Public and Engaged Anthropology: The Legacy of Nina S. de Friedemann

Greta Friedemann-Sánchez
University of Minnesota

Nina S. de Friedemann (1930-1998) was a public anthropologist. She practiced engaged research, with a view to promoting social justice for the communities with whom she collaborated and studied, and she anticipated the public anthropology of the North Atlantic academia by five decades. A pioneer in Afro-Colombian studies and in visual anthropology, she documented and defended the cultural contributions of Black populations to the identity of an ethnically diverse Colombia. Friedemann's fundamental work inspired leaders of the Black communities in their demands that culminated in Law 70 of 1993, also known as the ley de negritudes. Her research materials are housed at the Luis Angel Arango Library under the name Fondo Nina S. de Friedemann, a repository available for study. Using unpublished materials, correspondence, publications, and photographs, Greta Friedemann-Sánchez reflected on three pillars of her mother's ethical legacy within the contemporary normative framework for the protection of human subjects and the historical context during which Nina S. de Friedemann worked as an anthropologist.

Keywords: Colombian anthropology, engaged anthropology, ethics, historical archives, public anthropology

INTRODUCTION

From the time she graduated as an anthropologist in 1963 until October 27, 1998, when she edited the last issue of the journal *América Negra*, Nina S. de Friedemann (1930-1998) worked against racism, stereotyping, and the invisibility of the Black people of Colombia.

While several of her studies, books, and professional activities addressed the genocide and ethnocide of Indigenous peoples in Colombia, her professional emphasis was on documenting and defending the cultural contributions of Black populations to the identity of an ethnically diverse Colombia. She also dedicated her work to denouncing and combating the hegemonic structures of symbolic and material power that insist on oppressing Black communities and individuals.

Her extensive ethnographic work comprises sixteen books, most of them accompanied by photographs, hundreds of articles, five documentary films, and several photography exhibitions. From the very beginning of her professional career, she used these diverse communication strategies to reach out to a broad audience and to advocate for people of African descent in Colombia through culture and legal frameworks. As Jaime Arocha (Nina's colleague of thirty years and coauthor of four of her books), Rudecindo Castro, and Carlos Andrés Meza put it, the work of this pioneer was fundamental and inspired leaders of the Black communities in their demands that culminated in Law 70 of 1993. Sometimes called *ley de negritudes*, this law gives statutory legitimacy to the collective ownership of land of Black communities in Colombia. It also recognizes their rights to political representation, their own education, and the environmental protection of

their lands (Arocha 2000; Castro and Meza 2017). In short, Nina S. de Friedemann was a public anthropologist who practiced engaged research to promote social justice for the grassroots communities with whom she collaborated and studied. Her work anticipated the public anthropology of North Atlantic academia by five decades (Shepper-Hughes 2008; Vine 2011). This discipline approaches issues of the public good and social justice by analyzing the dialectics between the structural factors imposed by the dominant society and the agency with which individuals and subaltern groups resist them[1]. The practice of public anthropology is, above all, an ethical practice.

Here, I want to point out that, although the academic convention is to refer to authors by their surname, as her daughter, I find it more genuine to call Nina by her first name. Therefore, this is how I will address her in the text henceforth. Nina's ethics manifested themselves in her efforts to preserve and document her work as an anthropologist. These consist of three pillars: first, the rigor with which she collected, recorded, and cataloged events relevant to her research and public service; second, her practice of public anthropology, which implied a commitment to the demands of the communities with whom she worked; and, third, her recourse to other expository genres, beyond the academic, to repatriate research results to the communities she studies and to broader audiences. In the following, I will document these three pillars of Nina's public and engaged anthropology and close with some reflections on her legacy to contemporary research practices.

In 1997, acknowledging the importance of her work as a social scientist, the Luis Ángel Arango Library (Biblioteca Luis Ángel Arango, BLAA) invited Nina to provide bibliographic and research material for the collection it would establish in her name. The Nina S. de Friedemann Fund is Nina's complete professional archive, cataloged by the BLAA. It is located in the Room of Rare Books and Manuscripts at its main building in Bogotá, along with a collection of Colombian cultural assets. The fund was launched on October 29, 2018, to coincide with the twentieth anniversary of Nina's death. The presentation of the fund's collections was highlighted by a symposium entitled "Conversaciones: 20 años sin Nina," [Conversations: 20 years without Nina] which was organized by Jaime Arocha, founder of the Afro-Colombian Studies Group at the National University of Colombia; Alberto Abello (1957-2019), then director of the BLAA; Carmen Millán de Benavides and Peter Rondón Vélez, director and researcher of the Caro y Cuervo Institute, respectively; and Ramiro Delgado from the Department of Anthropology of the University of Antioquia. On that occasion, I presented the paper that served as the basis for this article. Here, I will elaborate on the topics discussed by reviewing unpublished materials. These include Nina's correspondence, publications, and photographs; my conversations with Jaime Arocha; and my own experience as her daughter and an anthropologist—a source that offers both an intimate and historical perspective.

NINA S. DE FRIEDEMANN FUND

On July 8, 1997, fifteen months before her death, Nina S. de Friedemann wrote to historian Jorge Orlando Melo, then director of the BLAA. Her letter bears the letterhead of the journal *América Negra*, which she founded. In it, she thanked the director for the deference of establishing the Nina S. de Friedemann Fund with her materials. She also detailed the contents of twenty boxes, filled with issues of journals such as *Current Anthropology* and *Ethnology*, ready to be packed and sent by the library to its headquarters in La Candelaria. Additionally, she stated her intention of enriching the fund not only with bibliographic material but also with study materials. "To the extent that my occupations permit it," she wrote, "I will continue my work of sorting and packing materials, as agreed upon in our conversation on this matter" (personal archive of Greta Friedemann-Sánchez).

Nina must have printed two identical letters or faxed the letter to the director of the BLAA, because she gave me a signed original when she visited Minneapolis, where I have lived since 1990. Her youngest grandson was also born in this city in February 1998, the year of her death. During my visits to Colombia, Nina would show me the archives and say, "Greta, here are the letters from the entire period of the Colombian Institute of Anthropology" (which I will mention below). "Here are the notes on Palenque, the reels with unedited films, the slides from the carnival, the audiotapes of this or that study with Jaime, the

field notebooks from Guapi. Here are..." How could I have guessed that Nina would die before she finished cataloging her studio and that I would need to remember all of those "here are" statements when I had to pack it? It was she who decided to contribute to the fund. Jaime Arocha and I took on the responsibility of turning her intentions into reality.

Packing the study was a painful endeavor because, as Jaime Arocha (2003) put it, "we were demolishing the most precious area of Nina's life": her study, which was also a space for gatherings and intense conversations (142). A large number of people came to this space almost every day. On many occasions, the reunions lasted a long time. Her visitors ranged from students to scholars as renowned as Orlando Fals Borda, Xochitl Herrera, and Miguel Lobo-Guerrero. People also came from the United States, such as David Maybury-Lewis, or from France, such as Ariane Deluz.

There was no shortage of social leaders in attendance, such as Rudecindo Castro, Piedad Córdoba, Pastor Murillo, or Luis Carlos Galán. Members of the communities with whom she worked also stopped by, like Alfredito Salas, a frequent guest at lunches and dinners. The presence of Jaime Arocha —with whom Nina worked closely for most of her career— was ubiquitous since they met in 1977 (Arocha 2000). Because Jaime is emotionally a member of my family, I will call him by his first name for the remainder of this article.

Jaime and I hired an assistant to perform the task, which at times seemed unfeasible, of listing in a spreadsheet all the books that would go to the BLAA, including the number of the box where we put them. Not having easy access to a university library for reasons I will outline later, Nina had built a magnificent library. Strangers and acquaintances, colleagues from all around the world, mailed books and manuscripts for her review. Her revision work multiplied after she took over the editorship of *América Negra* and began to receive countless publications to review in the journal. Hence, piles of documents always covered her desk, clamoring for her attention. Jaime and I used a library classification system to organize the materials, so that they were already sorted when they reached the BLAA (Arocha 2003). Nina used to slip cards between the pages of her books with notes analyzing what she was reading. So, we intended that the BLAA should have not only her library, as Nina had decided, but also her insights about such a variety of written works. This way, it would be possible to appreciate the intellectual growth that nurtured her creativity.

The fund contains all the materials from her professional practice: notes, notebooks, field journals, and recordings of interviews and other events of important symbolic value, such as funeral rites. It also includes the cards she used to catalog data and her draft manuscripts. All her written works can be found there, including books, journal and newspaper articles, and unpublished papers. Since Nina was a public anthropologist, the fund also houses the documents underpinning her public service over the years. For example, it has documents related to the work done by Jaime —along with other activists— in 1990 to ensure that the National Constituent Assembly introduced provisional article 55 of the Political Constitution of 1991. This article gave legal voice and visibility to Black communities for the first time in Colombian history. There are other documents attesting that Nina, along with Rudecindo Castro and other leaders of the Afro movement, applied the necessary pressure so that the Congress of the Republic processed the bill that would later become Law 70 of 1993 (Castro and Meza 2017). The repository also includes public policy advocacy documents and correspondence with Colombian government officials. In one of the documents stored, Nina denounced the massacres in the lower Atrato region to the former president of the Republic, Ernesto Samper Pizano (1994-1998), and encouraged him to intervene on behalf of the first displaced individuals from that area (Rondón-Vélez 2020).

Nina was also a pioneer in visual anthropology. For this reason, the Luis Ángel Arango Library has given great prominence to the photographs, transparencies, negatives, 8 and 16 mm films, and videotapes in the fund. In addition to the photos she took, there are also examples of those taken by her collaborators, journalist Richard Cross, anthropologists Ronald Duncan, Steven Church, and Jaime, and, naturally, by her family members, who accompanied her when doing fieldwork. These include photos taken by her husband, Robert Friedemann, and her daughters, Nancy and me—Greta.

The collection also contains materials from a number of conferences and symposia attended by Nina. One of these gems, as Jaime observed during the fund's presentation, is the material from the First Congress of Black Culture in the Americas held in Cali in 1977. The congress was organized by the Colombian

Foundation for Folklore Research, the Peruvian Black Youth Cultural Association, and the Center for Afro-Colombian Studies. Manuel Zapata Olivella led the event. It aimed to "bring together intellectuals, artists, and academics from the Americas, for the first time, to unify ideas and approaches regarding the origin, development, and outlook of African cultures in the Americas," in order to mobilize the community toward concrete action on their demands (Fundación Colombiana de Investigaciones Folclóricas, Asociación Cultural de la Juventud Negra Peruana and Centro de Estudios Afrocolombianos 1977)[2].

NINA AND HER METHODOLOGICAL LEGACY: RETAINING AND DOCUMENTING HISTORICAL AND RESEARCH RECORDS

While packing materials for the BLAA, our family put into practice the notions that have always guided us about knowledge and academic freedom. The information included in the fund would be publicly available for research purposes. According to my notes, I packed thirty boxes with photographs, field journals from studies on the Pacific coast (Guapi, Chico Pérez, Timbiquí, and Coteje) and the Caribbean coast (San Andrés, Providencia y Santa Catalina, Ciénaga, Barranquilla, and Bajo Magdalena), analytic cards from her work in Palenque, recordings of interviews, ethnopoetry events, recordings made at carnivals, and more. Once packed, the boxes covered Nina's entire studio to the ceiling, overflowing to fill the hallway, an adjoining room, and part of the garage.

Our zeal in packing the study, detailing the contents of the boxes and how they were related, reflected the ethical duty Nina practiced: to maintain the investigative and historical record and the temporal nature of the facts in their entirety. Nina devised practices for the organization, storage, and retention of data and for comprehensive record-keeping in research projects, including administrative documentation. She did so to ensure the quality, integrity, and transparency of research. This documentary material enabled the triangulation and interdisciplinary integration of data from various sources of information, such as field journals, interviews, visual documents, history, ethnohistory, historical chronicles, legislation, and works of ethnic, popular, and contemporary art. Additionally, her organizational method allowed her to draw parallels between her research results and the existing literature. For example, one of Nina's theoretical contributions is the concept of "traces of Africanness," which refers to the iconographic, symbolic, and linguistic backgrounds present in African-American cultural systems (Friedemann 1994; 1992). Jaime gave an account of the triangulation through which Nina corroborated the traces of Africanness in the Carnival of Barranquilla:

> In 1993, she encountered more traces of Africanness at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York (MET). Walking through the African art pavilion, she was surprised to find masks similar to those of the carnival's *marimondas* (Friedemann 1994). However, the caption that accompanied the objects in the display cases did not refer to the *micos* (monkeys) that came out to dance in the streets of Barranquilla, but to the Cameroonian Bamilekes' way of representing their elephants. Friedemann then wondered whether, throughout Afro-Colombian history, there had been a mistake in the taxonomy of dancing fauna (Friedemann 1994). In April 1998, she repeated her tour of the MET and found the same elephants again (Friedemann 2008) and perhaps she said goodbye to this world with the desire to convince carnival taxonomists to revise their categories and acknowledge that African elephants had also come with the slave trade and insisted on dancing every year. (Arocha 2016, 144-145)

Nina anticipated thirty years of practice in qualitative methodology on the retention of research-related data and documents. In the North Atlantic scholarship, which gave rise to the regulatory framework for research ethics to which I will refer in the next section, the medical sciences introduced and defined the parameters for data retention. This practice became widespread in the social sciences in the mid-1990s, although there are still disciplinary and institutional discrepancies over requirements[3].

Nina's analytical methods were also ahead of the methodological debates on internal validity —a closed question measures what you want to measure— and external validity—what is measured can be generalized to other populations with the same characteristics as the sample. It is worth clarifying that the above applies only to quantitative methods. In qualitative methods, the quality, integrity, and reliability of research underlie the triangulation, parallels, data retention, and documentation, which is available for review by third parties (Miles et al. 2014)[4].

I am emphasizing the size of the archive because it was impossible to remove every personal document that may have found its way to the Luis Ángel Arango Library. Any individual who has experienced the death of a loved one understands and empathizes with the logistical and emotional turmoil that follows the event. It was only twenty years after their packing, and inspired by the homage that resulted in the original paper, that I had the courage to open the boxes in Minneapolis. Inside, I found the galley of the book *Ma Ngombe: guerreros y ganaderos en Palenque* [Ma Ngombe: warriors and herders in Palenque] (Friedemann and Cross 1979), which the family initially declined to place in the fund for emotional reasons. The document is currently in use for a new edition of the book with annotations by Jaime Arocha. After the work is done, the galley will be sent to the fund. The boxes also contain copies of two unpublished books, namely *Villarrica* and *Güelmambí*. Both books were written in collaboration with my maternal political uncle, Ronald Duncan, who is also an anthropologist. The books were packed with my notes detailing what went into each box. My memory may fail me, but I seem to recall conversations with my family and Jaime regarding the decision to keep personal correspondence and the family's personal photographs out of the fund. Did I take these items out of the boxes at the last minute? Or are they in the fund? I do not know; and this uncertainty is an expression of my distress twenty years ago.

What would have been the rationale for including personal documents, if we did so? Without a doubt, the decision stemmed from our desire to prioritize Nina's historical record as a professional, a champion of Afro-Colombian rights, and a leader of a public and engaged anthropology at the service of Colombian society. Therefore, we must have decided to include as much material as possible in the fund.

After these recollections and reflections, I raise the following question about the responsibility of a researcher interested in using the materials in any archive. When a person dies, are they granted the status of research subject and, in turn, become an object of protection under ethical principles? Or, to the contrary, does subject status apply only to someone who is alive and can claim to have been put at risk due to the handling of information by a third party?

It was precisely for the sake of protecting the privacy of many people that we initially agreed on restricting access to the correspondence in the fund during the first twenty years because it could contain personal and private information regarding Nina's family and her collaborators. All of these professional letters can certainly offer historical insights regarding events of public interest. However, they may also contain sensitive, personal information, which, if made public, could adversely affect the reputation, dignity, and professional, legal, economic, and social integrity of the individuals concerned. Later, we changed the twenty-year restriction to fifteen years after seeing the interest in the documents in the fund. The expectation was that this information would help shed light on historical events in Colombia in support of the struggle for social and ethnic justice. This is absolutely possible under the ethical principles of the Declaration of Helsinki, the Belmont Report, and Colombian legislation.

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK ON RESEARCH ETHICS IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

The following summarizes the basic principles of the international and national regulatory framework on ethics in social research. This summary covers the provisions of the Declaration of Helsinki (General Assembly of the World Medical Association 2014), the Belmont Report (United States National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical Behavioral Research 1978), the Nuremberg Code (Annas 2008), Resolution 8430 of 1993 and Statutory Act 1581 of 2012 regarding the protection of personal data[5]. In turn, the Constitutional Court's rulings T-409 of 1992 and C-574 of 1992 ratify that investigators in Colombia must comply with the aforementioned international law conventions (Cruz et al. 2010).

The 1964 Declaration of Helsinki provides guidelines on scientific design and the proportionality between predictable risks and possible benefits of research; it states that there must be a balance between the benefits to society or a social group relative to the risks. This principle extends to the individuals that become research subjects. It emphasizes respect for the subject's rights, which take precedence over those of science and society.

The Belmont Report of 1979 has three basic ethical principles. The first principle is "respect for persons," which declares that research must allow for the dignity and freedom of every person. Thus, it is necessary to obtain the research subject's (or their representatives') informed consent and respect their privacy. The second principle is "beneficence," which demands that researchers maximize the benefits and minimize the harm associated with the research. The ethical parameters of this principle include doing no harm or preventing harm and promoting good. The third principle is "justice," which implies equity in the selection and recruitment, as well as impartial treatment of those under research. It also demands the fair treatment of research subjects.

Lastly, although it was the first code to be issued, we have the 1948 Nuremberg Code. This legislation emphasizes informed consent and respect for the freedom of the individual, as stated in the two previous codes. In Colombia, Resolution 8430 of 1993 follows the international regulatory framework to the letter and incorporates all its ethical parameters[6]. The origins of the regulatory framework are rooted in the violation of the human rights of research subjects whose bodies and psyches were experimented on by medical researchers during World War II in Europe and, between 1932 and 1972, in the United States. The regulatory framework only covers human subjects.

Who is considered a research subject in all these codes? Any living person about whom data is obtained through an intervention or interaction (such as an interview) or the review of documents, databases, or other sources. Therefore, it is necessary to handle personal and private data sensitively and responsibly.

Twenty-three years have already gone by since Nina passed away, and we are talking about an archive. Do we really need to worry about protecting people? Given my uncertainty about having included personal documents in the fund, and that although Nina is (and is studied as) "a classical anthropologist," her family members and some colleagues are still alive. The privacy and personal integrity, dignity, and personal and professional reputation of all of them —colleagues or family— must be safeguarded as provided by the regulatory framework.

Outlining the international regulatory framework is also important because Nina's methodology anticipated the spirit of these standards in three interrelated ways. Firstly, she insisted on including peoples of African descent in social research, which had been excluded from this kind of research, if not systematically, then through the use of disparaging stereotypes. She applied this standard for the entirety of her career, adhering to the principle of justice from the Belmont Report, which requires the equitable selection of populations for fairness in research. Secondly, she campaigned for an engaged anthropology to promote the welfare of ethnic groups. And thirdly, she advocated for the repatriation of research results. These aspects, implicit in the regulatory framework, are interwoven threads running through Nina's work.

A PIONEER IN PUBLIC AND ENGAGED ANTHROPOLOGY

The foundations for engaged social science in Colombia date back to the 1930s. This period saw the emergence of solutions that vindicated Indigenous agrarian struggles, as Jaime observed in "Antropología en la historia de Colombia: una visión" [Anthropology in Colombian history: an overview] (Arocha 1984a). Gregorio Hernández de Alba and Juan Friede, two of its precursors, founded the National Institute of Indigenous Affairs. They did so as a response to the focus on pure, objective, and neutral science advocated by Paul Rivet, who founded the National Ethnological Institute in 1941. Hernández de Alba, Friede, and others conducted socio-economic assessments with a commitment to Indigenous agrarian struggles (Arocha 1984a)[7]. Even so, this public and engaged approach was not predominant in the social sciences when Nina graduated from the Colombian Institute of Anthropology in 1963[8]. The dominant academic position since the 1950s was classical Indigenous ethnography, which sought to salvage cultural data, albeit disconnected from political-economic factors. This approach ignored and perpetuated ethnocidal and genocidal behavior

(Arocha 1984a). At the same time, an early version of applied anthropology had emerged, driven by state institutions and international development agencies to promote cultural change, modernization, and economic development (Arocha 1984b)[9]. These two ways of practicing anthropology were not in line with the needs of the grassroots communities nor with the multiple leftist movements that permeated and politicized the universities. They ignored the rampant ethnocide and genocide of various Indigenous ethnic groups as the State endeavored to expand its capitalist holdings and those of the ruling and dominant classes (Arocha 1984a).

Against this background, the Colombian Institute of Anthropology hired Nina as a researcher, while the National University hired her as a professor. There, she began her career as a public and engaged anthropologist[10]. One of her first professional actions was to lead the creation of the Anthropological Society of Colombia in 1969 in order to denounce the massacre of sixteen Cuivas at the Rubiera ranch in 1967. The victims included six minors who were executed after being served *sancocho* (Arocha 2021). According to Jaime, the massacre revealed that

> for the settlers of the Eastern Plains, not only was killing —Guahibo or Cuiva— Indians not a crime, but it was a sport practiced for at least the previous 100 years. Shortly after, newspapers reported that in Planas the army had fired on defenseless Guahibos. [Despite the massacre], the international outcry to find those responsible did not resonate in the Colombian Institute of Anthropology, which excluded itself from the discussion and declined to investigate, claiming that doing so would violate the neutrality that should accompany the social sciences. (Telephone conversation with Jaime Arocha, May 19, 2021)[11]

The society was founded "to create an organization whose independence would guarantee the free expression of a commitment to grassroots communities" (Arocha 1984a, 80). Nina led the society and its newsletter, *Micronoticias Antropológicas*, as mechanisms to speak out, discuss and publicize the violation of human rights (Arocha 1984a). The society also published *Antropológicas*, which included first-hand documentation of human rights violations. Its first issue featured a chronicle on the Rubiera massacre written by journalist Germán Castro Caycedo after reviewing documentation regarding the acquittal of the perpetrators by a jury in June 1972 (Arocha 2021).

Micronoticias also served as a vehicle to denounce the human rights abuses suffered by academics such as Orlando Fals Borda and María Cristina Salazar (Fals's wife) under Turbay Ayala's administration (1978-1982) (telephone conversation with Jaime Arocha, May 19, 2021). The security statute, decreed by Turbay and protected by the state of siege, suspended citizens' rights and guarantees. This decree granted military forces the power to try civilians in summary courts martial and to exercise other mechanisms of repression against individuals who dissented from the government and thus were labeled as subversives[12].

> The repressive mechanisms used back then would be inconceivable today after the 1991 Constitution. How is it possible that you could be arrested on the street, taken away, and tortured? And the persecution of Indigenous peoples went on. The *resguardos* [reservations] were required to have juridical personality, and if they did not, they were outside the law. It was a macabre era in the country. (Telephone conversation with Jaime Arocha, May 19, 2021)

Future generations can browse the fund and review the society's records, issues of *Micronoticias,* and documents regarding the pursuit of science as a public service in the context of this dark history of Colombia. The following is a summary of events presented to the United Nations Human Rights Committee by Fals and three other victims:

> On January 21, 1979, Mr. Fals Borda, a Colombian sociologist and professor, and his wife, María Cristina Salazar de Fals Borda, were arrested by members of the Military Institutes

> Brigade under the Security Statute. Mr. Fals was held incommunicado without judicial guarantees, such as legal aid, at the Usaquén Infantry Headquarters from January 21 to February 10, 1979, when he was released without charges. His wife continued to be detained for more than a year. A military court later ruled that there were no grounds for detaining Mrs. Fals Borda. (United Nations, Human Rights Committee 1982)

Nina proposed the name Sociedad Antropológica de Colombia (Anthropological Society of Colombia) instead of Sociedad Colombiana de Antropología (Colombian Society of Anthropology), so that it would be open to foreign researchers, who were numerous at the time (telephone conversation with Jaime Arocha, May 19, 2021).

The ethics framework became a constant concern since the early days of Nina's career. And how could it be otherwise, given the historical and political context of the genocides of Indigenous people in 1967 and subsequent repression? While she denounced the lack of studies on Black populations and won greater recognition for her work in that field, her activities also focused on the violation of human rights against Indigenous populations. Specifically, her work vindicated the struggles for rights and access to land as evidenced by her early study in Tenjo, Cundinamarca, *El común de indígenas de Churuguaco* ["*El Común de Indígenas*" in Churuguaco] (Friedemann 1965), her work as editor of a book covering the land challenges of different ethnic groups in the country (Friedemann 1976a), and the volume *Indigenismo y aniquilamiento de indígenas en Colombia* [Indigenism and the annihilation of Indigenous peoples in Colombia], in collaboration with Juan Friede and Dario Fajardo (1975). This last book begins as follows:

> The disappearance of Indigenous peoples and cultures in America is a catastrophe that, in a few years, will be five centuries old... In Colombia, Indigenous people still exist and many live on lands that contain strategic resources relevant to the national economy and the international capitalist system. (Friedemann, Friede and Fajardo 1975, i)

The seminal article "Antropólogos y antropología en Colombia: sus responsabilidades" [Anthropologists and anthropology in Colombia: their responsibilities] (Friedemann 1971a) arose from the Declaration of Barbados for Indigenous liberation. According to the declaration, the ethnocide and genocide of American Indians was a result of the process of capitalist expansion. It also defined the anthropologist's responsibility to provide knowledge about Indigenous peoples and their oppressors to support their struggle for liberation (Arocha 1984a)[13]. The article gathered the opinion and discussions expressed by the members of the Anthropological Society of Colombia regarding the Declaration of Barbados and the annihilation of Indigenous people in Colombia (Arocha 1984a). This document was and still is a protest against the neo-colonialism of North Atlantic academia and its followers (Arocha 1984a). There, Nina outlines a typology of social scientists as they relate to the application of research for the benefit of humanity. The first group, which she named "neutrals" or neo-colonial academics, whether domestic or foreign, consists of those scientists who reject the application of their research outside of the academic sphere. That is, they are those who do science for science's sake and argue that to use research in any other way turns the researcher into a social worker. In Nina's words:

> This formulation of neutrality is offered with the implication of a lack of commitment to take social responsibility in the expression of critical judgments regarding decisions such as the integration of Indigenous peoples to the proletariat in oil-producing regions, or the cultural disasters that would result from the displacement of Indigenous and Black people from the lands they have occupied for many decades, lands on which lakes are planned for hydroelectric production […]. (Friedemann 1971a, 8)

Within the group of neutral anthropologists, Nina's harshest criticism is against foreigners with urgent ethnography or data salvage programs "among Indigenous groups that are known to be dying out" (Friedemann 1971a, 11). The second group consists of anthropologists that are aware of their scientific

responsibilities towards the country, what is known today as public anthropology and in Colombia is called engaged anthropology. This group of engaged scientists believes that their research products must be disseminated in the interest of the country's various communities. Nina closes her article with an analysis of the use of ethnographic data that remains trapped in foreign journals and in languages inaccessible to Colombians; that is, non-repatriated data.

In a folder in Minneapolis, I have a report written by Nina to the administration of the Colombian Institute of Anthropology (Instituto Colombiano de Antropología, ICAN). It contains a summary of the special session regarding ethics in the anthropological practice in Colombia during the congress of the American Anthropological Association held in New York City in November 1971. The title of her conference was "Some Points of Responsibility of Anthropologists: A Colombian View" (Friedemann 1971c). In her report, Nina wondered why there was a debate between neutral and engaged anthropologists if the board of this association had adopted ethical parameters in May of that year, which emphasized that "the anthropologist has a responsibility toward the public… he commits to disseminate the results of his research and to communicate his opinions as a scholar of mankind" (1971b, 4).

In the last section of the report, Nina concluded with a summary of the nine publications made by foreign colleagues after hearing her critique of the lack of repatriation of information and the failure to resolve the debate between neutrality and compromise. She closed the report with a question that would guide her throughout her career and would serve as a beacon for her colleagues and future generations:

> It will be hard to find a common path in the practice of human anthropology for scientists coming from countries with dissimilar interests and socio-economic developments, when their work is conducted according to codes that respond to needs different from those of the host countries. Would it then be unreasonable to propose that anthropological research in Colombia adhere to a code that addresses our needs? (1971b, 12)

So, in 1971, she was advocating for the formulation of academic public policies and national ethical frameworks so that foreign researchers could follow their own ethics codes and, at the same time, develop a professional code of practice centered on the application of science for the betterment of the Colombian people. That is, she was proposing the practice of public anthropology. It is important to mention explicitly the channels that she used to communicate her ideas from such early years. Since then, she furthered her advocacy through publications in newspapers (Friedemann 1971d) and academic journals (1971a), participation and presentations at international congresses (1971c), and administrative reports (1971b).

Positioning oneself as a public and engaged anthropologist requires the initial awareness of not being unthinking cogs in the socio-political and academic system. On the contrary, it implies acknowledging that the very actions of each researcher have the potential to produce and reproduce the dominant institution, discipline, and system. The researcher has to choose to adopt this reflexive position while knowing, to some extent, that the choice has its costs. And, in Nina's case, it certainly did.

The lack of academic freedom to conduct research in a public institution became evident in the mid-1970s. Nina summarizes this in *Un siglo de investigación social. Antropología en Colombia* [A century of social research. Anthropology in Colombia] (1984). The Colombian Institute of Anthropology established four research stations in 1974,

> primarily located in Indigenous regions. From a governmental perspective, their establishment responded to the political and administrative needs of State consolidation and unification in marginal areas (Jimeno 1980). Some of the researchers tried to remain focused on the groups under study. But the clash of commitments manifested itself before too long. Indeed, the expansion of independent power beyond the orbit of the Institute of Anthropology demanded from researchers declarations of loyalty and adherence to the administrative execution of governmental work programs. (Friedemann 1984, 418)

In my opinion, the description must be extended and made more concrete for the generations that did not live in those times. In a recent conversation with Jaime, I asked for details regarding the summary of the facts published by him and Nina (Arocha 1984a; Friedemann 1984).

> The director of the Colombian Institute of Anthropology had funds that had been earmarked for the research stations, which were the Caribbean, Arauca, Pedrera (in the Amazon and Vaupes), and a fourth one. Research funds were diverted to support initiatives by Gloria Zea [director of Colcultura and supervisor of the director of ICAN] and the reconstruction of Ciudad Perdida [in Tayrona Park, Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta] by the institute's director. This affected the directors of each station, Nina among them. Nina contacted then House Representative Alegría Fonseca, who summoned the directors of ICAN and Colcultura to a congressional session to inquire about the funds. They attended one of two sessions. The day after the first session, which was a payday, a letter supporting the administration of ICAN's director appeared next to the sheet that the researchers had to sign to receive their paychecks. At that moment, the payroll is on one side and the letter on the other. Those who did not sign the letter of support could not sign the payroll and collect their check. I witnessed that Nina refused to sign and was dismissed ipso facto. (Telephone conversation with Jaime Arocha, January 14, 2021)

The other station directors met the same fate, as did other opponents of the institute's policies. In total, around twelve of ICAN's fifty researchers were ousted through contract cancellations and job terminations (Arocha 1984a)[14]. Jaime documented these facts in issue 3 of the 1979 *Micronoticias* (Arocha 1979). Nina and Jaime had met the previous year; they agreed on issues of ethics and commitment, as well as the future of anthropology in Colombia in that time of repression and restricted democracy. Their mutual understanding was such that they unified projects (Arocha 2000)[15]. This explains why Jaime was at the ICAN office on December 22, 1978, working on *Bibliografía anotada* [Annotated bibliography], when the deputy director of the institution "enters with the written order to evacuate. He demands an inventory and Nina tells him that the most important thing about that office is the light bulb, because the Institute needs a great deal of light at the moment" (Arocha 1979, 11). It is clear that, for Nina, her ethical position and conscience required her to denounce the performance of public employees and, if necessary, the State itself[16].

On October 29, 2018, during the inauguration of the fund, the director of the Room of Rare Books and Manuscripts at the BLAA asked my sister and me about the last unopened box in the fund, still sealed. The time restriction for opening it expired on that very day. With the then director of this institution, Alberto Abello, my sister Nancy and I opened the box, which contained politically sensitive documents. It included the letter of dismissal signed by Gloria Zea and the many letters written to different bodies, including the Ministry of Labor, asking for her severance pay. Overwhelmed, I did not miss the irony of the moment: Nina and the documentation of thirty years of engaged practice had been welcomed back into the fold of the State. With nothing less than her own fund at the Bank of the Republic's Library.

The refusal to support policies endorsed by senior state officials ended Nina's tenure at the ICAN and, ironically, paved the way to carry out her work with supreme autonomy and academic freedom. This allowed her to deepen her collaboration with Jaime Arocha.

REPATRIATION OF RESEARCH FOR A PUBLIC ANTHROPOLOGY

The repatriation of research results is indispensable for a public and engaged anthropology. To repatriate means making research data available to a broad audience, including the host communities and countries, as Nina argued and exemplified through her work (Friedemann 1984). Nina and Jaime experimented with various registers and modes of publication to repatriate their studies. As a result, they could reach broader audiences and influence public policy. Jaime wrote about this work dynamic in several articles that summarized Nina's contribution and their mutual collaboration (Arocha 2016, 2000). For

instance, the book *Herederos del jaguar y la anaconda* [Heirs of the jaguar and the anaconda] (Friedemann and Arocha 1985, 1982) was published during the era of restricted democracy: a period when Turbay Ayala introduced the Indigenous Statute, which sought to restrict the recovery of *resguardos* and furthered the socio-cultural annihilation of ethnic groups[17]. The book is a response to the ongoing atrocities; it provides Colombia —and the public opinion— with a comprehensive and accessible overview of Colombian Indigenous peoples (Arocha 2000).

Their experimentation with writing in different registers resulted in a style designed to reach the general reader. In their efforts to find a simple language to convey complex histories, Nina and Jaime extended their collaboration with writers to learn "from people who did not write bricks" (Arocha 2016, 142). It is worth mentioning that Nina and Jaime traveled to Tumaco in 1983 to read segments of their writings to the fishermen. The experience taught them that their texts were too long (Arocha 2000). The final result was the collection of non-fiction stories in the book *De sol a sol* [From sunrise to sunset] (Friedemann and Arocha 1986), which summarizes the genesis, transformation, and presence of Black people in Colombia. The second edition of *De sol a sol* will be published soon with a new introduction to update the reader on the changes experienced by Black communities since its initial publication.

Going back to the first half of her professional career, Nina used photography and documentary film as tools for research and the repatriation of information. For example, her documentary filmed in Villarrica (Duncan, Duncan and Friedemann 1973), in northern Cauca, sought to "capture the opinion of the people of Villarrica regarding the problems of violence and continued dispossession that arise during the expansion of sugar mills" (Valencia and Silva 2014, 37). In the manuscript *La película antropológica: una herramienta para la investigación y acción social* [Anthropological film: a tool for social action and research], prepared for the repatriation of the documentary *Villarrica*, at the University of the Atlantic in 1975, Nina described her methodology for choosing the content of the documentary:

> After having hundreds of still photographs, taken with the community's awareness of the work that we were doing, the process of selecting photographs took place with the collaboration of several people, not necessarily those pictured in them. During this process, the first strokes of the visual and verbal description of the community started to emerge. We began to reduce the number of photographs to a tolerable numerical sample, always taking care to adhere to the themes. This sample was submitted to members of the community, during sessions that were recorded and used as material for the film's soundtrack. The community members who participated in the sessions fulfilled the requirement of belonging to different groups, i.e., by religion, political affiliation, occupation, etc. The data for this stage of the work came from another section of the body of the anthropological investigation. Then, the community members organized the photographs in the sample according to their own cultural categories. This categorization was used to develop the documentary, and filming began. The assembly of the Villarrica segments is the result of this work... Villarrica as a film was completed in 1974. It was delivered to the University of the Valley. From then on, we can track whether it is used to fulfill its intended role: as a tool for research and social communication. (Friedemann 1975, 4)

Nina also used visual documents to get feedback on the information and about what to communicate in the project of San Basilio del Palenque, Bolívar department (Valencia 2014). On this occasion, she innovated by turning the image into a tool for building collaborative knowledge.

> In anthropology, when an audiovisual work contemplates reciprocity in itself, it provides conditions to develop a Shared-Science. When the subject groups are integrated as lived experiences that take part in the work, then the shared anthropological cinema can respond to the rigorous approaches of the social responsibility of science and its scientists. (Friedemann 1975, 3)

Concerning informed consent, as referred to in the regulatory framework, the current understanding is that it is not something to be obtained only once so that the researcher can then investigate at their leisure. It is an iterative process that begins when the researcher approaches a community or individual and makes known the objectives of the possible research and participation, continues with data collection and is repeated in cycles that can last days, weeks, months, and even years. Nina's methodology, where she invited the community to collaborate on the selection of photographs and themes in her projects in Villarrica and, later on, Güelmambí, demonstrates some of the processes she followed to develop rapport and obtain consent. It is worth clarifying that obtaining informed consent in the medical sciences requires documents signed by the subject granting their consent to participate in the study, documents that can help the researcher follow up on clinical studies. This standard does not apply to the social sciences since having a document with a subject's signature ultimately means having a document—the only document in the study—in which the subject is identified with personal information. And this contradicts the spirit of the rule regarding anonymity. For this reason, the current best practice is obtaining repeated verbal consent but not having a document with a signature to record its attainment. Therefore, Nina's archives, like those of the vast majority of social researchers in politically sensitive areas, have no written records of consent, again in anticipation of and adherence to the regulatory framework.

Nina's research in Güelmambí, Nariño, details artisanal gold mining. In particular, it describes the social organization by bilinear lineages whose members trace their origin back to a "focal ancestor, founder of the group and original owner of the land to which their descendants are entitled." In this region, these ancestors are called *troncos* (Friedemann 1974, 2). Here, *mayoritarios* and *mayoritarias* —leaders chosen by the communities— of these large clans regulate the rights to the collective territory that includes the rivers, their banks, and the strips of land that the communities demarcate parallel to the riverbed. Likewise, these persons mediate in the conflicts created by the State when it tries to uproot the population after declaring the strips to be wastelands. This anomaly is precisely what Law 70 of 1993 sought to correct by legitimizing the collective dominion over ancestral territories. With a photographic exhibition (Friedemann, Sabogal and Witlin 1972), a film (Friedemann and Duncan 1973), and a book (Friedemann 1974), Nina presented the results of an investigation that would inform the constitutional reform initiated in 1990.

I will focus on the visual exhibition because it is an innovative resource to conduct repatriation processes. Its title was *Minería del oro siglo XX. Barbacoas, Nariño* [Gold mining in the 20th century. Barbacoas, Nariño] (Friedemann, Sabogal and Witlin 1972), and it contained 79 photographs with their respective titles, captions, and maps. The exhibit was shown at the National Museum of Colombia in Bogotá, then at the universities of the Atlantic, Nariño, and Cauca, and, finally, in Barbacoas. It provided different audiences in Colombia and the people from Nariño themselves with access to information regarding the "territorial exploitation and economic exploitation by the multinational companies that owned the mechanized equipment responsible for destroying the environment and ruining the ancestral inhabitants" (Arocha 2016, 139). In her publication "Cine documento" [Documentary film], Nina clarifies that it was impossible to show the film *Güelmambí: un río de oro* [Güelmambí: a river of gold] (Friedemann and Duncan 1973) in Güelmambí due to the lack of electricity. For this reason, the photographic exhibition and the film were taken to Barbacoas, where they shattered all expectations due to the high number of attendees (Friedemann 1976b).

Ma Ngombe: guerreros y ganaderos en Palenque (Friedemann and Cross 1979), also being reedited by Jaime, is an ethnography where the texts engage in a permanent dialog with 286 photographs taken by journalist Richard Cross (1950-1983) (Valencia and Silva 2014). By considering the image as both ethnographic data, methodological tool, and pedagogical and communicative document, Nina literally made visible in Colombia those who were rendered invisible, discriminated against, and excluded by the dominant society. And she did so through their collaboration (Friedemann 1976b; Valencia 2014). Jaime describes the repatriation to Palenque in the following manner:

> Nina also made a pilgrimage to the Church of Palenque and presented her book *Ma Ngombe* to Saint Basil [and San Basilio]. Her work spread quickly and had an unexpected impact in terms of enhancing the pride of the men and women of Palenque. (Arocha 2016, 143)

The dozens of opinion articles in national newspapers and the countless letters written to members of the public administration were also ways of repatriating information. Peter Rondón Vélez, who conducted a thorough study of the Nina S. de Friedemann Fund, has this to say about the documents related to the *ley de negritudes*, mentioned at the beginning of this article:

> The texts with the greatest legislative relevance are drafts, comments, excerpts, and copies of law 70, in which Nina played a leading role by mediating between the communities and the government. As a spokesperson, she sent letters to Presidents Julio César Turbay (1978-1982) and Belisario Betancur (1982-1986), as well as Minister of the Interior Humberto de la Calle Lombana (1990-1993), where she questioned the conduct of the ministries for disregarding the rights of Afro-Colombians and emphasized the urgency of establishing the Special Commission for Black Communities in 1992. (2020, 267)

An account of the work conducted by the special commission where, among others, Jaime Arocha, Piedad Córdoba, Carlos Rosero, Silvio Garcés and Rudecindo Castro participated, can be found in the book *Calle caliente* (Castro and Meza 2017). Castro and Meza describe Nina's influence: firstly, by writing the document that defended the bill after the first debate in Congress and, secondly, by addressing the chamber orally (2017, 189-191)[18]. Now, if Nina were alive today, I suspect that she would say that written and oral participation in the Congress of the Republic constitutes a mechanism for the repatriation of information.

The Challenges Overcome by the Legacy and Those That Remain

Early on, Nina recognized the challenges faced by researchers affiliated with North Atlantic academia regarding the practice of public anthropology:

> […] a number of these anthropologists come to the country with the financial backing of foundations or entities that allocate funds to projects in fields of study defined by conditions that sometimes respond to the particular needs of departments in universities or anthropology laboratories, and their performance conforms to these guidelines. The anthropologists may be forced to work within controlled frameworks with respect to their social responsibility. (1971a, 12)

Throughout her career, she, like many Colombian and Latin American scholars, wrote and denounced the lack of dissemination and repatriation of information by scholars in North Atlantic academia. Similarly, she criticized the fact that researchers in the global North did not use the research by Colombian and Latin American social scientists. Although new information and communication technologies (NICTs), the World Wide Web, and the Internet have developed exponentially—facilitating access to databases and electronic communication—it is still hard to consult South Atlantic academic works. This is because the requirements of North Atlantic academia on journal indexing, which is now a global requirement, structurally limit access in the North to publications from the South. So much so that, despite being aware of this fact, finding the relevant publications for this article proved difficult. In Jaime's words, "Latin American researchers remain invisible" (telephone conversation with Jaime Arocha, May 19, 2021). Therefore, in founding the journal *América Negra*, Nina set out to strengthen both South-South and South-North dialogs (Arocha 2016).

Undoubtedly, practicing public and engaged anthropology, and engaged social sciences remains a challenge for the academic community in the United States. The priority is still placed on scholarly production to advance theoretical frameworks and publish in indexed journals with limited epistemologies, dissemination, and repatriation. And, therefore, community-engaged research and publications that reach

out to stakeholders continue to be neglected. The requirement to produce articles with a theoretical emphasis and be published in journals, which few will read not only because they are written in a specialized jargon and in another language, but also because they have to pay for access, prevails over non-peer-reviewed books and public policy reports (Friedemann-Sánchez and Grieve 2020, 2019). This prevalence persists even if these works have achieved their objectives through international (Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women 2019) and national advocacy[19]. Since an individual's ethical requirements may conflict with those of the institution to which they belong, their negotiation becomes a process that can be not only exhausting but also fruitless[20].

Nancy Scheper-Hughes is an American public anthropologist who has researched and campaigned on organ trafficking. Based on her experience, she argues that, in public anthropology, one has to work on two separate tracks. One is keeping up with "[…] the expected rate of scholarly productions of books, articles and graduate students, participating in academic meetings, etc.". The other is "[…] doing human rights work, serving on international panels, giving keynote speeches in places and at events that don't matter a hoot to one's peers" (2008, 3). Scheper-Hughes argues that it is possible to survive (Northern) academia simply by doing what mothers do: working double time. And if you are a female academic, must you work triple time? According to the author, practicing public anthropology is a right and a privilege. And she closes her article with the same question that Nina asked fifty years earlier, at the beginning of her career: "If anthropology cannot be put to service as a tool for human liberation why are we bothering with it at all?" (Scheper-Hughes 2008, 3).

While in Northern academia there is an ongoing debate about the practice and recognition of public and engaged research, in Colombia, this discussion took place several decades ago with good results, although it is not acknowledged in North Atlantic publications (Baba and Hill 2006; Scheper-Hughes 2008; Vine 2011). That statement remains valid even as the global neoliberal trend in academic circles is forcing researchers to move away from an engaged professional practice (Boron 2006).

Those Colombian social scientists who have developed and taught methodologies for public and engaged research since the 1940s have proved successful. Myriam Jimeno has referred to their work as nation-centrism (2007). That is to say, the anthropological practice in Colombia today is focused on "the struggle for the appreciation, visibility, and participation in the Colombian nation of social sectors such as Black and Indigenous people, and the poorest segments of the population" (2007, 10). The trademark of the practice of anthropology in Colombia is the combination of research and civic action, in other words, of a public and engaged anthropology.

Nina modeled the creation of institutions to overcome the limits of engaged practice. This is evident in the establishment of the Anthropological Society of Colombia and the creation of editorial projects such as *Micronoticias Antropológicas* and *América Negra*. Thanks to these actions, the practice of public anthropology began to take shape. Nina left with us the desire that Colombia should not lose its openness to engaged anthropology. The spirit of her letter to Jorge Orlando Melo lives on. As well as her hope for historical documentation to help new generations in creating a fairer Colombia for Afro-descendants, Indigenous, and other subaltern populations. The Nina S. de Friedemann Fund is Nina's final ethical act in her practice as a public anthropologist.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This article expands on the topics discussed in a paper presented at the Luis Ángel Arango Library during the symposium "Conversaciones: 20 años sin Nina" [Conversations: 20 years without Nina] held in October 2018 to commemorate the twentieth anniversary of the death of anthropologist Nina S. de Friedemann. The video of the symposium is available at the following link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YMljjLIEdY8. I am grateful to Jaime Arocha, Luis Carlos Castro Ramirez, editor of the open journal Antípoda where this article was first published in 2022, and the peer reviewers for their suggestions. Early drafts benefited from the comments of Stephen Ellis, Gail Dubrow and Kristine Miller, scholars at the University of Minnesota's Institute for Advanced Studies in the fall of 2021.

ENDNOTES

1. Robert Borofsky coined the term public anthropology. However, several Latin American and Colombian social scientists pioneered its implementation, including Juan Friede and Orlando Fals Borda, who preceded North Atlantic public anthropology by several decades.
2. For further information about the congress, refer to the book published by Silvia Valero, Los negros se toman la palabra [Black people take the floor] (2020), which records its plenary sessions and debates.
3. I worked for six years as a researcher at one of the Veterans Administration's research centers in the United States. Through this experience, I saw the differences between the parameters of the centers and the universities. In the centers, the data is stored on encrypted computers and servers to protect research subjects, and it is destroyed after five years have elapsed since the end of the investigation. Ensuring that the data is kept on secure devices is also required in university environments; however, the idea of destroying it after the five-year limit has passed is unthinkable for the universities and social sciences. In these areas, data retention is the basis of comparative studies. When I stopped working with the Veterans Administration, I had to leave my research data in the institution, while at the University of Minnesota the data belongs to the researchers, not to the university.
4. Needless to say, this debate is not over. Some political science journals in the North Atlantic academia require the deposit of anonymized data, whether quantitative or qualitative, in order for an article to undergo peer review. The lack of distinction between quantitative and qualitative methods in editorial requirements has been the subject of much debate among researchers specializing in qualitative methods because it is not possible to anonymize an entire qualitative database. And doing so would mean losing the context necessary for analysis.
5. Congress of the Republic. 2012. "Ley Estatutaria 1581 de 2012". Diario Oficial 48.587, October 18. http://www.secretariasenado.gov.co/senado/basedoc/ley_1581_2012.html
6. Ministry of Health. 1993. "Resolución n.° 8430 de 1993. Por la cual se establecen las normas científicas, técnicas y administrativas para la investigación en salud" [Resolution n.° 8430 of 1993. Establishing scientific, technical, and administrative standards for health research]. Ministry of Health, Bogotá, October 4. https://www.minsalud.gov.co/sites/rid/Lists/BibliotecaDigital/RIDE/DE/DIJ/RESOLUCION-8430-DE-1993.pdf
7. Jaime and Nina dedicated the book Un siglo de investigación social. Antropología en Colombia [A century of social research. Anthropology in Colombia] (1984) to Juan Friede.
8. The Colombian Institute of Anthropology was founded in 1952 following the merger of the National Archaeological Service and the Ethnological Institute.
9. Jaime Arocha and Myriam Jimeno detail the emphasis on training specialists for cultural change and social development with the collaboration of universities and state entities (Arocha 1984b, 1984a; Jimeno 1984). For example, around 1960, sociologist Orlando Fals Borda was simultaneously dean of the National University and Secretary of the Ministry of Agriculture (Arocha 1984a).
10. Nina was hired by the Colombian Institute of Anthropology on April 10, 1964, and her last day of work before her dismissal was December 21, 1978 (see appendix in Arocha 1979). In 1971, Nina was a professor in the Department of Anthropology at the National University. I do not know the exact date of her incorporation. However, I disagree with Myriam Jimeno's summary of why Nina left the National University, along with Gerardo Reichel-Dolmatoff, Alicia Dussán, Roberto Pineda, and Virginia Gutiérrez de Pineda. According to Jimeno, the students saw the professors as proponents of anthropology as a colonial product and criticized a lack of community engagement in the curriculum (Jimeno 2007, 19-20). There is no way that Nina could have been forced out of the university due to a lack of community engagement! I suggest the cause was her refusal to align with any of the leftist movements at the university or her decision not to teach historical materialism, which dominated all social sciences curricula.
11. More information to support the contents of this conversation can be found in various works by Nina and Jaime (Arocha 2021, 1984a; Friedemann 1984; Friedemann and Arocha 1982, 33-35).
12. Decree 1923 of 1978. Diario Oficial 35.101, September 21.
13. An issue of Micronoticias was dedicated to the dissemination of the Declaration of Barbados (Arocha 1984a, 80-81).
14. Those affected included Miguel Lobo-Guerrero, Xochitl Herrera, Francisco Ortiz, Elizabeth Reichel, and Martin Hildebrand (see Hildebrand 1977).
15. Their first projects were Bibliografía anotada [Annotated bibliography] (Friedemann and Arocha 1979) and, five years later, Un siglo de investigación (Arocha and Friedemann 1984a). The latter anticipated the analysis

of the discipline in historical-political contexts and the role of classical and applied anthropology in academia by three decades (Baba and Hill 2006). Details of the development of the Bibliografía anotada can be read in Jaime's Micronoticias from 1979.

16. Alegría Fonseca described in an interview with El Tiempo that her first debate "was to prevent the construction of luxury hotels in Tayrona Park" (Nieto 2013).
17. The Congress of the Republic did not pass the bill (Friedemann 1987). For an analysis regarding the practice of anthropology in Colombia after the academic, political, and juridical turmoil of the seventies and the first half of the eighties, see "Antropología en Colombia: después de la conmoción" [Anthropology in Colombia: after the commotion] (Friedemann 1987).
18. The document in response to the Government's objections is included in Annex 1in the book with Nina's handwritten pagination.
19. Congress of the Republic – House of Representatives. 2020. "Ley Ordinaria. Por el cual se regula la creación, conformación y funcionamiento de las Comisarías de Familia, se establece el órgano rector y se dictan otras disposiciones" [Ordinary law, which regulates the creation, conformation and operation of Family Commissioner's Offices, establishes their governing body, and issues other provisions], House of Representatives project no.: 133/2020C. Gaceta (Bogotá) 672 of 2020. https://www.camara.gov.co/comisarias-de-familia-0. Law 2126 of 2021 "Por la cual se regula la creación, conformación y funcionamiento de las comisarías de familia, se establece el órgano rector y se dictan otras disposiciones" [Regulating the creation, conformation, and operation of Family Commissioner's Offices, establishing their governing body, and issuing other provisions]. https://www.alcaldiabogota.gov.co/sisjur/normas/Norma1.jsp?i=115640
20. During a meeting in 2020 with the promotion and tenure committee at my university, when I submitted my resume and asked if I could apply to become a full professor, one of the committee members congratulated me on my successful advocacy at the United Nations and with various levels of the Colombian Government to strengthen legislation toward a life free of violence. This advocacy translated into changes to the legislation currently underway in Congress. However, they remarked, "but none of that is research." When asked what constitutes research, the reply was, "it has to be published in an indexed journal." With the passage of Law 2126 in August 2021, the committee and the university will have a new opportunity to put into practice a definition of research in line with the needs of the global South and South Atlantic academia.

REFERENCES

Annas, G.J., & Grodin, M.A. (2008). The Nuremberg Code. In E.J. Emanuel, C.C. Grady, R.A. Crouch, R.K. Lie, F.G. Miller, & D.D. Wendler (Eds.), *The Oxford Textbook of Clinical Research Ethics* (pp. 136–140). New York: Oxford University Press.

Arocha, J. (1979). La insubsistencia de Friedemann: Una versión vivencial. [Friedemann's dismissal: An experiential version]. *Micronoticias*, *3*, 9–12.

Arocha, J. (1984a). Antropología en la historia de Colombia: Una visión [Anthropology in Colombian history: An overview]. In J. Arocha, & N.S. de Friedemann (Eds.), *Un siglo de investigación social. Antropología en Colombia* (pp. 27–130). Bogotá: Etno.

Arocha, J. (1984b). Antropología propia: Un programa en formación [An Anthropology of our own: A program in the making]. In J. Arocha, & N.S. de Friedemann (Eds.), *Un siglo de investigación social. Antropología en Colombia* (pp. 253–300). Bogotá: Etno.

Arocha, J. (2000). Elogio a la afrigenía. [In praise of Africanness]. *Nómadas*, *13*, 179–193. Retrieved from https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=105115264015

Arocha, J. (2003). El Fondo Nina S. de Friedemann de la Biblioteca Luis Ángel Arango. [The Nina S. de Friedemann Fund at Luis Ángel Arango Library]. *Boletín Cultural y Bibliográfico*, *40*(64), 142–147. Retrieved from https://publicaciones.banrepcultural.org/index.php/boletin_cultural/article/view/1009

Arocha, J. (2016). Nina S. de Friedemann (1930–1998): La etnógrafa de africanías y cimarronismos. [Nina S. de Friedemann (1930–1998): The ethnographer of Africanness and Maroonages]. *Revista de Estudios Colombianos*, *47*, 136–150. Retrieved from

https://colombianistas.org/wp-content/themes/pleasant/REC/REC%2047/Ensayos/47_19_Ensayo_Arocha.pdf
Arocha, J. (2021, July 27). “Colombia amarga” [Bitter Colombia]. *El Espectador*. Retrieved from https://www.elespectador.com/opinion/columnistas/jaime-arocha/colombia-amarga/
Arocha, J., & de Friedemann, N.S. (Eds.). (1984). *Un siglo de investigación social. Antropología en Colombia*. [A century of social research. Anthropology in Colombia]. Bogotá: Etno.
Baba, M.L., & Hill, C.E. (2006). What’s in the Name ‘Applied Anthropology’? An Encounter with Global Practice. *NAPA Bulletin*, *25*(1), 176–207. https://doi.org/10.1525/napa.2006.25.1.176
Boron, A.A. (2006). Las ciencias sociales en la era neoliberal: Entre la academia y el pensamiento crítico. [Social sciences in the neoliberal age: Between academia and critical thinking]. *Tarea*, *122*, 45–73. Retrieved from https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/5350/535055620003.pdf
Castro, R., & Meza, C.A. (2017). *Calle caliente: Memorias de un cimarrón contemporáneo*. [*Calle caliente*: Memoirs of a contemporary Maroon man] Bogotá: Instituto Colombiano de Antropología e Historia (Icanh).
Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women. (2019, March 14). *Concluding observations on the ninth periodic report of Colombia. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women*. Geneva: United Nations. Retrieved from https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2fC%2fCOL%2fCO%2f9&Lang=en
Cruz Solano, E., Cárdenas Alvarado, M.B., Escobar López, M.T., & González Monroy, A.D. (2010). *Regulación ética en investigación con seres humanos en Colombia*. [Ethical regulation of research involving human subjects in Colombia]. Bucaramanga: Universidad Industrial de Santander. Retrieved from https://www.uis.edu.co/webUIS/es/investigacionExtension/comiteEtica/normatividad/documentos/normatividadInvestigacionenSeresHumanos/5_Regulacioneticaeninvestigacion.pdf
Duncan, R.J., de Duncan, G., & de Friedemann, N.S. (1973). *Villarrica*. Colombia.
Friedemann, N.S. de (1965). Tenencia de tierras, un factor de marginación socio-económica en una comunidad rural [Land ownership, a factor of socio-economic marginalization in a rural community]. *Revista Colombiana de Antropología*, *13*, 269–285. https://doi.org/10.22380/2539472X.1718
Friedemann, N.S. de (1971a). Antropólogos y antropología en Colombia: sus responsabilidades. [Anthropologists and anthropology in Colombia: their responsibilities]. *Revista de la Universidad Nacional* (1944–1992), *9*, 5–16. Retrieved from https://revistas.unal.edu.co/index.php/revistaun/article/view/12089
Friedemann, N.S. de (1971b). *Informe al Instituto Colombiano de Antropología, participación en el Congreso Anual de Antropología Nueva York, 18 al 21 de noviembre de 1971*. [Report to the Colombian Institute of Anthropology, participation in the Annual Congress of Anthropology, New York, November 18-21, 1971], personal archive of Greta Friedemann-Sánchez.
Friedemann, N.S. de (1971c). *Some Points of Responsibility of Anthropologists: A Colombian View*. Paper presented at the congress of the American Anthropological Association, November 18–21. New York, personal archive of Greta Friedemann-Sánchez.
Friedemann, N.S. de (1971d). Antropólogos y sus responsabilidades [Anthropologists and their responsibilities]. *El Espectador, Magazine Documentary section*, 3–5.
Friedemann, N.S. de (1974). *Minería, descendencia y orfebrería artesanal, Litoral Pacífico (Colombia)* [Mining, descent and artisanal goldsmithing, Pacific coast (Colombia)]. Bogotá: Universidad Nacional, Facultad de Ciencias Humanas.

Friedemann, N.S. de (1975). *La película antropológica: Una herramienta para la investigación y acción social* [Anthropological film: A tool for social action and research]. Manuscript, personal archive of Greta Friedemann-Sánchez.
Friedemann, N.S. de (1976a). *Tierra, tradición y poder en Colombia. Enfoques antropológicos* [Land, tradition, and power in Colombia. Anthropological approaches]. Bogotá: Instituto Colombiano de Cultura.
Friedemann, N.S. de (1976b). Cine documento: Una herramienta para investigación y comunicación social. [Documentary film: A tool for social communication and research]. *Revista Colombiana de Antropología*, *20*, 507–546. https://doi.org/10.22380/2539472X.1732
Friedemann, N.S. de (1984). Ética y política del antropólogo: Compromiso profesional [The ethics and politics of the anthropologist: A professional commitment]. In J.Arocha, & N.S. de Friedemann (Eds.), *Un siglo de investigación social. Antropología en Colombia* (pp. 381–428). Bogotá: Etno.
Friedemann, N.S. de (1987). Antropología en Colombia: Después de la conmoción. [Anthropology in Colombia: After the commotion]. *Revista de Antropología*, *3*(2), 142–164. Retrieved from http://www.ram-wan.net/restrepo/latinoamericanas/despues%20de%20la%20conmocion-friedermann.pdf
Friedemann, N.S. de (1992). Huellas de africanía en Colombia [Traces of Africanness in Colombia]. *Thesaurus: Boletín del Instituto Caro y Cuervo*, *47*(3), 543–560. Retrieved from http://bibliotecadigital.caroycuervo.gov.co/741/1/TH_47_003_071_0.pdf
Friedemann, N.S. de (1994). Marimondas en el carnaval de Barranquilla, Colombia. [*Marimondas* at the carnival of Barranquilla, Colombia]. *América Negra*, *8*, 171–177.
Friedemann, N.S. de, & Arocha, J. (1982). *Herederos del jaguar y la anaconda.* Bogotá: Carlos Valencia Editores.
Friedemann, N.S. de, & Arocha, J. (1985). *Herederos del jaguar y la anaconda* [Heirs of the jaguar and the anaconda (second edition.)]. Bogotá: Carlos Valencia Editores.
Friedemann, N.S. de, & Arocha, J. (1986). *De sol a sol. Génesis, transformación y presencia de los negros en Colombia [From sunrise to sunset. Genesis, transformation, and presence of Black people in Colombia]*. Bogotá: Planeta.
Friedemann, N.S. de, & Cross, R. (1979). *Ma Ngombe: Guerreros y ganaderos en Palenque* [Ma Ngombe: Warriors and herders in Palenque]. Bogotá: Carlos Valencia Editores.
Friedemann, N.S. de, & Duncan, R.J. (1973). *Güelmambí: Un río de oro* [Güelmambí: A river of gold], 24 min. 16 mm black and white film. Colombia.
Friedemann, N.S. de, Friede, J., & Fajardo, D. (1975). *Indigenismo y aniquilamiento de indígenas en Colombia* [Indigenism and the annihilation of Indigenous peoples in Colombia]. Bogotá: Ediciones CIEC.
Friedemann-Sánchez, G., & Grieve, M. (2019). The Humphrey School of Public Affairs, The Advocates for Human Rights. *Relating to Access to Justice, Discriminatory Gender Stereotypes, and Violence Against Women.* Republic of Colombia Stakeholder Report for the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), 72nd session (18 February–9 March 2019).
Friedemann-Sánchez, G., & Grieve, M. (2020). *Colombia's Portal to Justice for Women Victims of Violence: The Family Commissioner Office and its Institutional Challenges*. Bogotá: Taller de Edición Rocca.
Fundación Colombiana de Investigaciones Folclóricas, Asociación Cultural de la Juventud Negra Peruana y Centro de Estudios Afro-colombianos. (1977). *Primer congreso de la cultura negra de las Américas* [First congress of Black culture in the Americas]. Invitation to the congress, Nashville: University of Vanderbilt Archive. Retrieved from http://docrep.library.vanderbilt.edu/mzo/correspondence/MZO.corr.ICongreso.197707.pdf

General Assembly of the World Medical Association. (2014). World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki: Ethical Principles for Medical Research Involving Human Subjects. *The Journal of the American College of Dentists*, *81*(3), 14–18. Retrieved from https://www.acd. org/wp-content/uploads/JACD-81-1-2014-3.pdf

Hildebrand, M. (1977). La situación actual del Instituto Colombiano de Antropología. [The current situation of the Colombian Institute of Anthropology]. *Micronoticias*, *47*, 1–3.

Jimeno, M. (1984). La consolidación del estado y la antropología en Colombia. [State consolidation and anthropology in Colombia]. In J. Arocha, & N.S. de Friedemann (Eds.), *Un siglo de investigación social. Antropología en Colombia* (pp. 159–195). Bogotá: Etno.

Jimeno, M. (2007). Naciocentrismo: Tensiones y configuración de estilos en la antropología sociocultural colombiana [Nation-centrism: Tensions and configuration of styles in Colombian sociocultural anthropology]. *Revista Colombiana de Antropología*, *43*, 9–32. https://doi.org/10.22380/2539472X.1095

Miles, M.B., Huberman, A.M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook.* Los Angeles: Sage.

Nieto de Samper, L. (2013, January 17). Alegría Fonseca y su lucha por mejorar el medio ambiente del país. [Alegría Fonseca and her fight to improve the country's environment]. *El Tiempo*. Retrieved from https://www.eltiempo.com/archivo/documento/CMS-12526275

Rondón-Vélez, P. (2020). 20 años sin Nina S. de Friedemann. Un acercamiento al estudio antropológico de las comunidades afrodescendientes en Colombia. [20 years without Nina S. de Friedemann. An approach to the anthropological study of Afro-descendant communities in Colombia]. *CS*, (32), 249–277. https://doi.org/10.18046/recs.i32.3726

Scheper-Hughes, N. (2008). Making Anthropology Public. *Anthropology Today*, *25*(4), 1–3. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8322.2009.00674.x

United Nations, Human Rights Committee. (1982). *Observaciones del comité de Derechos Humanos a comunicación 46/79* [Observations of the Human Rights Committee on communication 46/79]. Bogotá: United Nations. Retrieved from https://www.hchr.org.co/documentoseinformes/documentos/html/informes/onu/cdedh/CCPR%20Observaciones%20a%20comunicacion%2046-79.html

United States National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical Behavioral Research. (1987). *The Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research* (vol. 2). Washington, D. C.: United Nations.

Valencia Peña, I.H., & Silva Chica, L. (2014). Nina S. de Friedemann: Imágenes de la existencia negra en Colombia [Nina S. de Friedemann: Images of Black existence in Colombia]. *Revista Chilena de Antropología Visual*, *23*, 27–61. Retrieved from http://rchav.cl/2014_23_art02_valencia_&_silva.html

Valero, S. (2020). *Los negros se toman la palabra. Primer Congreso de la Cultura Negra de las Américas: Debates al interior de las comisiones y plenarias* [Black people take the floor. First Congress of Black Culture in the Americas: Debates within the commissions and plenary sessions]. Bogotá: Pontificia Universidad Javeriana; Universidad de Cartagena.

Vine, D. (2011). 'Public Anthropology' in Its Second Decade: Robert Borofsky's Center for Public Anthropology. *American Anthropologist*, *113*(2), 336–339. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1433.2011.01334.x