert attention from real social change. The hiring appears to have come at the sacrifice of one minority group for the benefit of others in a way that may be linked with undermining of the very reform of and progress of social science.

This is not a call to turn back the clock. It is a call to examine the real impacts “diversity” may have had on one hidden minority (Jews) and also to question whether academic diversity has promoted its promised mission for improving social sciences and for transforming institutions and society in ways that have achieved measurable and sustainable social progress in all areas, not simply in “representation” in a few positions. This article raises the speculation that the seemingly more “diverse” and “representative” social sciences may actually be continuing the same colonial (or corporatist), assimilationist agenda that adherents of diversity claimed they would challenge while pretending to do otherwise.

Here is the irony. For a small number of university academics who have entered the ranks of academia and come from diverse minority backgrounds, their advance is a sign of social justice. Yet, at the very same time, the society around them, in almost every social justice or progress measure for which their social science fields are supposed to contribute to improvements, situations appear to be much worse.

- Social inequality in the U.S. and Western Europe has worsened since 1970, not improved, in what is a clear sign of social regress and injustice, not progress. Nobel Prize winning economist Paul Krugman calls it “the Great Divergence” (Noah, 2010) and even the International Monetary Fund (IMF) now recognize that “Widening income inequality is the defining challenge of our time. In advanced economies, the gap between rich and poor is at its highest level in decades” (Dabla Norris, et. al, 2015). In 2012, the top 1% of Americans owned 40% of the wealth; nearly double of the share (23%) in 1978. The net worth of the top 400 Americans (the 0.1%) was equal to the bottom 50% of all Americans in 2010, up from only 5% some thirty years before (Sale and Zucman, 2014). The more “diverse” social science of the past few decades has not only offered no benefit but has appeared impotent as the situation has gotten worse.

- With the increased social inequality has also come a corresponding political inequality, with transfer of power to the economic elites, and with the U.S. increasingly described not as a democracy but as an “oligarchy” (Domhoff, 2013). While the appearance of minorities in the university and in political
positions, globally, suggest on its face that there is more democratization, almost every measure shows the opposite, including in participatory procedures in universities and their communities, themselves. - Though minorities may be more visible in the U.S., the acceleration of globalization and homogenization of peoples into a global industrial economy has promoted cultural genocide in the name of assimilation. Cultural diversity and associated language diversity is disappearing. The rate of language (and affiliated culture) extinction is now estimated at one language every two weeks (Crystal, 2000). The data here suggests that “diversity” in hiring in social sciences may actually have worked to accelerate homogenization and assimilation, at the expense of minority cultures and their protection. - The promotion of diversity has also not led to greater tolerance or “peace” if measured in terms of global militarization. In adjusted figures, global military spending rose 50% between 2001 and 2010 (Russell, 2011). There are more courses on “peace studies” and more courses on “Women’s Studies” (originally claimed to challenge “male hierarchy”, “patriarchy” and violence) but this “diversity” seems to have no impact on global peace or tolerance or demilitarization. - While the global data on “poverty” is ambiguous, what is clear is that very few, if any, countries are sustainably integrated with their environments and resources. Social science has not led any path for changing human behaviors that are leading to a planetary crisis due to global climate change and unsustainability. There were certainly warning signs in the 1960s and 1970s when there were calls for a new, more representative social science that would be friendlier to nature and to native cultures. Again, there seems to have been no positive impact at all.

Given this data, what is the real impact of this “diversity” and this “progress” in the disciplines? What is it in thinking and applications that have changed over the past thirty years? Are the changes in hiring policy really a sign of progress or a cover to divert attention from regress, or perhaps to create a form of collusion?

Overall, if measured in terms of citizen rights versus the state and versus corporate power and in terms of economic equality, or even in terms of the accountability of university disciplines and faculty to students and to society and in the democratization of the university and teaching methods which is something that would be directly in the hands of faculty members to change (Lempert, 1995), one might argue that the “99%” of citizens in developed countries are all now worse off today despite greater “diversity” in the social sciences and other professions and that the “diverse” faculty in universities have done little or nothing to promote any kind of measurable change. Diversity policies have brought women and a large spectrum of minority representatives into certain disciplines, but they have not had any noticeable impact on the application of social science for measurable social progress in social equality or rights protections, or in the goals of social science in advancing predictions or promoting applications. Greater diversity in the social sciences has not replaced the agendas of colonialism (now, neo-colonialism) or inequality in government and corporate policies. Nor has the opening up of positions to diversity promoted the quality of social science in answering its core questions and developing tools to promote the interests of social justice. The change has, however, appears to have resulted in purging (and perhaps partly demonizing) the very minority group (Jews) that had, in part, been working to try to build and humanize the social science disciplines. It appears that what has actually occurred in academia has been the dismantling of social science, of standards, and of an overall, implementable, human rights agenda at all levels.

Again, so that there is no misunderstanding among readers, the purpose of this article is not to attack the diversification in university hiring or to suggest that “minorities and women” are somehow to blame for changes in the world over the past thirty years that may be harmful. It is to suggest that the specific people who have been chosen for positions and the way that they have been chosen may indicate an undermining and reversal of the actual claims that were made for promoting and achieving diversity. It is that the hiring may have been conducted with the purpose of eliminating those minority faculty (many of them Jews) who were promoting a progressive agenda for transforming social science, its methods, its applications and society and replacing them with “representational” faculty who would agree to dismantling and replacement of social sciences and real attempts at social progress.
Is there a connection between these new faculty selection policies, the apparent impact on Jews, the apparent dismantling of the social sciences and social “regress” rather than real progress? Or is it all just coincidental? This essay cannot answer that question. It can only point to some of the changes that have occurred and that few scholars are ready to examine and raise this (largely unwelcome) question in universities and society.

The AAA resolution to punish Israeli (Jewish) anthropologists and only Israeli (Jewish) anthropologists occurred simultaneously with calls for the elimination of implementable ethics standards and alongside a process in the discipline that has eliminated standards for the discipline. In the view of its supporters, the boycott resolution was an example of “progress”. To this author, it appears to be a symbol of the very opposite, despite all of the positive attention to the human rights of Palestinians (that this author and most anthropologists affirm).

Over the past thirty years, there has been a gradual change in American social science that can be highlighted by what has been happening in anthropology (and particularly in social and cultural anthropology). The changes have not been documented and are rarely a subject of discussion. Nevertheless, the changes are immediately visible both in statistics and in the ideological changes in American social science. Not only have Jews (and particularly Jewish men) been disappearing from the social sciences in which they were key founders. The Jewish approach to social science that built these disciplines – empiricism, prediction, and applications for social progress – has been replaced by approaches that mirror the views and methods of the 19th century Catholic Church, now promoted by non-Jewish minorities and women. Perhaps there is some kind of causal relationship. Perhaps this is just a coincidence. These two changes may be independent of each other but reflect the same underlying cause. Either way, they merit examination.

In keeping with anthropological tradition, this article presents a variety of initial data on Jews, on academia, and on social change in the U.S. and Europe over the past thirty years in a way that raises issues for discussion. One way that anthropologists raise issues is to look at phenomena in other societies that are considered “primitive” or, in some cases, societies of “enemies”, and then to note that in “our” society (that of the anthropologists) we do something very similar but call it something else or hide it from view. Anthropologists call this the approach of “culture critique”. This article opens with such a critique. In 20th century Europe in regimes that we consider primitive or barbaric, there were quotas that reduced Jews in some professions in order to assure that the professions reflected the actual population. Today, we refer to the implementation of those quotas as “purges” and discrimination. The end result of those quotas was to promote loyalty to regimes that used ideas of “representation” and “progress” to undermine progress. Certainly the motivation in those countries was not to “assimilate” multiple minority groups but to eliminate them, but it was also to promote policies of “unity” that promoted militarism, corporatism (in different forms), and new forms of inequalities in the name of social progress. The goal also seemed to be to undermine social sciences. It is uncomfortable to ask this question, but in many of these aspects, “Is there really a difference in how the policies of “representation” in certain professions were used then and are being implemented now in the U.S. and Western Europe?” Has part of that approach been copied for similar purposes, either knowingly or subconsciously, without drawing attention?

Some Quantitative Data on Jews in Anthropology and Sociology

While statistics on Jews are hard to come by, few anthropologists deny the qualitative data on Jews in the profession, today. This article is too short to offer “proof” of what has happened to Jews in the profession. But there is available data, both quantitative and qualitative, to perform what sociologists call an “ethnic stratification” analysis.

In a profession that relies on qualitative data, through participant observation, this piece offers the best data available. It is presented from the perspectives of those in the profession, including this author, as well as in the form of some basic quantitative comparative data that can be compiled using a simple technique of assigning ethnicity to different populations and then comparing those groups. Examining
“ethnic stratification” data within a profession is a standard part of social stratification that sociologists regularly examine (Shibutani and Kwan, 1965; Noel, 1968) for various minority groups. Though most current studies focus on specific classes of minorities and do not include Jews (who have become an “invisible” minority in many ways), there have been studies of Jews in specific professions such as law, with quantitative data and qualitative analysis that notes the attraction of Jews to professions that deal with issues of rights and social justice (Heinz and Laumann, 1982).

In comparing the lists of Jewish scholars in subjects (once social sciences) like Anthropology and Sociology today, it appears that the Jewish founders and luminaries of those disciplines have disappeared or have been replaced, perhaps as a direct result of the hiring policies of “representation”.

- Most lists of sociology’s founders name Emile Durkheim and Karl Marx (both Jews) alongside Max Weber, and some add George Simmel (also Jewish) among the top four.
- In anthropology, Jerry Moore’s “Visions of Culture”, finds 7 or 21 founders of the discipline as Jews, including the founders of sub-fields (Marcel Mauss and Marshall Sahlins in Economic Anthropology). This is culled from a larger list with similar proportions. Though Jews are only 2% of the overall population in the U.S., and were about the same in pre-World War II Europe, one third of 42 biographical entries in the Dictionary of Anthropology are Jews (Moore, 2012). Few lists of the founders of the profession are complete without Franz Boas and Edwin Sapir, Jews founding Columbia’s department, Robert Lowie, one of the founders of the department at the University of California, Berkeley, French Jews like Mauss and Claude Levi Strauss, British Jews like Max Gluckman, and more recently Marvin Harris at Columbia, and Eric Wolf at the City University of New York.

Of course, Jews were historically still the minority among leaders of the field and overall in the field, itself. Among the other two thirds of the famous names in the field were a number of anthropologists who directly supported the colonial and racist agendas of anthropology of that time (Herbert Spencer and Edward Morgan, among them). The question to be raised is whether Jews were part of the “progressive”/humanitarian agendas of social science as a social science in reflection of Jewish culture.

While there are no statistics on Jews today in anthropology and sociology (and the most recent membership survey conducted by the American Anthropological Association (AAA) did not even recognize Jews in its categories of members of 2016, despite the author of the survey apparently being Jewish (!))), it is easy to note that the numbers are few. In scanning the lists of social and cultural anthropologists at major institutions in New York City, where Jews were founders of the discipline and where Jews are some 10% of the population and perhaps more of the student population, it is now hard to spot any by looking at family names and given names. There may be 1 of 27 at Columbia today, though 4 of 6 emeritus faculty are presumably Jewish. New York University appears to have 2 out of 30. John Jay’s department, part of the City University of New York, has 1 out of 14; an Israeli teaching area studies courses on the Middle East.

To test the quality of this data, I compared the numbers of academics that I identified as “Jews” in different fields and in different subfields. For example, in some top universities, this method identified Jews as up to 20% or more among the faculties of public policy and law, while only about 2% of sociology and anthropology. Within sociology and anthropology, itself, among young faculty (recent Ph.D.s), there are more Jews in areas that remain less racially or ethnically diverse and where there is more science (physical anthropology, archaeology, and medical anthropology).

In examining the ethnicity of younger anthropologists, one can also find differences in percentages of Jews among the “four fields” of anthropology where there are different hiring policies and impacts. Traditionally, anthropology has four fields: physical anthropology (evolutionary biology of humans and primates that is mostly natural science), archaeology (science and technical application), linguistics (science) and social and cultural anthropology (originally considered to be “social science and humanities”). If there are Jews left in anthropology departments, they are visible first in physical anthropology and archaeology as well as medical anthropology (an “applied” subfield of cross cultural public health) where faculty appear to be chosen for scientific skills. Among social and cultural anthropologists, where advertisements for faculty are now directly geared towards “representation” (“area
studies,” gender, sexuality, and ethnicity), one finds very few Jews. Those who can be identified appear to have been chosen for their gender (as “Women’s Studies” anthropologists) or sexuality (as “Queer Studies” anthropologists) or for a specific area studies (“Jewish Studies” or “Middle Eastern Studies” anthropologists) given how they identify their specialty areas and courses that they teach on their university web pages.

In fact, there also seems to be a link between this de facto outcome (apparent disappearance of Jews) and the methods used in hiring. Anthropological hiring is now clearly, and admittedly, targeted to “representation” rather than to social scientific achievement in solutions to specific problems and applications, or to specific measurable social impact. To examine how this discrimination has worked to eliminate Jews, the author wrote to hiring committees and personnel offices of those universities who use specific language of “representation” in their hiring policies in Anthropology, with specific questions on how these criteria applied to Jews. Among the terms used in university hiring today to promote “diversity” is the term “historically under-represented group.” Before 1973, there were still quotas on Jews in many universities (Oren, 1985) but Jews had, despite quotas, advanced to become overrepresented in Anthropology and Sociology, presumably on the basis of merit. The question this author asked was specifically how two universities that used this specific term as a criterion in hiring would treat Jews and how a Jewish candidate should present himself in applying given the potential for either preference or reverse discrimination. The author asked the schools to specifically define their terms “under-represented” and “historically” to see what time frame they used for history and what criteria they used for representation. Indeed, if the goal were to overcome discrimination and not to discriminate against Jews, the term they would use would be “historically subject to discrimination” rather than “underrepresented” which specifically implies a quota. If they were really promoting diversity and wanted minorities to ensure real intellectual diversity, they would identify the contributions and link them to the discipline’s questions and goals, but they do not do that either. They simply look for representation and ways of triggering it by mentioning “areas” of geography or topics like gender. The weasel word phrase, “historically underrepresented” seems specifically designed to allow for discrimination against one single minority; Jews. The inability or unwillingness to define what is meant by “historically” and “underrepresented” signal that the targeting, specifically, of Jews, is the intent, since it would be easy to answer questions if this were not the case. If the time period meant a century ago, with the history of universities as founded by churches (including one of the universities queried, where Jews would not have been hired), Jews were underrepresented. Today, again, they may be only “quota represented” (down to 2%) or less. Today, similarly, in many anthropology departments, men, who are technically a minority of the population, are also becoming an “underrepresented” minority given the introduction of “Women’s Studies” into Anthropology. So, the term “historically” and “underrepresented” are highly ambiguous terms without transparency and subject to abuse. If Jews are welcome because of the merit and diversity that they bring to these disciplines, it would be very easy for university hiring groups to simply say that Jews were historically “disproportionally” represented on the basis of merit and that they cannot be considered “historically over-represented”. In fact, the universities that use these terms refused to define these terms or to answer how they fit Jews, as a minority and they refuse to use the term “disproportionally” represented in order to make it clear that they are not seeking a 2% quota for Jews. The conclusion that seems easy to reach is that the term “historically underrepresented” is essentially a euphemism for quota filling through “representation”, with departments like Anthropology and Sociology being used specifically for such “representation” rather than for merit based hiring. In fact, the only two groups today that may be the direct victims of the use of this euphemistic term are Jews and (to a small extent) men. Reducing men to some 48% of faculties at most replaces half of the men. Forcing Jews from some 20% of the profession that they achieved on merit and in the face of discrimination, down to 2%, is potentially a purge of some 90% of Jews who would have sought work in the profession. In other words, it appears that after decades of fighting discrimination and gaining representation on
merit, majority groups and other minorities have now worked together to establish a fixed quota for Jews that can no longer be overcome by merit because it is based directly on population statistics.

The result of this for these disciplines is that this “area studies” or single variable approach to hiring works to replace holistic and comparative (social scientific) anthropology, whose mission as a discipline was to test hypothesis and provide solutions and applications to disciplinary questions. The impact of these hiring policies appears to have been to diminish the percentage of Jews in the profession to that similar to their numbers in the population (around 2%) and to replace them with other visible minorities in a form of apparent reverse discrimination. It also appears to have been to eliminate the structure of the discipline around answering questions, following standards, modeling phenomena at the level of societies and cultures, and generating technologies for promoting overall solutions to humanistic concerns. One can speculate on how or whether these two agenda were linked in the hiring and whether the “representational” faculty who were chosen were also selected on specific criteria related to their approaches to science and to real impacts on concerns of social justice.

Similar numbers of Jews in professions in the Soviet Union, starting in the 1950s, were considered evidence of the impact of Russian anti-Semitism, stepped up during the Cold War. There, Jewish entrance into teaching and professional fields dropping to about 2% to reflect their percentage in the national population. For anthropology and a number of current social science fields and spinoffs from Anthropology and Sociology like “Legal Studies” or “Social Justice”, the numbers are now similar, though one does not hear these as calls for sanctions against U.S. universities (as there were calls for sanctions against the Soviet Union) or for migration of intellectuals to “Free World Countries” where they could fulfill their professions (assuming such places exist today or can be identified) or for change. Faced with such barriers in the Soviet Union and other one Party States, Jews and others who were refused entrance to their areas of professional aptitude and choice sought to move to other specialties that are less “political” and that also offered less potential for any kind of transformative social change. Jews are now highly represented in fields of technology (particularly computer science), natural sciences, and administration in the U.S. and Western Europe and perhaps this also represents the same phenomenon. It is not clear whether Jews have left anthropology and sociology because they no longer see it as places where empirical social science is welcome and where they can do real social change. Perhaps they have left as a result of discrimination. Perhaps both factors are at work.

Some Qualitative and Interpretive Data on the Role of Jews in Anthropology and Sociology

Interpreting the meaning of the decline of Jews in the key social science disciplines of anthropology and sociology is difficult because “Jewish culture” and “Jewish values” are, themselves, in flux today and are disputed. To really understand how hiring policies have been used and how Jews in and outside of these disciplines see themselves and the pressures on them would also require the kind of detailed investigation that is way beyond the scope of this essay. However, it is possible to use the very types of interpretive methods that alternatives use to generate the kinds of hypotheses that anthropologists raise, to suggest connections between the decline of Jews in these disciplines and the decline of “social science” and of applications to “social justice” and “social progress” in these disciplines.

To analyze what social phenomena mean, anthropologists typically use forms of qualitative analysis. Among the methodologies is “participant observation” by those who directly confront a particular phenomenon and can report and analyze their experience. Other methods include structured and non-structured interviews with “informants” whose identities are protected.

The format of this article is too brief for a full explanation of these methods and for proof of every conclusion (or conclusive observation) offered here. In qualitative studies, and particularly today in anthropology where authors increasingly study their own ethnic groups, it is impossible (and not always advantageous) to be completely “neutral.”

The value of these methodologies is to allow for reflection, introspection and the raising of hypotheses and interpretations that follow.

The perspective of this author is that the attraction of many of the Jews to the fields of anthropology and sociology in the past, as reflected in the topics and goals of their research, was the ability to advocate
for equality and respect for minorities (particularly in sociology that focused on measures of inequality and power). Indeed, elite attacks on these fields from outside the university often focused on the uses of empirical study by anthropologists and sociologists to challenge dogmas of racial and religious superiority. The perspective of Jewish intellectuals was to use empiricism (i.e., social science, itself) as the means of combating racism and its associated policies. This tradition is long rooted in Jewish culture and particularly in the cultures of Jews living in the European and American Jewish “diaspora” (Cahill, 1998; Lempert, 2015).

In their work in the mid-20th century, the belief of many Jewish social scientists was that the “neutrality” and “objectivity” of social science was the most effective means of achieving the goals of social justice and social progress, through legal and political protections. Rather than simply argue for “representation” and attack science and technology, the Jewish empiricist view, particularly in social science in the 1950s to 1970s, was that scientific objectivity offered the keys to legal and political protections. The ethos of Jewish social scientists and affiliated movements in law by Jewish legal scholars, lawyers and judges, was that elimination of scientific objectivity and the standards and laws that derived from them, would lead to a return to discrimination and oppression in another form.

Indeed, if one were trying to undermine the movements towards social progress, through legal enforcement of rights that empirical social science was building, it would appear that the way to do that would be to eliminate Jews from these professions and to try to eviscerate the disciplines. The way that authoritarian governments in Europe suppressed calls for social progress and rights protections was to repress social sciences and to eliminate Jews in them. The Hungarians did this. The Nazis did this. So did the Soviet Russian Empire in its ethnic purges.

If one were seeking to do this in the United States, one could seek to suppress the data and the work of scholars on specific questions of social change, equality and rights or one could replace and co-opt them. Certainly, one question to ask about social sciences over the past thirty years is whether the ethnic policies of “representation” have also somehow co-opted the scholars who have been hired in these professions.

Certainly, the advocacy for rights and social justice has not been suppressed in the writings and speech of anthropologists and sociologists. It is loud and clear, coming from the perspective (and, often, the specific self-interest) of each entrant on behalf of his or her group. On the other hand, it would simply be nothing more than “noise” if it were detached from standards, science, and applications. That may be what has happened.

**An Interpretive Theory about What has Happened and its Impact on Social Science and Social Progress**

There have been two clear changes in universities in the past thirty years, in profile of faculty and in curricula, and they appear to be related. One has been “affirmative action” to create “equity” in the universities on the basis of representation among faculty members; particularly in gender and skin color. The other has been a transformation of social sciences and humanities in ways that have eliminated empirical social science in fields like social and cultural anthropology and that have created a series of new “representational” disciplines that promote “identities” and area studies but without social science or technical applications to institution building and social change. These changes have turned large areas of social sciences into theologies, philosophy, journalistic reporting, and promotion of homogenization/assimilation of cultural and intellectual differences in the global, urban, industrial, New World Order. The early descriptions of these changes claimed that they represented an incorporation of “morality” (D’Andrade, 1995) along with “re-invention” (Hymes, 1982). This author, writing about the changes, has found much of it justified on the basis of reactions against the uses of social sciences by modern governments to cause harm rather than good. The justification seemed to be that the only way to eliminate the immoral use of social science and technologies was to eliminate social science and the technologies, themselves, rather than to confront and change them (Duncan, 1995; 2011; 2013).
The two processes appear to be interconnected though the causality is not clear. Ironically, American Jews have largely facilitated this change even though it has come at the expense of Jews in the social sciences and appears to have undermined the very approaches, social reform goals, and intellectual pursuits promoted by Jews.

In the former Soviet Union and in Western Europe, quotas to replace positions and approaches of Jews were instigated by authoritarian “populist” regimes. In the U.S., the approach appears to have been supported by Jews, with Jewish men retiring and filling their already “minority” slots with other minorities, women.

What probably led Jews to support this transition was the claim that this approach to “representation” would promote equality and “social justice” along with new “advocacy” approaches.

Traditionally, Jewish social scientists had often sought to directly confront the political actors who were using social science for immoral ends and had sought to reform social sciences and their applications. Jewish intellectuals like Noam Chomsky, Howard Zinn, Frances Fox Piven, Marvin Harris, and Jared Diamond have been leaders of a tradition of intellectuals promoting social science for progressive social goals. There seem to have been similar movements among women (“eco-feminism”) and among minorities promoting progressive and applied social sciences (e.g., the tradition of sociologist William DuBois, followed in historically black colleges in the U.S. The idea for promoting diversity and representation throughout academia may have been based on the belief that diversity would magnify this approach rather than replace it.

The result, however, appears to have been the opposite; to undermine real economic and political equality and social justice, either through biases entering into the hiring or through other influences that the new representational diversity was unable or unwilling to check, as individuals pursued the interests of their specific groups and their own careers.

The ethical principle that was emerging in anthropology by the 1960s was to protect minority cultures and difference, not to assimilate minorities (the current approach), while the goal of sociology was to promote economic equality and opportunity, not just homogenization. The “representation” supported by anthropology today, however, is mostly one of promoting assimilation and, unfortunately, what could be viewed as cultural genocide, through support of globalization. Meanwhile, the goals of “equality” have boosted some women and a few minorities into positions of power while overall social inequality in the U.S. and globally are now at their highest levels in decades. One of the impacts of a turn away from social science and application is that these fields no longer teach the science of social transformation and progress; only the rhetoric, metaphor, philosophy and documentation of transition.

When Jews founded key social sciences, it was partly to address “Jewish questions” of cultural survival, tolerance (predicting and averting genocides and war), rule of law and accountability, sustainability, social “progress” including equality, and intellectual freedom. The approach was not advocacy for Jews but the opposite: stress on shared intellectual approaches, commitment to objective principles, reason and empiricism. The goal was to overcome subjectivity and self-interest and to focus on long-term progress and civilization. With the disappearance of Jews in social science, this has been reversed. Rather than build institutions and focus on the long-term, social science today appears to have become a forum for competing self-interests and narcissism.

In the areas of social science today that were once the purview of Jewish scholars, seeking a “neutral”, humanistic, empiricism to promote shared long term human goals and to build technologies for human betterment, what one finds instead are self-interested advocacy, narcissistic philosophizing, and dogma, whether it is in anthropology and sociology or in small pockets in other social science disciplines. Most of the works of Jewish social thinkers and social scientists from the 1960s and earlier have been purged from the curriculum and from journals. A form of Orwellian “Newspeak” now determines that classic theories of social science and their applications are “too old” to be cited, and scholars in these areas report inabilities to publish as a result of these exclusionary criteria. Questions and comparisons are no longer of interest to the young scholars who are emerging in these fields, and are eliminated. Citations to authors like Daniel Bell, Marvin Harris, Paul Goodman, Noam Chomsky, and those who partly resurrect their approaches today, like Jared Diamond, are reportedly targeted for removal.
Critics say that there are still Jews in social sciences but that they have simply moved. The positions that they take, however, may actually show the larger phenomenon. Among economists and policy makers, prominent Jews like Paul Krugman, Joseph Stiglitz (two Nobel Prize winners), Jeff Sachs, and former Secretary of Labor Robert Reich, are often viewed as examples of Jewish “progressives”. Yet they are in fact supporters of globalization and minority assimilation, using empirical critiques to occasionally call for more taxation, redistribution and opportunity. Perhaps they are examples of the pressures for co-optation that may exist throughout the disciplines. They are Jews and still promote certain Jewish views and approaches, but not the full set of human rights and protections that Jews sought to address in anthropology and sociology.

Though there are still many Jews in some other disciplines that were considered parts of the social sciences, the idea of Jewish missions there, including commitment to empiricism, have also disappeared, though Jewish scholars were among those pushing those disciplines in the 1950s through the 1970s to focus on equity, opportunity, and empowerment; modeling strategies of change and teaching applications. Social sciences like economics and political science today appear to have become theologies of “production engineering” and “manufacturing consent”, offering mathematics and support and defense of current systems rather than mechanisms of change. There are still plenty of Jews in these areas as there were throughout the Cold War. In fact, these were easy disciplines in which Jews could fit, but in ways that muted possibility for progress or social change. Jews remain in these fields, with their work appearing to often serve the interests of the upper 1%, promoting American exceptionalism and its economic dogmas. Many of these Jews are the adherents of neo-conservatism and neo-liberalism; the ideologies of militarism, globalism and corporatism.

Soviet Studies offers an example of the changes that have occurred. In that area field, some Jewish scholars did try to compare empires and understand how they could be humanized, like Alfred Meyer, Harold Berman, Alex Inkeles, Daniel Bell, and David Lempert, with others taking similar approaches in related fields; among them, Immanuel Wallerstein, Seymour Melman and Alvin Toffler. Most, however, worked to demonstrate their support for U.S. elites through their agreement to take Jewish anger out on the Russians and other Slavic peoples in ideological condemnations (Lempert, 1988).

When confronted by the data of declining numbers of Jews in specific disciplines, critiques say that changes that have occurred in the disciplines are not linked to ethnicity. They claim that Jews themselves have abandoned social science and applications and concerns of social progress and social justice. They say that the numbers of Jewish scholars in fields like economics, law, and political science, who serve establishment agendas, suggest that Jewish intellectual culture has changed and that Jews are not the victims but responsible parties for the problem. They say that Jewish scholars have simply moved out of fields like anthropology and sociology into other areas that are more prestigious and more lucrative and that it is by choice. They say that the lack of minorities promoting social science today and its applications for social progress is not due to selection but also to choice.

This author believes that the data shows otherwise. Progressive Jewish intellectuals have, in fact, some of the largest followings in readership of their works and recent political candidates in similar traditions (like Senator Bernie Sanders) do as well. This author believes that there have been specific ideological and political pressures that have targeted types of research, empirical methods, teaching approaches, research questions and applications. The approach that remains is one that reflects not only a “conservative” agenda but also a set of religious beliefs behind it.

In anthropology, in place of Jewish attempts at a neutral, empirical and objective social science, linking studies of humans to evolution and biology, are now dogmas that were originally those of the Catholic Church. The discipline’s current assumptions sever the link between humans and biology, attacking the idea of cultural and social evolution or comparisons with primate behaviors. They deny any kind of objectivity or neutrality that would allow use of the scientific method. They deny that behaviors are determined or predicted, or that there are technologies that can be used to improve the human condition. What has replaced science is the idea that everything is a subjective individual choice. This is the same ideology as that of the Catholic Church. The battle that is being waged against social sciences
today appears to be largely an echo of the battle against “evolution” and Darwinian theory, that has existed for some 150 years and that appears to have emerged in a new form. The replacement of Jews in anthropology and sociology, and the approaches in other sciences largely seem to reflect an emergence of Christian religious beliefs about determinism, free will, and about science itself. The idea that science and empiricism are only “beliefs”, the attack on comparing human groups to those of primates and other species, the attack on beliefs of cultural “evolution”, the attack on predictions of human behavior using nature and science, and the belief that cultures are “socially constructed” rather than subject to natural and environmental determinants, are basic Christian religious beliefs.

Teaching and research in social sciences today have largely returned to the methods and approaches of Church scholarship that predate the opening of the university to social science (and to Jews in the 20th century). There’s little or no laboratory testing, little hypothesis testing, little modeling, little thought experimentation. There is no real empowerment of students through objective skills learning or democratic experiential education (Lempert, 1995). There are few student-designed community protection projects. Instead, students are channeled into existing organizations as low level assistants and trained for obedience to dogma and to narcissistic philosophy. What is taught today is semantics, “deconstruction” and paralysis rather than entrepreneurship for social change. That is akin to Church scholarship. Current scholars are reinventing the wheel and treating symptoms and offering philosophies and definitions rather than addressing any root causes of contemporary problems such as genocides and inequalities.

In economics and political science, while there are dogmas about human nature that are not allowed to be tested or examined (that of “profit maximizing” or “utility maximizing” individuals, putting unlimited greed above community or society), in anthropology, the dogma is that all cultures and societies are “social constructions” created in the mind and imposed by the mind and perception, also apart from biology or environment. The current ideology is that history cannot be used as a comparison with modern conditions in order to model and predict contemporary societies in order to be able to change them, because we are at the highest point of creation, in a “post-modern” age that is distinct and incomparable. In the context of this set of ideological beliefs, most applications and tools that would promote sustainability or co-existence or social progress find themselves labeled as sacrilegious, or “hegemonic”. The only way to examine reality is through “metaphors” of power; to “deconstruct” rather than to reconstruct and create. At the same time, political labels are the norm given that scientific comparisons are forbidden. In American social science, political terms like “socialism” and “post-socialism” are used in place of scientific concepts in order to use scholars to perpetuate divides with Eastern Europe and prevent comparisons with U.S. This is theology.

What is left in place of social science is journalism and philosophy (Duncan, 2011). Power can be documented but not held accountable. Indeed, anthropologists now view it as “immoral” to write about those who exercise power or to attempt change other than that benefitting one’s own group interests. Area studies is promoted for foreign policy and domestic reporting, not for theory and hypothesis testing

If there are any Jews among the names of leaders in fields like anthropology, they are no longer empirical social scientists but philosophers. Even in Israel, Jewish social scientists have also abandoned the traditions established by Jews, in an effort to gain recognition from American colleagues in fields now dominated by a very different tradition.

Within social and cultural anthropology today, for example, some of the more recent Jewish icons are Clifford Geertz (half-Jewish), Paul Rabinow and Sherry Ortner. These are Jews whose reputations rose as they offered attacks on the scientific method and turn to anthropology as literature, philosophy, and introspection with little or no practical application or solutions to the intellectual problems posed by the discipline.

Indeed, one of the reasons that the American Anthropological Association is able to cover up what has been happening and to pretend it has not occurred, is to point to the few Jews who were on the side of the Israeli boycott, as “evidence” that there is no anti-Semitism in the profession. Others simply say that Jews “choose” to no longer enter social sciences because of some unexplained lack of interest. Such a view fails to recognize that the destruction of empirical social science and the purging of Jews may itself
be the signal to Jews that their views are unwelcome. Jews may view the disciplines not only as unwelcoming but also lacking in prestige and salary, and on the downslide, in comparison to other disciplines in the university where Jews traditionally excel and where they seem to still be “disproportionately” (but not “over”) represented.

Discussion: Has This Topic Been Suppressed?

Why is it that Jews are silent about these changes? With calls to ban Israeli institutions for discrimination against Palestinians, how is it that a discriminatory purge against Jews and Jewish approaches in social sciences like anthropology are not even discussed by Jews in a form of solidarity to promote Jews?

Every minority group in the social sciences, with one exception, now advocates for its members to create a promotion network for positions in a patronage system reminiscent of (and perhaps no different from) the “old boys’ network” that they sought to challenge. The exception is Jews. There is no group of Jewish anthropologists or Jewish social scientists protecting or promoting the interests of Jews. Jews seem to be afraid to draw attention to themselves in this way and to protect each other or to advocate for a specific Jewish view of social science and social justice through social science.

Jewish-American academics appear to see no evil, hear no evil and speak of no evil. I know the issue has been raised to many of them, with appeals to Jews to stand up to protect Jews. They appear to recognize the issues presented in this article and do not disagree that Jews are disappearing from these professions. Yet, those asked uniformly respond that they do not wish to even mention the issue of anti-Semitism, let alone work for any solidarity among Jews in the way that other groups support each other.

It may be that Jews are unable to admit that the stated goals of equality have failed to promote social justice and that decisions by Jews have been a part of the problem. Many Jews were the instigators of these changes, in the name of “social progress”. It may be hard to admit that something far different and potentially far more dangerous has occurred and continues to occur. As in Europe in the 1930’s, Jews remain silent, perhaps hoping that problems will just go away and pretending that they do not exist; hoping they will be able to assimilate and not be noticed or targeted.

There is a sympathetic way to look at the bind that Jewish academics may find they are in. The position of Jews is unlike that of other ethnic groups.

First, if Jews still recognize the tradition of science and objectivity as the path towards “perfecting the world” in the Jewish tradition of social justice and progress, the last thing they would want to do is to be part of a system that simply argues for “representation” of ethnic groups as the key to progress in the disciplines. The Jewish approach was to create a non-sectarian social science that would raise everyone together by pursing “truth” and solutions. A “multi-sectarian”, fragmented social science in multiple directions of advocacy and self-interest represents the very breakdown of this goal. By turning themselves into just another advocacy group, Jews would be recognizing the failure of the Jewish ideal and its replacement with just self-interest advocacy and narcissism. If this is where we are today, and it may be, how could Jewish intellectuals admit it and join it?

Second, Jews may find themselves at greater risks today if they self-identify. If the gutting of the social sciences is an attack on the idea of science itself, and a return to an anti-Darwinian belief that denies a kind of evolutionary “determinism” and replaces it with the view of the Church, Jews may truly be more vulnerable than ever before because they represent challenge to a unifying religious dogma. Calling attention to themselves may be a real danger, for individuals and for Jews as a whole. Faced with such dangers, the approach of Jews is typically to avoid attention and to try to blend in, as the safest strategy for survival.

It may be one thing for blacks or Latinos or Asians to make demands for greater representation. These groups are already large percentages of the populations in the U.S. and Western countries or they have links to large populations, elsewhere. By contrast, Jews are a very small group.

For Jews to make the argument that they are deserving of a return to over-representation because their contribution has been more valuable to the professions, that it represents the heart of progress of the
professions, and is also at the basis of social change, in an era where the “powers that be” have turned back the clock to destroy social change, if not the planet with it, may be courting danger. It would be reasonable for Jews to fear that they would be inviting exactly that backlash against Jews that has occurred regularly throughout history in the Western world.

Whatever the reason, Jews remain silent today, offering little challenge to the “politically correct” ideologies of “progress” and “social justice” offered by other groups, though they may be little more than myths.

**Conclusion**

Anthropologists try to step “outside” of their own cultures to take a broader perspective, as if they were seeing their own cultures for the first time, without being fixed in the existing debates and discourse. In the U.S. and Western Europe, the debate over multi-culturalism as it has been applied in universities and in other areas in society has been fixed into a polarized debate. One must either be entirely for it or entirely against it, with the risk that any critics are described as “racist” or “sexist” and wanting to return to “the past” in a reversal of what is assumed without any debate to be a sign of “progress”. There are different forms of multi-culturalism and reform, including the one that minorities and women promised but have apparently not followed, to transform science and technologies so as to achieve humanistic goals of cultural sustainability, economic equality, political reform, and peace. The promise was not to replace social science and its technical applications with only humanities subjects, each promoting study of a different group. But who, today, can or will promote it, particularly after nearly thirty years of attacks.

Criticism of what has happened is so controlling that it has been described in the very terms that everyone understands and that harks back to thinking in totalitarian states: “political correctness”. How is it that such controls on thinking and critique could come to characterize what is supposed to be “progressive” social change towards more openness?

As seen from the outside, viewed as a whole, the answer seems to be that the multi-cultural path that was chosen seems to be one almost entirely in line with the growing wealth, power, and authority of elites that is everything but social progress. The multi-culturalism that we find today in university disciplines like anthropology and sociology appears from the outside to have substituted an ideology of “social justice” for real social justice, in a way that covers up a regressive, globalist agenda and suppresses any debate on what has happened by targeting critics as “racist” or “sexist”.

Those who have benefitted from this new form of “multi-culturalism” (that seems to be closer to “assimilation” or perhaps “tokenism” rather than an introduction of multiple cultural approaches to real social transformation) are, of course, the first to attack any critics and to defend the changes. Their arguments are that they have never stopped criticizing globalization and various “isms” that they never really measure or define (primarily “capitalism” and “socialism”). They claim that they have awakened “consciousness” and taught people to “think” and that what they do is on high “moral” ground.

Certainly, this article will face these very attacks.

The challenge to the defenders of this path of multi-culturalism, is to show that after more than a generation, that they have had real, measurable impact on the larger society in ways that are greater than the previous era (post-World War II to the 1970s) in areas of social justice and social progress. Not only can they not show this with any actual data, since all the data shows regress not progress, but they no longer even have the tools to offer measures.

The irony is that this new “morality” has not only come at the expense of the one ethnic group that traditionally fought for and built the infrastructure for social progress, but that its adherents have worked to destroy this infrastructure. They have worked to make the university impotent by attacking science, undermining social science, and eliminating measurement, itself. Given what the measurements now show, they certainly have no incentive now to rebuild a system of measurement.

They will say that what they have done is “moral”, but they have made themselves and their disciplines powerless, if not useless in promoting social progress. They have stripped social science of its science and technology and turned it into something more akin to religion. They can no longer justify
what they have done with measures because they no longer believe in measures; viewing measurement (and perhaps civilization, itself) as some form of “oppression” to be eliminated (Strathern, 2000; Engle Merry 2011).

While many of the minorities who have taken positions in academic disciplines may claim to be teaching (or, in politics, representing the interests of) “social justice”, it appears to be empty rhetoric. The larger implications are well reflected in the political acts of members of the AAA against Jewish anthropologists. This is not social change or institution building based on legal or scientific principles. What we are seeing is a destructive political attack without equity and without theoretical basis. We are seeing echoes of the wrongful tactics used by others a century before, but now in the hands of new groups claiming to be more representative but apparently caring only about their own parochial interests; perhaps too co-opted or too cowed to try to look at themselves or to stand up to those powerful actors who are the real source of injustices.
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1 The legal review and legal issues raised were discussed with a member of the AAA who is also an attorney and who has asked for confidentiality.
2 The final reported vote was 2,423 against and 2,384 in favor, announced in early June 2016.
3 This standard comes from U.S. law, established by the Supreme Court and defined in the decision, Village of Arlington Heights v. Metropolitan Housing Corp., 429 U.S. 252 (1977). The three possible tests of it are: whether the impact is “stark and dramatic”, whether the historical background suggests that discrimination was intended, and whether administrative records demonstrate intent. There are reasons to suggest that each of these three standards are met, independently here, and particularly the first.
4 This is reported by an anonymous member of the AAA.
5 While no better method of ethnic identification is available in the absence of surveys, this method at least has the advantage of consistency in that the same bias (undercounting or over-counting) and is used only for the purpose of historic trends, not to confirm “accuracy”. The author made identification by looking at typical Eastern European Jewish surnames that often use animal totems (“wolf”, “fox”), colors (“white”, “black”, “green”) and link to professions (“stein” for gems work, “sugar”), and common place endings (“stein”) in Germanic, Russian, Hungarian and other Eastern European Slavic forms along with common first names, as well as Israeli names. The most likely bias is to underreport the actual numbers. In an effort to avoid discrimination, Jews in the U.S. and Europe often changed their surnames and adopted common first names as well as sought to hide their origins through different cosmetic means (e.g., cosmetic surgery, straightening hair). Large numbers of Jews in recent years have also intermarried, though that may only start to affect the data recently given the lag time.
6 This kind of identification is still sensitive for some Jews since this kind of formal identification of Jews by surnames and physiognomy was used by both the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany in carrying out discriminatory (and deadly) policies. It is also likely that the same methods were used up until the early 1970s in college admissions in major universities to enforce what was then an “unofficial” quota (Oren, 1985).

Here, however, there is no attempt to identify and “out” any specific individuals for any discriminatory purpose, in fact the opposite. There is no attempt to invade privacy or to try to force anyone of Jewish ancestry to quantify or define that ancestry. Jews, today, are understandably apprehensive today about identification (e.g., is it best to include Hebrew or Yiddish language skills and Jewish religious education on a list of skills today or is it immediately understood that it is something to be hidden?) and there was no attempt to approach individual to ask them to self-identify.

6 Bucknell University, in Pennsylvania, for example, uses the term “historically underrepresented in higher education” and has a university statement on promoting diversity as well as a special Associate Provost for Diversity. In 2017, the author wrote directly to the Associate Provost for Diversity, the Provost, the Dean of Arts and Sciences, a Programme Chair for an academic hiring slot using this term, and the head of the Human Resources offices as well as a staff member. The Anthropology Department of American University in Washington, D.C., also offered an ad in 2017 noting that “Applications from historically underrepresented minority and identity groups are strongly encouraged to apply”. The author wrote to the Department Chair.