



Regeneration!

Newsletter of the
Community Forestry Research Fellowship Program

Volume 3, no. 2

Summer 2003

Editor's Introduction

This issue of *Regeneration!* includes two columns that reveal the diverse and often contrasting experience with research on community forestry in the United States. In her Focus column, Eliza Darling raises provocative questions about the efficacy of participatory research (PR) in helping to ameliorate social inequities that are rooted in the functioning of the modern capitalist system. Reflecting on her dissertation research in New York's Adirondacks, she suggests that although PR is often intended to effect political, economic, and/or social reform, some conflicts are not resolvable by reform efforts, no matter how well-intentioned, because they arise from fundamental structural oppositions.

In contrast to Darling's article, Jacquelyn Ross describes one situation in which participatory research has stimulated action to heal deep rifts within a community and has begun to address issues resulting from the history of genocide and marginalization of Native Americans in California's Central Valley. The case Ross describes is one of reform, in which the gravel industry, environmentalists, farmers, county officials, Native Americans from the local area, and others have come together to address a seemingly intractable situation. Are there lessons here that could help in the Adirondacks? Can, and should, PR address the fundamental structural oppositions that Darling describes, and if so how?

We hope that these columns will stimulate thoughtful debate, and we encourage you to use the Community Forestry bulletin board on the CFRF website to engage the issues.

Carl Wilmsen
Editor



In this issue:

Focus:	2
“Liberalism, Capitalism and Community Forestry: Food for Thought” By Eliza Darling (CFRF Fellow 1998-2000)	
2003 Community Forestry Fellows	6
Community Forestry News	7
The Appalachian Forest Resource Center: A New Node for Community Forestry	
Where Are They Now	7
Former fellows work in public, non-profit and academic positions.	
Voices from the Field:	8
“Bringing the People back to the land: The Tending and Gathering Garden Project” By Jacquelyn Ross	
Resources and Services:	10
Conferences:	11
Conference Scholarship	12
Call for Papers:	12
Publications:	13
Jobs	14
Request for Proposals:	15

Focus



“Liberalism, Capitalism and Community Forestry: Food for Thought”

By Eliza Darling

(CFRF Pre-dissertation Fellow 1998-1999)

(CFRF Dissertation Fellow 1999-2000)

I joined the CFRF group in 1998 as a Pre-dissertation Fellow, and subsequently continued as a Doctoral Fellow in 1999. Having finished my fieldwork in spring of 2001, I have been out of the CFRF loop for quite some time. I was immensely gratified to see the critical depth and political acuity embodied in several of the recent "Focus" columns published in this newsletter. My interest has been particularly piqued by the series of astute questions raised by Fellows in these pages: who, exactly, constitutes the "community" in community forestry? What sorts of disparities become masked by the ubiquitous but problematic "stakeholder" discourse? What does it mean to be a "participatory" researcher and how should we handle the myriad political conflicts that go along with being so deeply embedded in a community? My aim in this column is to explore some possible theoretical underpinnings for these questions, for I believe they share in common a subtle critique of the liberal ideologies that sustain the philosophy and practice of participatory research.

While there is insufficient space here to recall the long and convoluted history of the term "liberalism," much less its concrete expression in political practice, we may begin with the basics: most scholars understand classical liberalism as an ideological product of the Enlightenment which coalesced into a full-blown political economic project (particularly in the works of Locke, Rousseau, Hume, Ferguson, and Smith) that would be carried on

by innumerable succeeding scholars from John Stuart Mill to John Maynard Keynes. Indeed, Immanuel Wallerstein (1995) holds that liberalism constituted the dominating ideology of the capitalist world economy from the French Revolution in 1789 to the fall of the Berlin wall in 1989. While the term liberalism has taken on several complex and often contradictory meanings, its fundamental political project has been the ideological legitimization of the laissez-faire capitalism in the name of individual freedom, equality and liberty. Frequently, liberalism has also been associated with the bid to keep state institutions from constricting the free flow of capital, and keeping the state's hand out of market is often linked to arguments about the inalienable right of individuals to make their own social decisions free from state interference.

But liberalism took a rather different turn in the United States in the 1930s with the advent of the New Deal, when the term became synonymous with the reform policies of FDR (such as Social Security and other forms of social "insurance," ostensibly intended to provide safeguards for American workers against the exigencies of the capitalist system but which also served to quell the revolutionary fervor of an increasingly restless proletariat). In this sense, liberalism came to be associated with its exact opposite, namely, the *efficacy and necessity* of state interference in a range of political economic arenas, from the labor disputes to environmental degradation. Thus has Liberalism (with a capital L) come to be associated with the welfare state in North America. Over the course of the past twenty years, classical liberalism has been resurrected by regimes around the world in the form of "neoliberalism," which has more to do with the *dismantling* of FDR-style social welfare programs (and anything else standing in the way of capital accumulation) than with their safeguarding, frequently in the name of globalization. In a nutshell, we've traveled from Lockian liberalism to American

Liberalism and right back again to neoliberalism, which constitutes a modern-day return to the original form. Hence the common confusion over the term "liberalism" in the United States: what we would typically call "Conservatives" in the American political parlance are actually neo-liberals in the Lockian sense of the term.

But what does any of this have to do with community forestry, or the CFRF? I believe there is a distinct and unspoken liberalism (New Deal-style) underpinning the principles of community forestry and participatory research, to say nothing of the Ford Foundation writ-large (which is a far longer tale than can be told here). Nancy Menning put it aptly in her recent "Focus" column when she stated that "Ford is not interested so much in forestry per se...rather, the Foundation's main focus is on alleviating poverty and injustice" (2001:3). I believe this is an accurate observation, not merely of the program itself, but of the Fellows who join it, seeking not only funding for their work, but looking for concrete solutions to the various inequalities which plague forest communities across the United States in the wake of deindustrialization and capital flight in the postfordist economy. We are particularly concerned that many individuals living in resource-rich areas of America are paradoxically poor; there is a disjuncture between the availability of natural wealth and the distribution of social wealth, and we believe that we can successfully intervene to fix this problem.

Indeed, as Fellows we are part of a longstanding tradition in the United States, which can again be traced back to FDR, of rallying various and sundry social scientific "experts" to the cause of liberal reform. We are, in a sense, experts-in-training, sent out into the field to learn about the economic dilemmas confronting US forest communities in the hope that we may eventually contribute to their alleviation. And while we are not paid by the

U.S. government, the dissemination of environmental NGOs (such as Ford) across the globe constitutes an extension of the old state-led liberal reform into the private, nonprofit sector. It is important to note that FDR-style liberalism was never intended to throttle capitalism altogether; indeed, in the context of the social unrest begotten by the widespread immiseration of the Great Depression, liberal social economic policies actually served to *prevent* American capitalism from disintegrating into revolution or anarchy. Nor is the Ford Foundation, of course, in the business of revolution; it is here to assuage and repair, not foment dissent. Tellingly, the main page of the CFRF website itself says it best, invoking that sacred cow of liberal environmentalism, "sustainability." And that, to my mind, means seeking both humane and environmentally sound ways to sustain the capitalist mode of production by increasing the participation of various "stakeholders" in the production and distribution of forest resources.

Now, to many among the environmentally-minded, all of this may seem like a good idea, or at the very least, a noble one. The dilemma arises when Fellows in the field encounter problems with capitalism that cannot be fixed: built-in disparities of class, race, gender, and ethnicity that are fundamental to the continuing expansion of capital accumulation in all capitalist societies. Brinda Sarathy put the problem beautifully in her last column, when she adroitly expressed her discomfort with the language of "stakeholders:" "There are radical power imbalances in this society...which also are reflected in community-forestry arenas. There are people at stake and there are stakeholders – the two are not always commensurable" (2003:3). I would extend the critique beyond the question of language to the practice of "participatory research" itself. Fellows in other columns in this newsletter (Harris 2003, Graham 2002, Yung 2001) have described field situations in which "cooperation," "facilitation" and "partnership"

between warring groups in US forest communities seem downright impossible given the often diametrically opposed interests of the groups involved. In such situations, Fellows express frustration with conducting good "PR," or participatory research, which seems inevitably to involve facilitating an egalitarian dialogue between various interests in a given community. Fellows seem compelled, in classic American liberal style, to try to keep everyone happy, seeking to get all interested parties to (at least) sit down at the same table. When they do not succeed (and some don't), they return to the perennial question: who is the community here? Whom, exactly, am I supposed to help? Where should I make my alliances? I would contend that such tensions are part and parcel of participatory research because they are rooted in the nature of capitalism itself. Fellows, through such experiences, are learning what erstwhile liberal reformers have known from time immemorial: that some conflicts are not resolvable through better training in conflict-resolution; they cannot be ameliorated through negotiation, dialogue or cooperation because they are based in fundamental structural oppositions which reform, no matter how well-intentioned, cannot amend.

To make the issue more concrete, let me give you an example from my own fieldwork. Initially, I went to the Adirondack Park in upstate New York with the intention of studying the demise of the region's logging industry as paper companies sold off properties to developers. I quickly learned that the more urgent story that needed to be told lay in the residential housing market. I subsequently spent two years in the central Adirondacks studying the phenomenon of rural gentrification, which is fairly easily explained: heavy investment in expensive seasonal housing (rented for exorbitant sums by the week) has diverted capital from year-round, affordable housing (rented for more reasonable amounts by the month), resulting in a full-blown housing crisis for the local working

class. The State of New York, which owns half the property in the Park and heavily regulates the remaining private property, has inadvertently exacerbated the problem by restricting the available land for residential development through both outright purchases (which remove land from production altogether) and complex zoning laws (which restrict the number of houses which can be built on private property). The result is gentrification: soaring residential real estate prices, a shrinking stock of permanent, affordable housing, displacement for local workers, and a subsequent labor shortage for the local capitalist contingent.

Charting the various political, economic and environmental interests in these messy waters is no easy task. While it is tempting to posit development as an insider-outsider phenomenon, with the "poor" locals on the losing end of the battle, the reality of gentrification belies such an assumption. Frequently, landowning locals are the perpetrators of gentrification themselves, building seasonal homes on their own properties (purchased before real estate prices peaked in the 1980s) and renting them out to tourists. In a similar vein, it is disingenuous to decry gentrification as uniformly "bad" for local communities. The truth is that gentrification has proven to be a deal with the devil for many Adirondack towns; without the thriving housing industry it produces, such places would likely exist in a permanent state of depression, offering few employment opportunities in either the construction trade or the service end of the ecotourism industry, both of which are bolstered by the influx of second homeowners gentrification brings. Non-gentrified Adirondack towns tend to have plenty of housing but few jobs, while the gentrified ones have plenty of jobs but scarce housing. As a participatory researcher, I find myself confronted by a situation in which I can be of little use except as a documenter. In the particular region where I conducted my

fieldwork, there is little available private property left for the construction of public housing, even if these towns were eligible for HUD or FDA funding, which by and large, they are not. And besides, such projects are at best stopgap measures that might temporarily dam a quite fluid and evasive capitalistic housing market that is bound to seep around them, creating new and equally intractable problems. As urban researchers well know, public housing has hardly served as a solution to gentrification in the city, and it is unlikely to provide long-term help for rural communities faced with the same problem.

Do I believe that such structural conflicts negate the efficacy of participatory research? That depends upon what we want to get out of it. Anthropologists have been conducting such research for years, ducking, dodging and negotiating the complex political currents that run beneath the surface of any community. We call it ethnography, and it constitutes one of the most effective strategies for learning just how intractable capitalist inequality can be. In the current climate of neoliberal revanchism (Smith 1996), when social (and environmental) safety nets are being slashed at an astonishing pace, the good old days of liberal reform policy may ring with an air of nostalgia. Of course, old-style American liberalism has by no means gone the way of the dodo, as programs such as the CFRF aptly attest. But if the role of the social science researcher seems ever more crucial in the context of war and imperialism, to say nothing of eroding civil liberties here at home, then we are compelled to critically assess that role – historically, politically and theoretically. What, exactly, do we hope to gain by doing participatory research? Whose side are we on? Can we truly hope to effect political change if we view all sides of a political-ecological conflict as "stakeholders," equal in

voice, power, and agency? Why do we choose to be "participants" rather than "activists?"

I would contend that in order to answer these questions, as well as those raised by other Fellows in this column, we need to engage in an honest discussion about the capitalist mode of production and the role of academic scholars as social critics versus apologists for capitalism's inherent disparities. And indeed, participatory research is a great way to move such discussions beyond the academy and get them out into the forest communities where such disparities are being played out in concrete struggles over capital, resources, wages, and rights. The burden of theory, however, lies with us: as scholars it is our job to infuse whatever practices we bring to the field with a critical understanding of the political economic (as well as ideological) structures faced by our community partners. I would invite other Fellows to engage in a theoretical/political debate about participatory research in these pages.

Editors Note:

We encourage the CFRF Fellows and members of the Community Forestry community to carefully consider the questions posed here and send feedback. To respond to this column, visit the [Community Forestry Bulletin Board and Message Board](#).

References

- Wallerstein, Emmanuel. After Liberalism. New York: The New Press, 1995.
- Smith, Neil. The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City. London: Routledge, 1996.

2003-2004 Community Forestry Fellows

Masters Fellows

Mary Adelzadeh (University of Michigan)

“Measuring Community Empowerment Through Co-management Structures”
Research site: Nevada and California

Troy Bowman (Iowa State University)

“Social and Economic Drivers Affecting the Community Forest and the Dynamics of Residential Development in Cedar Rapids, IA”
Research site: Cedar Rapids, Iowa

Ara Kaufer Eickson (University of Washington)

“An Evaluation of Urban Street Tree Condition Between Two Economically Diverse Neighborhoods in Seattle, Washington”
Research site: Seattle, Washington

Kristen A. Tiles (University of Wisconsin)

“Forest Landowner Cooperatives and their Members: What makes Cooperation?”
Research site: North-western, Wisconsin

Austin Zeiderman (Yale University)

“Evaluating Urban Community Forestry in Baltimore, Maryland: Identifying, Describing, and Analyzing Lessons Learned from Over a Decade of Neighborhood Ecosystem Management Activities”
Research site: Baltimore Maryland

Dissertation Fellows

Katherine Albert

(Rutgers State University of New Jersey)
“From Forest Communities to Community Forests? A Political Ecology of Regional Change in the Acadian Forest”
Research site: St. John Valley, Maine and Quebec

Kali Fermantez

(University of Hawaii at Manoa)
“Ahupua’a-From the Mountain to the Ocean: Native Hawaiians Reclaiming Their Place through the Restoration of Traditional Land Management Concepts.”
Research site: Waianae community, Oahu, HI

Katheryn Fulton (University of Oregon)

“Forests and Fishing Narratives in Southeast Alaska: Discursive Links Between Local, Regulatory, and Corporate Marketing Forces”
Research site: Petersburg and Kake, Alaska

Brinda Sarathy

(University of California at Berkeley)
“Mobilizing for Participation in Natural-Resource Management: Comparisons between Latino forestry-workers, Ecosystem regulation advocates and Mushroom harvesters”
Research site: Southern Oregon

Pre-Dissertation Fellows

Shannon Brawley (Univ. of California, Davis)

“Participatory Action Research: A Cross-Cultural Approach to Riparian Reclamation”
Research site: Cache Creek Conservancy, CA

Carolyn Finney (Clark University)

“Black Faces, White Spaces: African Americans and the Great Outdoors”
Research site: Adirondack Mountains, NY

Sharon Hausam

(University of Wisconsin-Madison)
“American Indian Participation in Collaborative Forest Planning”
Research site: Cibola National Forest, NM

Kenli Schaaf (Perdue University)

“Private Forests in a Fragmented Landscape: A Case Study of Community Based Collaboration in North-Central Indiana”
Research site: North-Central Indiana

Where They Are Now?



We recently surveyed the former CFRF Fellows to find out how they applied their Community Forestry research. Although many of the fellows are still working on their dissertations, some listed below, have moved on to work in the public, non-profit, or academic sectors.

Alec Brownlow (CFRF 2000) is working as an Assistant Professor in Geography and Urban Studies at Temple University. He is currently teaching courses in Environment & Society, and a seminar entitled *Sustainable Cities*.

Jennifer Graham (CFRF 2000) is now a Research Associate for the Centre for Community-Based Management in New Brunswick, Canada.

Jake Kosek (CFRF 1998) is working as a Post Doctorate researcher in the Anthropology department at Stanford University.

Jeremy Madsen (CFRF 1999) is now the Field Director for Greenbelt Alliance, a non-profit advocacy group in the Bay Area, CA that works to protect the Bay Area's remaining open space and promote livable communities. Jeremy's job is to manage campaigns and negotiate conflicts between environmentalists, affordable housing advocates, labor unions and businesses.

Thomas McCoy (CFRF 2001) is now working for the Forest Service, at Cleveland National Forest in San Diego, CA.

Laurie Young (CFRF 1999, 2000) is working as non-tenure faculty at University Montana while she finishes her dissertation.

We would like to know what the rest of the former fellows are up to. Please send your career updates to cffellow@nature.berkeley.edu.

Honors and Commendations

Vanessa Casanova (CFRF Masters Fellow 2002) was elected as a member of the Council of the Rural Sociological Society. Last August the RSS voted to include student representatives on Council. Vanessa will become the first student to serve on the RSS Council.



Community Forestry News

Appalachian Forest Resource Center: A New Node for Community Forestry

June 15th saw the dedication of the Appalachian Forest Resource Center in Meigs County Ohio. The regional node of the National Community Forestry Center launched activities at Rural Action's 68 acre Research and Education Center in Rutland Ohio across the river from West Virginia. The dedication celebrated the donation of the land and 6-bedroom home that houses the AFRC project. Festivities included a down-home picnic including a hog roast, fishing derby and horseshoes. Ted Strickland, the local Representative to Congress, spoke as did Joy Padgett, head of the Governor's Office of Appalachia, and Tony Bedard the CEO of Frontier Natural Products Cooperative who donated the facility.

Rural Action also brought on Ginger Deason as the coordinator of the Appalachian Forest Resource Center. Ginger has a wealth of experience working with Non-Timber Forest Products in the tropics.

Voices from the Field



“Bringing the People back to the land: The Tending and Gathering Garden Project”

By Jacquelyn Ross

The Native American Tending and Gathering Garden at the Cache Creek Nature Preserve in Yolo County started as a one-woman landscape plan. In the past three years, it has grown into a long-term, multi-level restoration project, with a steering committee of twenty-plus people. This transformation is due largely to an investment in a participatory research process. As a committee member, herein I will share some personal thoughts and observations on how this process is working for us.

To appreciate the Cache Creek Nature Preserve (CCNP) and the work of the Cache Creek Conservancy (CCC), it helps to know a bit about recent Creek history. The headwaters of the creek are up at Clear Lake, the largest natural lake in California completely within the state borders. Cache Creek extends for 75 miles through three counties. An environmental and recreational treasure, Cache Creek is also an excellent source of aggregate. In the post-war building boom of the 1950's, the small gravel extraction companies along the creek markedly increased their mining activity. Ensuing concern over the mining led to decades of community discord. Competing interests and values among mining companies, landowners, farmers, and other local stakeholders created fissures in the community. Repeated efforts at resolution bore no fruit.

In 1996, after painstaking discussions and deliberation, the Yolo County Board of Supervisors adopted the Cache Creek Resource Management Plan (CCRMP). As stated in this document, the development of this plan was based “on the key assumption that the creek must be viewed as an integrated system, with the emphasis on the management of all Cache

Creek's resources, rather than a singular focus on any one issue.” Thus, Yolo County had a road map that addressed the main issues of concerned parties and established community accountability for future activity.

From the CCRMP emerged a shared vision that focused on revitalization of the riparian habitat. The CCC, a non-profit corporation with a diverse, multi-talented Board of Directors, was created to guide the work of restoration along the creek. Funded by a tonnage-based voluntary contribution from the aggregate companies, the CCC also benefits from grants, in-kind contributions, and other funding sources. In 1999, a regional construction and materials leader, A. Teichert and Son (company), donated the 130- acre creekside property that is now the CCNP. This gift provided a home for some of the most innovative restoration work in the local area.

Located at the lower end of Cache Creek, the Preserve has become an important focal point in Yolo County. (Learn more at <http://www.cachecreekconservancy.org>) In addition to the Tending and Gathering Garden, the CCNP also hosts restoration projects such as the rice-straw bale and willow erosion control experiment, the Tamarix and Arundo donax (invasive species) removal effort, and the dramatic transformation of the 30-acre mining pit into a thriving wetland. The Preserve also has an active education program that welcomes numerous visitors who come for educational programs, community events, or the grace of a day in the country.

The reputation and receptivity of the CCC led scholar Shannon Brawley to believe that the Preserve might offer a good home to her landscape project. She met with Jan Lowrey, Executive Director of the CCC, to discuss her landscape architecture project. She wanted to grow a garden of plants indigenous to California, and make it available to Native basket weavers who suffered a scarcity of traditional plant gathering areas. Although this plan would later evolve into something much

larger, it was the starting place for her research, and Jan's positive reaction encouraged Shannon.

Shannon then went to Native American basket weavers in the local area. Matters progressed quickly as she met with local members of the Rumsey Band of Wintun, the tribe situated closest to the CCNP. She also met with weaving teacher Kathy Wallace (Karuk, Yurok, member of the Hoopa Tribe) who lived nearby. Now, the participatory research process started. These community experts thought that Shannon's basic idea was a good one but they suggested that the project's potential was much greater. In the months to come, they would change Shannon's conception of weavers and help her to alter her project.

I came into the project at the next stage. Shannon and Kathy arranged a meeting at the Preserve with CCC staff, and a sizeable group of local Native people who actively lived in their tribal cultures. This turned into an energetic brainstorming session. By the end of it, we had a list of short and long-term objectives that encompassed outreach and education for both the Native community and the community at large. We also had a "wish list" of desirable plants for the garden, and a core group of local people willing to contribute to the project. One of the most important project developments occurred at this meeting. After discussing the variety and number of basketry plants needed to support a serious weaver, we convinced Shannon that a 2-acre site would not provide the amount of materials she envisioned. However, in that small space, we could create a demonstration garden and a living gallery where weaving teachers from various tribal traditions could bring their students to identify plants and learn to tend them. Moreover, in the background of everything else was the question of whether the plants would choose to live in the place that Shannon had selected, the shore of the mining-pit-turned-wetlands.

This group of cultural practitioners, including Shannon, Jan, and other staff, became the

Steering Committee. We have members from 14 different California tribes. We have worked as a cohesive unit for the past three years. I find this extraordinary in several respects. The Native members are providing cultural expertise on a pro-bono basis to a non-Native entity, the CCC. We discuss some issues that we have not often brought forward to non-Native people. I have heard weavers share clearly painful history. A woman may tell the story of a family run out of an original home so that others may understand the significance of clearing a cultural path for those who suffer now from that long loss. At times, we have discussed some of the spiritual concerns that govern why something must happen in a certain way and not the way that might seem most logical or easiest to one not born to the culture. We are working across generational, tribal, and gender lines, to great effect. We seem to be enjoying this work.

Because this is a participatory research process that Shannon will have to write about at some point, the Steering Committee is engaged in examining and analyzing our effectiveness and success as a group. I think that we conduct ourselves as invested partners. Each person has something to give. There is a vast body of skills within our group. This influences what we are able to share with each other, and with the outer world. We help to host educational tours at the Preserve. We have developed several presentation modules that are easily adapted to the needs of visitors who come to learn about the projects at the Preserve. As community research partners, we are actively engaged with the lead scholar in the public presentation of the work. For me, this aspect of the involvement is markedly more positive from other projects I have seen where community partners are treated as consultants somewhat separate and apart from the heart of the research.

The TGG's impact on the CCC has been significant. It is my sense that of all the projects housed at the Preserve, this one has a particularly wide wingspan. Because it involves a variety of people, cultures, and skill sources, it is complex. We knew that it would be helpful to

have some ground rules in place to manage interactions that could easily become unwieldy. One of our first big tasks as a steering committee was to create guidelines to govern the project. This is a continuing effort. Such discussions are perhaps the most arduous tasks associated with our participatory research process. There are those weary times when we gaze hazily at each other from across strewn papers and smudged coffee cups. An unspoken thought hovers: “I’d really rather be outside with the plants.” Nevertheless, we recognize the importance of boundaries. Because of experience on school boards, non-profit boards, and related projects, Steering Committee members know that this is time well spent. While I have felt some frustration with the delicacy of the language we must employ to keep everyone involved and satisfied, we are setting an example for other projects. At the end of this particular process, we hope to offer a report to the CCC Board that will help us all work well together and possibly serve as a model in guiding like relationships in the future.

The essential incentive for me is the research itself. The Steering Committee members have changed the shape of Shannon’s research. We are looking for the answer to one of her central questions: Can we restore a former mining site to a Native Californian standard of ecological health? The answer to this question is important practically as well as academically. I feel that we have helped to set a higher standard for restoration as the cultural uses of the natural resources require an extremely healthy, managed landscape. Shannon has a more interesting set of questions and possibilities than she did at the outset of her work. Her answers will mean something to the mining community, Native tribal peoples, restoration ecologists, scholars, and those visiting schoolchildren who may be our future policy-makers. The physical garden itself, while still in the “grow-out” stages, has become a resource for some of our local weaving masters and their students.

I have lived in the Cache Creek watershed for most of my life. At last, I have an invitation to

be part of the solution to problems of which I have been peripherally aware for over 30 years. It feels good to be involved with something so central to the healing of the land and the people.

Resources and Services

Leadership Training for Non-Profits

Philanthropy.com recently reported on a new trend in leadership training for employees at non-profit organizations. Many organizations such as the Rockwood Leadership Program, offer management training courses in order to help non-profits to overcome the staff development crisis that cripples NGO’s. The Art of Leadership training program run by [Rockwood Leadership Program](#), is geared toward social-change activists. The program offers a two-and-a-half day training session that emphasizes collaboration in the work place and utilizes personal strengths to develop an individual’s management style. The classes are subsidized and priced on a sliding scale according to the employers' budget.

To learn more about leadership training visit Rockwood Leadership Program’s website at: <http://www.rockwoodfund.org/> or visit Philanthropy .com to read the recent report at: (<http://philanthropy.com/jobs/2003/05/29/20030529-140188.htm>).

Below are some links to other leadership training programs designed for nonprofits:

- [Compass Point](#) in San Francisco, CA
- [The El Polmar Foundation](#) in Colorado Springs
- [The Community Resource Center](#) in Denver, Co
- [The Foraker Group](#) in Alaska
- [The Resource Center](#) in Flint, MI
- [The Leader to Leader Institute](#) in New York
- [Rural Development Leadership Network](#) in NY
- [Government and Nonprofit Assistance Center \(GNAC\)](#) in Radford, VA
- [The Foundation Center](#) in Atlanta, GA

Conferences and Workshops



July 27-30, 2003

**Rural Sociological Society Annual Meeting-
"Spatial Inequity: Continuity and Change in
Territorial Stratification."**

Montreal, Canada

<http://www.ruralsociology.org>

August 15 - 17, 2003,

**The Society for the Study of Social Problems-
53rd Annual Meeting** "Justice and the
Sociological Imagination: Theory, Research,
Teaching, Practice and Action"

Atlanta, GA

<http://itc.utk.edu/sssp/annualmtg/default.html>

The goal of this conference is to locate, expound, and expand paths toward progressive social policy and social change. Sessions, workshops, and interactions will identify the ways in which theory, research, teaching, and practice can inform (and be informed by) public discourse and action in pursuit of justice. Academics, researchers and graduate students interested in presenting at the conference should visit the SSSP conference website to find detailed guidelines for submission of formal paper proposals.

September 17-20

**The 2003 National Urban Forest Conference:
"Engineering Green"**

San Antonio, Texas

This conference organized by American Forests is focused on the idea of engineering cities into existing natural systems. The conference includes presentations, tours, workshops, exhibits and social events. The conference aims to represent a wide range of perspectives from architects, engineers, researchers, and elected officials to practitioners, citizen activists, GIS specialists, teachers, and historians.

For the full conference program, exhibiting opportunities and registration details, visit the American Forests website:

<http://www.americanforests.org/conference/>

September 4, 2003

**Involving Harvesters in Inventorying and
Monitoring of Non-timber Forest Products in
the Pacific Northwest region**

Portland, OR

This participatory workshop is built around small group activities and interactive discussions. We will be seeking your input about the current inventory and monitoring of NTFPs, and recommendations on the design and implementation of a pilot program that would involve harvesters in inventory and monitoring. For more information on NTFPs visit <http://www.ifcae.org/ntfp/>. To pre-register, please contact Katie Lynch (ktlynch@ifcae.org).

September 14-16, 2003

**The Community Based Collaboratives
Research Consortium's National Conference:
"Evaluating Methods and Environmental
Outcomes of Community Based
Collaborative Processes"**

Salt Lake City, Utah

<http://www.cbrc.org/>

The Community Based Collaboratives Research Consortium (CBCRC) conference will present the results of Consortium funded research projects as well as emerging developments in the field of community based collaborative approaches to environmental management. The conference will be divided into three different parts: Research Methods, Collaborative Outcomes, and Applied Practice.

September 21-28, 2003

**XII World Forestry Congress- Forests,
Source of Life**

Quebec City, Canada

<http://www.wfc2003.org/>

October 25 - 29, 2003

**Society for American Foresters National
Convention**

Buffalo, New York

Conferences

October 16-19, 2003

**"Powerful Collaborations:
Building a Movement for Social Change"**
Sandstone, Minnesota

This annual conference is organized by Community Research Network (CRN) and sponsored by the Loka Institute. "Powerful Collaborations" will bring together activists and professionals working in the Community Based Research movement to share diverse ways of discovering and exposing truths to promote democratic decision-making processes, self-empowerment, and realization of community objectives.

The CRN welcomes presentations, readings, performances, and screenings from community members, organizations, artists, academics and activists, which include all project voices and are based on first-hand experiences with participatory projects. Scholarships are available for low-income attendees.

To register, apply for scholarships, and/or make a presentation proposal, please go to www.loka.org. If you have specific questions contact Rachel Maldonado at crn2003@loka.org or 512-585-1507. Registration, scholarship applications and proposals are due by September 2nd.

Scholarship

Scholarships Available for Minorities and Underserved Students to Attend the National Urban Forestry Conference

San Antonio, TX, September 17-20, 2003

Three scholarships are available that include: registration fees, half of hotel costs, and some travel money. Applications should be received in time for early-registration on July 31st, 2003.

For more information contact Melanie R. Kirk:
Phone: 979-845-1351, Fax: 979-845-6049
Email: mrkirk@tamu.edu

Call for Papers



Below is a list of upcoming conferences that are requesting papers. We encourage all of the CFRF Fellows and Former Fellows to enter papers. Small travel grants are available for fellows, who have participated in the program within two years, to attend conferences at which they are presenting papers that recognize the role of the CFRF Program in developing the research.

March 31 - April 4, 2004

2004 Annual Meeting of the Society for Applied Anthropology
"Social Science and Advocacy"

Dallas, Texas

Paper Abstracts due: October 15, 2003.

Applied anthropologists understand the value of spreading the knowledge of social science beyond the classroom and into the community. This applied work frequently leads to a position of advocacy. The 2004 meetings will focus on this part of the process: the role of social scientists as advocates.

For more information visit the SFAA website at <http://www.sfaa.net/am.html>

March 14-19, 2004

Association of American Geographers
100th Annual Meeting

Philadelphia, PA.

Paper submission deadline: October 9, 2003

The conference will recognize a century of geographic research and education with special events, exhibits, and presentations on diverse topics in geography.

For more information go to the AAG's website at: <http://www.aag.org/AnnualMeetings/index.htm>

For more opportunities present papers check the regular updates on the CFRF website at:
http://nature.berkeley.edu/community_forestry/opportunities/papers.html

Publications

Balancing Ecology and Economics: A Start-up Guide for Forest Owner Cooperation, 2nd Edition

To help address some of the challenges faced by private woodland owners, the University of Wisconsin Center for Cooperatives (UWCC), Cooperative Development Services (CDS) and the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy's Community Forestry Resource Center (CFRC) have published a second edition of *Balancing Ecology and Economics: A Start-up Guide for Forest Owner Cooperation*. The 160-page guide is intended to show how private landowners, working together, can improve the ecological conditions of their lands while at the same time improving their own economic well-being and that of the communities in which their forest land is located.

The guide draws upon the experiences of several established or forming sustainable forestry co-ops, as well as the experience of CDS, UWCC, and CFRC of IATP. Intended primarily for landowners and resource managers, the guide provides essential information on all aspects of establishing a forest owner cooperative.

For more information about Sustainable Forestry Cooperatives, or to order a copy of [Balancing Ecology and Economics: A Start-Up Guide for Forest Owner Cooperation](#), please visit: www.forestrycenter.org

Community Culture and the Environment: A Guide to Understanding a Sense of Place <http://www.epa.gov/ecocommunity/pdf/ccecomplete.pdf>

This EPA guide offers a process and set of tools for defining and understanding the human dimensions to an environmental issue. You can order a copy by sending an e-mail to: ncepiwo@one.net



Non-wood Forest Products in Africa: A Regional and National Overview

<http://www.fao.org/DOCREP/003/y1515b/y1515b00.htm#TopOfPage>

In most African countries, non-wood forest products - or abbreviated "NWFP"- play a significant role in the livelihood of the population by providing key subsistence products and income. Examples of NWFP are foodstuff, fodder plants, medicinal plants, exudates, bushmeat, etc. Despite their importance only limited information is available on the actual socio-economic importance of NWFP as well as on the ecological impact of their exploitation.

Understanding Community-Forest Relations

by Linda E. Kruger, tech. ed.

<http://www.fs.fed.us/pnw/pubs/gtr566.pdf>

Improved understanding of the relationships between human communities and forests is necessary to understanding how alternative forest management policies and practices can affect different communities. This knowledge also enhances our ability to formulate plans that are responsive to the needs and concerns of local communities, thus reducing polarization and related social and economic costs. In December 1997, an interdisciplinary panel representing academic backgrounds in sociology, anthropology, geography, psychology, economics, and recreation gathered in Oregon to discuss relationships between human communities and forests. This collection of papers is a product of the dialogue and interactions at the gathering.



Jobs

Executive Director for Tree Utah

TreeUtah is seeking a full time Executive Director to lead the organization to a new level of success in all facets of its operations. TreeUtah is a statewide nonprofit with an annual budget of \$400,000 dedicated to improving Utah's quality of life by enhancing the environment through tree planting, stewardship and education.

The ideal candidate will possess a strong commitment to conservation and community-building, work well with people, and be able to balance the organization's tenets and vision with larger community needs. The successful candidate is expected to strengthen program development and increase TreeUtah's profile through community partnerships and ongoing communication; effectively manage a professional staff of six and over 2,000 volunteers; and work collaboratively with the Board of Trustees; ensure funding through government, corporate, foundation, private and entrepreneurial sources; and exercise sound fiscal management.

This position requires strong written and oral communication skills, BA/BS degree, minimum 5 years managerial and development experience. Salary range is \$42,000-\$47,000 plus benefits depending on experience.

Deadline for applications is July 29, 2003

More information about TreeUtah is available at <http://www.treeutah.org>

To apply please send your resume, four references, and a cover letter explaining your interest in the Executive Director position to:

Barbara Pioli, NPM Consulting, 1343
Lincoln Street, SLC, UT 84105

Or bapioli@msn.com

California Center for Land Recycling (CCLR) Associate Director of Programs and Administration

The Associate Director is responsible for California Center for Land Recycling's (CCLR) Grant Program, Training Program and Consulting Services. CCLR provides a range of financial assistance, training, technical assistance and consulting programs for municipalities, redevelopment agencies and community based organizations. Reporting to the Executive Director, the Associate Director supervises all other CCLR staff. The Associate Director is expected to create and enhance CCLR's presence as a multidisciplinary outcome-driven advocate for redevelopment of difficult urban sites.

For more information on CCLR visit their website at <http://www.cclr.org/>.

Inquires and résumés should be sent to:

Johnston and Company, Attn: CCLR
6167 Bristol Parkway, Suite 140
Culver City, CA 90230
Fax: 310-410-3906
e-mail: johnstonco@earthlink.net

Executive Director for Community Resources

Community Resources is a regional, technical assistance nonprofit organization that works in partnership with community groups, public agencies and nonprofit organizations to develop community-based environmental programs that address the environmental, social and economic issues facing urban America. The Executive Director must be able to lead all aspects of this non-profit management as we continue to build Community Resources. S/He will work collaboratively with three other existing program staff, overseeing the organizations strategic development, financial management, new program development, and staff management.

For a more information visit Community Resources' website at

<http://www.communityresources.org/positions.html>

Request for Proposals

2003 Request for Proposals for the Northwest Carolina's Marketing Initiative



The Northwest Alliance Program for the Rural Carolinas is funded by The Duke Endowment and is charged with the task of promoting regional efforts that would help to decrease our unemployment and underemployment rates as well as build assets within our communities.

This faith-based initiative seeks to especially target those populations in our three counties who have been termed "left behind": small farmers and agricultural workers, Hispanics, African Americans, the elderly, poorly educated, dislocated workers and the long-term unemployed. One aspect of the Northwest Alliance Program is the development of a Regional Marketing Initiative showcasing our indigenous products.

For more information, contact:

Melanie A. Young, Program Coordinator,
Northwest Alliance Program for the Rural Carolinas,
45 N. Main Street, P.O. Box 1897,
Sparta, NC 28675
Phone: 336-372-8118, FAX: 336-372-8135,
Email: melaniey@skybest.com