



Urban Anthropology (The Journal): A Personal History

Author(s): Jack R. Rollwagen

Source: *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems and World Economic Development*, WINTER, 1991, Vol. 20, No. 4, Index of Urban Anthropology Volumes 1-20, 1972-1991 (WINTER, 1991), pp. 361-372

Published by: The Institute, Inc.

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40553217>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

The Institute, Inc. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems and World Economic Development*

Urban Anthropology (The Journal): A Personal History

Jack R. Rollwagen

Department of Anthropology
SUNY College at Brockport

ABSTRACT: A personal account of the twenty years between the establishment of the journal *Urban Anthropology* in 1972 and its evolution up to 1991 through the eyes of the journal's editor, Jack Rollwagen. This article discusses the professional context of the evolution of the journal, and links the establishment of *Urban Anthropology* to the author's career in anthropology. The journal expanded its scope of subject matter beginning in 1984, which was expressed at that time in the change of the name of the journal to *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems and World Economic Development*.

When, in 1963, I chose a topic for my dissertation research, anthropologists were just beginning to re-draw the boundaries of their discipline to include as a major focus of their attention not only peasant villages but also the migration of those peasants to cities. However, it was still not clear that such studies were appropriate subject matter, at least in the eyes of many anthropologists. Oscar Lewis had published *A Village in Mexico: Tepoztlán Restudied* in 1951, and had followed that with the article "Urbanization without Breakdown" (1952) in which he discussed the cityward migration of people from Tepoztlán, Mexico. I began to make plans for fieldwork in Mexico on rural-urban migration. By the time that I was ready to start fieldwork for my dissertation in 1964, the biographical accounts on city life in Latin America by Lewis that were to establish him to the larger audience of non-anthropologist readers in America were beginning to appear with great regularity: *Five Families* (1959), *Children of Sanchez* (1961), and, ultimately, *La Vida* (1965). The Robert Redfield - Oscar Lewis debate was at the center of attention of anthropologists studying peasants, those studying Latin America in general, and certainly those studying Mexico. However, it appeared curious to me that what I saw as an important potential source for the transformation of anthropology seemed to have very little impact upon the many journals published in anthropology. To a great extent, at least in my view (and in my memory),

anthropological journals of that time continued to be focused upon the ethnography and ethnology of primitives and the implication the study of those topics had for anthropology. There was debate about topics which were relevant to what was to come (e.g., the debate about "community"), but there was no journal source in anthropology to which one could turn one's attention for the coverage of rural-urban migration, urbanization, or urbanism. Similarly, there were at that time no books by anthropologists introductory to what was to become "urban anthropology." Mangin's collection of readings *Peasants in Cities*, one of the first books in anthropology to approach the topic of cities anthropologically, was published in 1970.

In the fall of 1971, I decided to explore the possible publication of a journal on urban anthropology. There were no journals in anthropology that specialized in the study of cities. However, I wanted to know whether it was a reasonable project. At that time, M. Estelle Smith was a colleague of mine in the Department of Anthropology at SUNY College at Brockport. I spoke to her about my plans and asked her what she thought. She said that she thought it was a good idea, and furthermore she said that if it would convince me to begin the experiment, she would contribute an article to the first issue.

I also began to explore the process of publishing, and the costs of publication. I reasoned that if I were able to generate enough interest *before* I began to actually publish the journal that I could pay for expenses out of the income generated by the sale of those journals. I rejected the idea of seeking institutional funding for the project or seeking to have the journal published by an academic publisher because I wanted to retain control over the publication process. I chose the format, the type, the paper stock, and the cover design. I decided very early that I would use high quality paper and cover stock, that I would pay for typesetting (rather than to use typewritten material, as others did at that time who began journals for their organizations), and that I would get the journal perfect bound. I also made the decision *not* to have anything other than articles in the journal (e.g., a calendar of meetings, news items, book reviews, etc). Also, there were to be no advertisements (and consequently no income from those sources either). Having determined the costs, I then began to consider how many people would have to subscribe in order to pay for the expenses. My calculations were that if I could convince 100 people to subscribe to the journal at a per volume subscription cost of \$7.50, I could pay the expenses for the first volume given the decisions I had made about format, typesetting, and binding.

At that point, I called a number of anthropologists who had published on topics which I considered to be appropriate for the subject matter of the journal. Over a period of several weeks, I accumulated a sufficiently large number of individuals who had agreed to submit articles that I could

begin the project. I then prepared a one-page, typeset, flyer about the project, including a subscription form. I took that with me to the American Anthropological Association (hereafter AAA) meetings in the fall of 1971, and arranged with the AAA to put them near the book displays. (At that time, the AAA allowed me to do that at no charge.) I also approached Robert V. ("Van") Kemper (whom I had met in one of the organizations of the AAA and who seemed to have a great deal of energy and promise) to help me in another aspect of the project. I had decided that the journal would contain nothing other than articles. However, I had the feeling that if I did not somehow publish book reviews and news items that the project would be less desirable to subscribers. After I had discussed the journal project with him, I asked if he would be interested in working with me on the "news" items, on book reviews, and other "non-article" items to be published in a separate newsletter. He agreed and thus began a friendship and collaboration that has continued to the present time.

The first issue of *Urban Anthropology* (the journal) and the *Urban Anthropology Newsletter* appeared in the spring of 1972. I had received sufficient subscription monies to pay for the costs of that first issue by the time that the first issue was published. Similarly, when the second issue was published there were enough additional subscription monies to pay for the costs of that second issue. Each of the two first issues (which comprised volume one) contained approximately 150 pages. *Urban Anthropology* continued to be published only twice a year for three years. By 1974, I had 350 subscribers, almost all of them individuals.

Not everyone thought that the idea of an "urban anthropology" was a good idea. The first issue of the *Urban Anthropology Newsletter* (UAN 1:1), contained comments by several scholars who were well-known by their work in urban areas. One of these, Anthony Leeds, challenged the very idea of an "urban anthropology."^[1] Fortunately, however, there were enough people interested in an "urban anthropology" to allow the journal to continue.

In 1974, I was contacted by an editor from Plenum Publishing Company located in New York City. Plenum was a "scientific" publisher, specializing in the hard sciences, medicine, and foreign language publications. They had seen *Urban Anthropology* and wanted to assume publication, buying it if possible. Although I was beginning to feel that the time that it took to edit and publish *Urban Anthropology* were taking its toll on my own writing and research, I still wanted to retain control of the journal. In my negotiations with Plenum, I was able to work out an arrangement in which I would be able to continue to own and edit the journal but they would assume all of the publishing, distribution, and subscription functions. They were to pay me \$1,000.00 a year as an honorarium to continue to edit the journal. They also bought all of the back issues of the journal. I agreed that *Urban Anthropology* was to become a

quarterly, since Plenum could charge more for a quarterly and because a quarterly journal in their eyes (and that of others) appeared more "professional," more "substantial." Furthermore, they had no desire to publish the *Urban Anthropology Newsletter*. After due consideration of the possibilities (and after discussion with Van Kemper about his role in the new arrangements), I decided to incorporate only two elements of the *Urban Anthropology Newsletter* into the journal published by Plenum: (a) book reviews; and (b) a section that was to be called "Communications." Estellie Smith volunteered to take over the book reviews section of the journal beginning with *Urban Anthropology* 4:3. She continued in this role until the publication of *Urban Anthropology* 12:3-4 when DeWight Middleton took over the book reviews. Van Kemper contributed frequent items to the "Communications" section of the journal from UA 4:1 through 7:4 (at which time he returned to Mexico City for a year of fieldwork and was, therefore, not able to continue his contributions on a regular basis). With the demise of the *Urban Anthropology Newsletter*, Van and Estellie were invited onto the journal as associate editors. By that time, I also felt that Urban Anthropology should have an editorial board, one which would help to establish the journal more firmly. I therefore made a list of individuals whom I hoped would agree to lend their names to this enterprise. The first editorial board appeared in volume 4:1 and included the following individuals: Douglas Butterworth, Wayne Cornelius, Richard G. Fox, John Gulick, William John Hanna, Ulf Hannerz, Jennifer James, Anthony Leeds, Kenneth Little, T.G. McGee, William Mangin, Richard M. Morse, Leonard Plotnicov, Robert J. Smith, and Aidan Southall.

Plenum's first action (taken without consultation with me) was to raise the subscription amounts from \$7.50 for either individual or institutional subscription for two issues a year (300 pages), to \$60.00 for institutions and \$25.00 for individuals for four issues a year (400 pages). At that point, almost all of the individual subscribers refused to renew their subscriptions. Later, I was able to convince Plenum that they should reduce the individual rate to \$15.00. However, the damage had been done and very few individuals re-initiated their subscriptions. However, under Plenum's management the number of institutional subscribers rose significantly. This put the journal on a firm financial foundation.

The arrangement with Plenum lasted six years. By the end of the fourth year, Plenum had changed editors twice, and had inadvertently introduced advertisements for their other journals into *Urban Anthropology* on one occasion. By the end of the fifth year, Plenum had lost interest in the publication of *Urban Anthropology* and the journal was falling further and further behind publication schedule. I began negotiations to reassume publication of the journal myself. The first step in the plan was to get Plenum to release me from the contract that I had signed. They were quite willing to do so. However, they retained all of the back issues of the

journal, which they eventually sold to J.S. Canner and Company in order to recoup some of their "losses." (J.S. Canner and Company can be reached at 10 Charles Street, Needham Heights, MA 02194; back issues of volumes 1 through 9 are still available from Canner.)

In order to prepare for the re-assumption of publication of *Urban Anthropology*, I established a "for profit" corporation to "own" the journal on 7 June 1973.[2] The reasons for doing so were quite straightforward: (1) it limited my personal liability; and (2) it made publication and the journal more straightforward than any other mechanism. For example, in order to obtain a permit for bulk mailing the journal I need only pay an annual fee (and the costs of the mailings, of course) and fill out very simple paperwork. Had I incorporated as a not-for-profit corporation, the process was extremely complicated and subject to review at every step and at any time by a diverse bureaucracy not inclined to favor "not-for-profits."

When I concluded that I wanted to continue publishing *Urban Anthropology* and that I would not only continue my role as editor but that I would also re-assume the role of publisher, I had to make a set of basic but very important decisions. One of the major problems with returning to the same procedure that I had used during the first three years of publishing *Urban Anthropology* was that I could not establish a publication schedule that was in any way predictable because I did not control the process of typesetting. However, other possibilities had become available in the early 1980s which had not been available in the 1970s when I first started the journal. I began to notice advertisements for a new kind of computer, one which was billed as a "personal computer." To me, this seemed ideal! I could buy my own computer and then I would not have to worry about scheduling time for the production of the journal. Also, it seemed to me, that if I owned the computer, I could pay for the machine out of the money that I would normally pay for typesetting.

I decided that I would buy an Apple computer. I also decided that, since I would be taking over the business end of the process, I would also have to have a business letter quality printer, and a modem to transmit the formatted journal copy to a typesetter. Since I had no savings, I made arrangements at a local bank to borrow sufficient money to pay for the computer, the software I needed, and the letter quality printer. The total came to more than \$8,000.00. The bank suggested that I borrow an additional \$5,000.00 in order to insure that I have sufficient money to pay for other startup costs. I took out a second mortgage on my house for \$13,000.00 on March 19, 1982 and started to learn (1) how to work a computer, and (2) how to manage a business, both at the same time that I also had to meet a quarterly journal publication schedule. The mortgage was paid off on 18 May 1984.

Throughout the history of the journal, I had evolved a particular set of practices about the editing of the journal as well. In the early years, I relied

mainly upon volunteered papers to provide the content of the journal. When *Urban Anthropology* was published only twice a year, this was not so much of a problem. However, when the journal expanded to quarterly publication, I knew that I was going to have to find other options. My policy, unconscious at first but more conscious as specific examples arose, was:

(1) to review articles submitted for publication from anyone regardless of whether they had a Ph.D. in anthropology or not. I reviewed articles from graduate students and from emeritus professors (and everybody in between) at a time when there were quite clear separations between those journals which were "professional" journals (i.e., followed the policy of publishing articles only after a review which would filter out graduate student articles) and those journals that were published by students and to a large degree were oriented toward the publication of student papers (e.g., the *Steward Journal of Anthropology*).

(2) to review articles by professionals from other disciplines. As I began to realize that relying upon individuals to volunteer papers would not bring in enough high quality manuscripts, nor bring them in at the times when I would be able to prepare them to meet my publication schedules, I began to look for other possibilities for papers. This resulted in the addition of two more policies:

(3) to be more active in contacting individuals who had presented symposia at various professional meetings (or who were about to do so) on topics that I felt were important to the field of urban anthropology;[3] and

(4) to make arrangements with some of the societies within the American Anthropological Association (or affiliated groups) who did not at that time have their own journal to publish the papers from a particular symposium as a special issue of *Urban Anthropology*.

(5) to encourage contributions from the widest variety of contributors. As editor, I solicited manuscripts from scholars throughout the world by letter, by personal invitation, and through colleagues.[4]

As a result of these activities, I began to get back onto publication schedule. However, it took ten years (1981 to 1991) before the quarter (e.g. "Spring, 19XX) on the cover of the journal matched the actual quarter of the "real" calendar year. It was not unusual during this period of time for me to be working on eight issues of *Urban Anthropology* at one time. In fact, it was almost necessary to have that many issues "in process." Editing

on a quarterly publication schedule requires that an issue be initiated well in advance of its actual publication. Solicitation of a set of papers that were presented in a professional meeting usually required sufficient time for the symposia paper to be rewritten in the style, formality, and length requisite for journal publication. Also, a high percentage of individuals who presented papers in symposia either never completed a formal journal paper or had that paper accepted. In order to have at least five or six papers that were acceptable for publication, I had to find symposia with at least eight papers.

I had made the decision early in the process that I would get peer reviews, and that these peer reviews would be anonymous. Peer reviews, of course, took time. When I sent out a paper for review, I always sent it out to at least two individuals whose names I had culled out of the index to the programs for the annual meetings of the American Anthropological Association or the Society for Applied Anthropology. I decided upon a "double blind" peer review process (in which neither the author of the manuscript nor the peer reviewer were given the name of the other party) because, it seemed to me, that it allowed editors more freedom in writing critical comments.

By the late 1970s, the number of people who referred to themselves as "urban anthropologists" was high enough to suggest that there be an association for individuals interested in "urban anthropology" within the American Anthropological Association. I was approached independently by two anthropologists to found a "Society for Urban Anthropology." I made all of the arrangements with the AAA to establish such a society during the AAA annual meetings in 1979 and to publicize the meeting in which the attempt would take place. During the meeting (attended by approximately 60 individuals, which indicated quite a bit of interest in such a society), the Society for Urban Anthropology (SUA) was founded. I was elected the founding president. I suggested that we have the policy of having the president-elect work on the program for the symposia that the Society for Urban Anthropology would present at the next AAA meetings. Leonard Plotnicov was elected president-elect and not only took on the task of program chair for the Society for the following AAA meetings, but also established the Society's *Newsletter*.

At the same time, I decided to expand contacts with other professionals in the international arena. The journal by now, of course, was being distributed throughout the world, as it continues to be today. However, in my own editing work I had the need to find reviewers to read manuscripts on a wide variety of topics. Finding reviewers who were experts in the topics of manuscripts was never easy. I wanted for myself (and I assumed that others would also want the same) a convenient reference source in which to locate anthropologists by (a) topical area of research interest, and (b) by country. I began in early 1980 to compile a directory of urban

anthropologists similar to the one which Van Kemper had published earlier in *Urban Anthropology* (Kemper 1975). I gathered names (and addresses, where possible) from a wide variety of sources, including the *AAA Guide to Departments*, the programs for annual meetings of the AAA and the Society for Applied Anthropology, journal articles, personal references, etc. Then I attempted to verify the information by sending individual entries to anthropologists around the world for any changes or new information. I decided that I would not publish the entry unless I received a response to my inquiry. I compiled the resultant information and published it in the Summer, 1981 issue of *Urban Anthropology* (which appeared in June, 1983). By 1982, *Urban Anthropology* (the journal) had been established for ten years and the Society for Urban Anthropology had been established for three years. I had been at work on the worldwide directory of urban anthropologists for two years.

The idea occurred to me that if I published a directory of urban anthropologists, I could help to create an organization of urban anthropologists which was worldwide. I searched for an appropriate name that I would use when I would publish this directory of urban anthropologists worldwide. I would then use this name when I published the directory of urban anthropologists in *Urban Anthropology*. I discussed this problem with Van Kemper at the AAA meeting. I suggested that the organization be titled "The World Congress of Urban Anthropologists. He countered by suggesting that I model the name for the worldwide association of urban anthropologists upon the newly created worldwide association of anthropologists and ethnologists, the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES). He suggested the title "World Union of Urban Anthropologists." By doing this, the organization could be positioned to become a constituent member of the IUAES. The title of the directory published in *Urban Anthropology* 10:2 became "The World Union of Urban Anthropologists (WUUA) International Directory of Urban Anthropologists." The integration of the WUUA within the structure of the IUAES never came about, although the idea behind the WUUA certainly served as a stimulus for the subsequent creation of a "Commission on Urban Anthropology" within the IUAES.

There were other forces working on shaping *Urban Anthropology* (the journal). Under the management of Edward J. Lehman (executive director of the American Anthropological Association between 1970 and 1987), the Association began to be re-structured. As the population of anthropologists had expanded, and as new societies of anthropologists developed (both within and outside of the AAA) the AAA Board of Directors began to be concerned about the impact that such societies had on the finances and future of the AAA. Ed Lehman's position was that societies (many of which operated within the AAA and utilized its services) must pay their share of the expenses. Lehman suggested to the AAA board that all societies either

state (a) that they were going to be organized within the AAA and were willing to pay for the services they received, or (b) that they would remove themselves from the AAA and, as a result, not receive any of the benefits of being a member of the AAA (e.g., they could no longer sponsor symposia at the annual meetings of the AAA, nor have society meetings at the AAA annual meetings, etc). Those societies which remained within the AAA "umbrella" which were large enough to fund the publication of a journal must have that journal published by the AAA.

I reasoned that if the AAA started another journal in direct competition with *Urban Anthropology* that they would take enough business away from *Urban Anthropology* to cause it to flounder financially. I contacted Ed Lehman and asked if the AAA were interested in buying *Urban Anthropology*. After some months of discussions, the negotiations were stopped by mutual agreement. However, I decided that if the Society for Urban Anthropology were to begin the publication of a new journal on urban anthropology, it would be wise to refocus *Urban Anthropology* to re-align it with my own changing interests and to reflect major new areas of interest in the profession at large. With the publication of the first issue of volume 13 of *Urban Anthropology*, the name was changed to *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems and World Economic Development* (hereafter "UAS"). In 1987, the AAA began the publication of the journal *City & Society* on behalf of the Society for Urban Anthropology.

With the change in name and direction of UAS, I felt that it was important to change the editorial board to reflect the expansion. A new editorial board was announced in *UAS* 15:1-2.[5] In recent years, Van Kemper has rejoined *UAS* as Associate Editor. He organized *UAS* 18:3-4 (a special issue on Bangladesh), and compiled the material for *UAS* 20:3 (a Directory of Urban Anthropologists) as well as the twenty year index to *UA* and *UAS* for the present issue. With Lawrence Breitborde, Van also organized *UAS* 18:1, a special issue on teaching anthropology.

As *UAS* completes its twentieth year of publication, it appears that the field of urban anthropology is well established, although perhaps in ways unforeseen in the early 1970s. (One measure of this success is the 1,060 individuals listed in the Directory of Urban Anthropologists [*UAS* 20:3] who were self-stated urban anthropologists, or judged by the editor to be so.) It is not uncommon today to find references in sources such as the AAA *Guide* to topical identifications such as "urban anthropology." However, today many anthropologists conduct fieldwork in cities without thinking of themselves as "urban anthropologists" but rather simply as anthropologists doing what anthropologists do. Thus, in this way "urban anthropology" has become part of the mainstream in anthropology, and this journal has played a major role in this process.

NOTES

[1] In the first issue of the **Urban Anthropology Newsletter**, Anthony Leeds criticized the founding of the journal **Urban Anthropology** in what has subsequently become a famous programmatic statement:

"There is a serious question involved in creating a new journal and newsletter called 'Urban Anthropology.' I consider such a field a spurious and retrograde one in that it tends to make an excuse for maintaining a subject matter within a discipline which cannot and should not handle it. Just because the work is done in cities in no excuse for creating another journal, which likely will be devoted to too much emphasis on microstudies of limited import for understanding cities. It will perpetuate through fossilization a thought approach which has already proved itself stagnant and unproductive. Why not create, instead, a journal entitled 'Urban Society' or 'The Journal of Urban Phenomenon,' open to the entire range of social science approaches, specifically emphasizing inter-disciplinary work and insights, or better, trans-disciplinary ones, needed to deal with urban problems. Why insist on continuing the parochialism of the field of anthropology? What geographer, economist, planner, etc., is going to publish in a journal called 'Urban Anthropology' and thereby bury himself? Thus, I fear that the creation of this new journal may contribute to furthering disciplinary sectarianism which has made most of the anthropology done in cities so sterile with regards to the nature of cities. The point is that 'urban anthropology' has usually been done as if (a) the city were an isolated unit and (b) as if the thing studied in the city has some intrinsic relation to the city. Neither of these assumptions is true, hence most of the work has ended up being very limited. For example, most of the African network literature seems to me to be completely bogged down in methodology because it has failed to attack important questions of broader substantive theory. Cities are simply one form of population nucleation, all of which are precipitates in localities of an extraordinarily complex system of interactions which constitute a society. It is theoretically possible and interesting to develop propositions as to how, when, and where nucleations will appear -- and having done so, necessarily also to designate their characteristics. What one has done, then, is to deduce the structure of life for any given city (that is, the context in which anthropological microstudies have been carried out) from general theory, a general theory which synthesizes work coming from various disciplines. By way of final note, I teach an urban course in our Department of Anthropology. I call the course 'Principles of Urban Analysis,' specifically to avoid damning my students to continuing the trivia of network methodology, street-corner studies, analyzing the rules for a fair fight, etc., and to get them to look at the city, city systems, and society in evolutionary perspective. That is, they must generate hypotheses and predictions with regard to the microstudy data as well as other kinds of data that urban anthropology has not paid as much attention to. The texts are readers in urban sociology, urban geography, and general systems theory. Lectures deal with a general theory of the nature of society and population nucleations. From this broad framework, one can filter down to the things one has classically seen done as 'urban anthropology.' But, instead of being a starting point (and end), these data now become only one sub-set of things one can do, carefully delineated in relation to variables which affect them, but which have not ordinarily been treated by anthropologists. By not treating them, anthropologists have failed to see the pressures and constraints operating on the systems that they study and have, hence, at best given only particularistic explanations, or at worst wholly erroneous accounts. From the broad framework, too, one can filter down to a great many other topics, which anthropologists have not dealt with but are highly relevant and for whose investigations anthropologists have some of the appropriate talents" (1972:4-5).

[2] The corporation's official name was initially "The Institute for the Study of Man, Inc," an innocent enough name for a corporation in the late 1960s and even in the very early 1970s, but a liability in the mid- and late 1970s and early 1980s. The name was officially changed to "The Institute, Inc." on 7 April 1987. As an additional legal safeguard, I registered the trademark "Urban Anthropology" on May 7, 1974. I also had decided very early in the establishment of the journal that I would copyright the journal. Consequently, **UA** had a ISSN number assigned (ISSN 0363-2024), and when the name of the journal changed to **UAS**, a new ISSN number was assigned (ISSN 0894-6019). As one aspect of this decision to copyright, I decided that authors would have every right to the use of their own articles published in **Urban Anthropology**. The "transfer of copyright" form that I had each author filled out before the article was published in **Urban Anthropology** allowed him/her (a) to re-publish his/her own article in edited works, and (b) to reprint his/her own articles for use in his/her own classes. This seemed to me to be an incentive for scholars to publish in **Urban Anthropology**. As a benefit of publication, I provided each author with two complimentary copies of the full issue in which his/her article were published, and 25 reprints of his/her own article.

[3] **UA** 8:3-4 was a special issue on "Social Urbanization in Latin America," Luise Margolies and Robert H. Lavenda, editors. This special issue was published in cooperation with the Society for Latin American Anthropology (SLAA). Another special issue (**UA** 10:3) in cooperation with that same society (from a period of time when Larissa Lomnitz and I were co-chairs of that organization) was the issue on Mexican Urban Household Economies, Jack R. Rollwagen, editor. The last cooperation between **UAS** and the SLAA was in the publication of "Directions in the Anthropological Study of Latin America" (**JAS** 15:1-2), Jack R. Rollwagen, editor. **UA** also cooperated with the Society for Urban Anthropology in the publication of a set of papers edited by Charlotte I. Miller: "Teaching Urban Anthropology," and with the General Anthropology Division of the AAA in the publication of a set of papers titled "Women in the Americas: Relationships, Work, and Power," Annie Barnes, editor.

[4] Many of these attempts ended in failure, either because no manuscripts were sent, or (in some cases) because manuscripts that were sent were not publishable. Due to these efforts, **UA** published an issue with articles by Israeli scholars (**JAS** 13:1), an issue (**JAS** 13:4) with articles from scholars in Eastern Europe, and a variety of issues with individually volunteered papers from scholars outside of North America.

[5] The members of this current editorial board can be found on the reverse of the table of contents page of this issue.

REFERENCES CITED

- Kemper, Robert V. (1975) Directory of Urban Anthropologists. *Urban Anthropology* 4(1):73-106.
- Lewis, Oscar (1951) *Life in a Mexican Village: Tepoztlán Restudied*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Lewis, Oscar (1952). *Urbanization without Breakdown*. *Scientific Monthly* 75(1): 31-41.

Lewis, Oscar (1959). *Five Families: Mexican Case Studies in the Culture of Poverty*. New York: Basic Books.

Lewis, Oscar (1961). *Children of Sanchez*. New York: Random House.

Lewis, Oscar (1965). *La Vida: A Puerto Rican Family in the Culture of Poverty*. New York: Random House.

Mangin, William (1970). *Peasants in Cities: Readings in the Anthropology of Urbanization*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.