Introduction: Committee Background, Mission and Objectives

The AAA’s permanent Committee for Human Rights (CfHR), established in 1995, is composed of 10 members, 8 of whom are elected by the AAA membership and serve three-year terms, with 2 ex-officio members (AAA President and President-elect). The Committee’s internal mission is to stimulate informed involvement in human rights among professional anthropologists through publications, panels, and other outreach. The Committee’s external mission is to gather information on selected, anthropologically relevant cases of human rights abuse and to propose appropriate related action. CfHR efforts occur at the annual meetings and throughout the year through Committee Task Groups and case-specific actions. This report briefly describes actions and activities taken by the CfHR between November 2009 and January 2011.

Part I: Internal Structure, Activities and Initiatives

Deborah Poole and Robin Root assumed the positions of co-chairs, for one year (2009-2010). Ilana Feldman and Jessica Winegar assumed the position of co-chairs at the 2010 CfHR Annual Business Meeting

The institutional and topical task groups established at the 2009 meeting included the following members:

A. 2010 AAA CfHR Standing Institutional Task Groups

CfHR Capacity Building and Materials Development
Shannon Speed
Victoria Sanford
Richard Wilson
Education/Outreach
Richard Wilson
Peter Redfield

Human Rights Curricula
Gretchen Schafft
Peter Van Arsdale
Ilana Feldman

Anthropology News CfHR Forum
Shannon Speed
Gretchen Schafft

AAA Meeting
Ilana Feldman
Gretchen Schafft

B. 2010 AAA CfHR Topical Task Groups
Indigenous Rights
Deborah Poole
Shannon Speed

Reparations
Richard Wilson

Language and Social Justice
Laurie Graham
Ana Celia Zentella
Victoria Sanford

Forensic Anthropology
Victoria Sanford
Heather Walsh-Haney

Iraqi Refugees
Richard Wilson
Daniel Rothenberg

C. Other Topics of Specific Concern and Ongoing Initiatives
Response to AAA Executive Board’s new (2010) Standard Operating Procedures
For the duration of 2010, the CfHR directed substantial time and effort at discussing the implications of the AAA Executive Board’s proposed new ‘standard operating procedures’ (SOPs) for advocacy letters, an activity central to the mandate of the CfHR.

The CfHR’s specific concerns included (see Appendix A for detailed concerns):
- Implications of the new SOPs for the mandate and status of the CfHR as an elected committee of the AAA;
- Implications of the new SOPs for responding to urgent action requests from AAA members regarding human rights abuses.
Following committee discussion, the CfHR drafted a series of responses detailing objections to the new SOPs, which were sent to the AAA president and Executive Board in May 2010. The final CfHR letter to the AAA EB is attached to this annual report (Appendix A), as are the revised Procedures for Advocacy and Policy Statements (Appendix B). The latter were received by the CfHR in 2010 in response to the CfHR concerns outlined in Appendix A.

At its November 2010 business Meeting, the CfHR discussed and approved the EB's revised Procedures for Advocacy and Public Statements for use in future letters that are cosigned by the CfHR and the AAA EB/President. Debbie Poole and Robin Root agreed to draft a disclaimer for letters sent by the CfHR exclusively.

D. Website and Database of Human Rights Experts
During 2010 CfHR continued to work on its web presence in the new AAA website.

---

Part II: External Activities
The CfHR maintained public involvement in three areas: 1) sponsoring events at the AAA annual meetings, 2) publishing a regular series of short pieces in Anthropology News and 3) responding to calls for action and public advocacy by AAA members and international colleagues. A summary of each is provided below:

A. CfHR activities at the 2010 AAA Meetings in New Orleans
The CfHR sponsored two invited panel sessions and two workshops.

1. Invited Session: WATER AND HUMAN RIGHTS
Organizer: BARBARA ROSE JOHNSTON (Center for Political Ecology)
Sat., Nov. 20th, 1:45 PM-5:30 PM
Panel Abstract:
In this session we take an anticipatory action approach in considering the tensions and intersect between human rights, environmental rights, and water quality, access, use, and control. As anthropologists we document, assess, and interpret local conditions, and through these efforts seek to understand and improve the human condition. In shaping subsequent action agendas we do "anticipatory anthropology" -- seeking audiences and attempting to shape policy agendas in ways that might forestall or prevent future crises. Thus, anthropological insight and voices help shape the public understanding of the social context of recent "natural disasters" drawing public attention to water, public health, and vulnerability in the making of disaster and in the response to disaster. Similarly, anthropological research and engagement in global negotiations over climate change has drawn public attention to the inequities in experiencing rising sea levels, contaminated water supply, enduring drought, floods, and violent storms, as well as the various human rights dimensions of climate change response. Much of this anthropological ecology has occurred within a context of issue-driven or place-specific subfields. This session represents an effort to construct a larger conversation that in its exploration of varied facets allows a broader understanding of water and human rights to emerge. Each paper examines a different facet of the water/rights intersect including exploration of water, human rights and natural disaster; global environmental change; new infrastructure development; food production and scarcity; fisheries; mining; war; and, the power, promise and problems in securing through governance the right to a healthy environment. Presentations include three core elements: (1) a "state of the world" summation of conditions, inequities, and emerging trends in water, environmental rights, and human rights; (2) evidence and insights from personal and professional case-specific work; (3)
identification of urgent and unaddressed questions, research needs, and pragmatic suggestions for action. In short, we ask: What is, or what might be, the power of an anthropological ecology with regards to water and human rights?

Panelists:
- USAN SLYOMOVICS (University of California-Los Angeles)
  - Sacred Water and Palestinian Water Rights - Negotiating the Currents in Transboundary Rights
- PRESTON HARDISON
  - Ecohydrological Rights: Human Rights to Water-Dependent Ecosystems
- BENEDICT COLOMBI (University of Arizona)
  - Nation Building Through Salmon: Global Trends, Human Rights, and Indigenous Peoples as World Citizens
- MARCUS BARBER (CSIRO Darwin, Australia) –
  - Water Rights and Coastal Circulation: Indigenous People and the Waters of the Northern Territory, Australia
- LAURA EICHELBERGER
  - "They Tell Us We Can't Afford It": The Global Paradox of Water as a Commodity and a Right
- LISA HIWASAKI (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) --
  - Water, Cultural Diversity, and Ecopolitics Within the UN: Struggles to Secure an International Framework for Addressing and Implementing Water as a Human Right
- KELLY ALLEY (Auburn University) -- Water Politics and Climate Change in the Ganges-Brahmaputra Basin: India, China and Bangladesh
- NANDINI GUNEWARDENA (United Nations) -- Engineered Crisis: Water Wars, Land Hunger and Resource Disputes on the Mahaveli
- MELISSA CHECKER (Queens College / City University of New York) -- "Green" Deserts, Green Water, and Green Wash: The Hydrological and Human Costs of Carbon Offsets
- CAROL MACLENNAN (Michigan Technological University) -- Mining Waters in the US: A Human Rights Policy Issue

2. Invited Session: Gender, Violence, and Human Rights
Sat., Nov. 20th, 1:45 PM-5:30 PM
Organizer: SHEILA DAUER (Columbia University-Teachers College)
Panel Abstract:
This panel will explore uses and efficacy of the UN human rights framework applied to examples of gender-based violence. Anthropologists who have analyzed use of this framework both in peace time and during armed conflicts report a range of results. Human rights activists have approached the framework (which is based on internationally approved human rights treaties and declarations) as a set of principles that can be applied in a variety of countries. However, human rights advocates have also realized that they can be applied only after work on the ground by and with local advocates. Both groups say there is a need for dialogue both about how women’s human rights are implemented and how the framework might be further developed. This panel opens a space for contributions to a dialogue on these issues.

Panelists:
• ELLEN GRUENBAUM (Purdue University) -- Human Rights Fatigue: "We Are Tired of Hearing About Human Rights"
• JANET CHERNELA (University of Maryland) -- Particularizing Universals/Universalizing Particulars: A Comprehensive Approach to Trafficking in Indigenous Women and Girls in the NW Amazon of Brazil
• CAROLE VANCE (Columbia University) -- Hijacking Trafficking: Does a Gender-Based-Violence Framework Advanced Rights-Based Interventions?
• SHANNON SPEED (University of Texas-Austin) -- The Intersectionality of Violence: Indigenous Women and Human Rights

**Anthropology News CfHR Articles**

Gretchen Schafft is the contributing editor for the Committee’s *Anthropology News* column, the Human Rights Forum. During her tenure in 2010, there were seven articles published:

**Teaching Human Rights: Creating an Informed Citizenry in the Classroom**
Gretchen E Schafft

**Human Rights Forum: Remembering Japanese-American Internment**
Peter T Suzuki

**Tribalwashing Yemen: US Policy Drones On, Missing the Real Story**
Kanhong Lin

**Human Rights Forum: Climate Change and Human Rights in Bangladesh**
Siddiqur Rahman
*Anthropology News*, Volume 51, Issue 6 (September 2010) Pages: 30-31

**Protecting Haiti’s Children: Disasters, Trafficking and Human Rights**
Marisa O Ensor

**Opposition in the Time of Avatar: Belo Monte Dam in the Brazilian Amazon**
Janet Chernela

**Guantánamo Detainees: Invisible Subjects, Legal Objects**
Menna Khalil

**CfHR Responses to AAA Member and International Colleagues’ Requests and Concerns**

---

1 Gretchen Schafft indicated that July and August 2010 titles are missing.
In 2010 the CfHR responded to AAA members’ and international colleagues’ calls for action on human rights crises. We have initiated statements and letters to national and international leaders, lending our anthropological expertise to critical human rights issues, including both urgent action responses and advisory letters to policy makers.

The following is a list of CfHR letters generated in 2010. The letters themselves are available for review via the CfHR webpage: http://www.aaanet.org/cmtes/cfhr/index.cfm:

- CfHR expresses concern for Chief Marcos Xukuru, tribal leader of Xukuru Nation
- AAA responds to Census regarding possible alternatives to "linguistic isolation."
- CfHR Expresses Concern About the Belo Monte Hydroelectric Project in Brazil
- AAA asks Census to revise terminology describing linguistic abilities of non-English speakers
- Letter to Kenyan authorities concerning police assaults on Samburu villages
- Letter of concern regarding the murder of Guatemalan anthropologist Emilia Margarita Quan Staackmann

2010 CfHR Annual Business Meeting
A key agenda item at the November 2010 Business Meeting concerned organization of the CfHR task groups. Until 2010, CfHR protocol was for the chair(s) to receive requests for advocacy/urgent letters. The chair(s) then assumed responsibility for drafting letters, managing their preparation, identifying supporting documents, forwarding referrals to outside experts, editing, circulation to CfHR members, and communications with AAA Executive Board. This process does not make effective use of the expertise and synergies that a committee structure would ideally provide; nor does there appear to be any process in place to generate briefs and to lend substance to the task force format.

At the annual meeting, the committee discussed the co-chairs’ proposal to streamline the institutional task and topical task groups. The following revisions were proposed and approved:

- Reduce to a minimum the number of task groups and reconstitute them around members’ specific areas of expertise and action;
- These task groups would be the primary mechanism by which CfHR work is accomplished and its mandates fulfilled.

Under the proposed format, the CfHR chair(s) would continue to receive the letters, however, they would then be triaged to the appropriate task force. The following institutional and topical task groups were reorganized as follows:

2011 Standing Institutional Task Groups

Education/Outreach
Julie Reyes

2 Angelo Falcon, Chair of the Census Advisory Committee on the Hispanic Population, briefly mentioned the AAA’s (via the CfHR/SLA joint Task Group on Language & Social Justice Task Group) work on the US Census while on the Brian Lehrer Show
Gretchen Schafft

*Anthropology News CfHR Forum*
Gretchen Schafft

*Program Committee (AAA Meeting)*
Stephen Loring
Miriam Ticktin

2011 *Topical Task Groups*

*Indigenous Rights*
Deborah Poole
Shannon Speed

*Language and Social Justice*
Laurie Graham
Ana Celia Zentella
Stephen Loring

*Human Rights, Law, and Justice in Kashmir*
Haley Duchinski
Robin Root
Appendix A
CfHR letter to the AAA Executive Board regarding the EB’s original ‘Standard Operating Procedures’

May 14, 2010

President & Executive Board
American Anthropological Association
Washington, DC

Dear President Dominguez and Members of the Executive Board:

This letter constitutes a response by the Committee for Human Rights to the new “Standard Operating Procedures for Approval of Advocacy Letters and Statements” (SOP). Although passed by the EB in “mid 2009,” these procedures—which are directed at all committees and sections within the AAA—were not forwarded to the CfHR until April 2010. This letter details our concern with both the form in which the SOPs were communicated to us, and, more importantly, the specific ways in which they affect the work of the Committee for Human Rights (CfHR).

First, a brief history of communications between the EB and the CfHR concerning these procedures. In September 2009, then AAA President Setha Low sent the CFHR a letter which included the text of an undated EB motion calling for new Standard Operating Procedures (SOP). This letter was discussed at length at the CfHR annual business meeting in November 2009. In that meeting, the CfHR expressed its unanimous concern that the letter did not include any details as to the nature of the new SOPs or the reasons why they were being implemented. In the absence of this vital information, the committee drafted a letter to the AAA President. In that letter, the CfHR accepted certain oversight functions on the part of the EB, but requested that there would be an expedited process of review in cases where evidence exists of a clear and immediate threat of human rights violations. We never received a reply to that letter. Since that time, the CfHR has been dealing with just such a case concerning police assaults on Samburu communities in Kenya. Yet the EB did not deal with the Samburu letter in an urgent or expedited manner. Instead the Samburu letter has been subjected to significant delays, illustrating the cumbersome and unworkable nature of the new framework. It was only in April (last month), while we were trying to work with the EB to move the Samburu letter forward, that we were sent the full list of SOP regarding advocacy letters. The full consequences of the new policy of the EB became immediately apparent to us, and in the interests of moving ahead quickly with the Samburu letter we requested that the SOPs not apply retroactively to letters initiated within the CfHR prior to our receipt of the SOPs in April. The EB agreed to that request in the case of the Samburu letter.

In this letter to the President of the AAA and AAA Executive Board, the CfHR wishes to formally raise our concerns regarding the new policy of the EB and to request revisions to that policy, since they radically alter the mandate and function of the Committee for Human Rights. In addition, the Committee wishes to express its concerns that it did not receive the new SOP straight away, that we have not been told why these SOPs were implemented and what triggered them, that the President has not formally responded to our Dec. 20th letter, and that the magnitude of time, energy, and coordination mobilized by the CfHR to address these issues with the EB has not been productive to date.
We address the new SOP point by point below:

**SOP No. 1** “A minimum of two weeks lead time is necessary for the AAA President and the Executive Board (EB) to review advocacy letter and/or statements to be issued on behalf of the entire association.”

**CfHR response:** The Committee accepts that not all situations call for an urgent letter about a human rights situation, and that in such cases a two week lead time is acceptable. However, this provision does not account for those situations where human rights violations are ongoing, widespread and systematic, and a clear and immediate threat exists of continuing human rights violations. At these times, a two-week timeframe for EB approval would nullify any meaningful response to the deteriorating human rights situation. Since this provision makes it impossible to generate urgent action letters in a timely manner and constrains and obstructs the work of the CfHR, we therefore request an amendment that outlines a separate expedited process in urgent human rights cases.

**SOP No. 2** “For an advocacy letter to ‘officially’ be forwarded to the EB for review, the Committee, Commission, Section or Board making recommendations must first have the approval of no less than a majority of its members.”

**CfHR response:** We have no objections to this procedure. This is already established practice in the CfHR.

**SOP No. 3** “All correspondence must contain the following elements in an accompanying cover letter before submission to the Executive Board. All of these elements must be included with correspondence submission; if any element is missing, a written explanation must be provided.

- a. Background information on the issue/concern addressed in the correspondence, including:
  
  i. Summary of the issue/concern
  ii. Proposed remedy (solution) to correct or address issue/concern
  iii. History (if any) of advocacy by AAA, other anthropological associations or other social science groups in relation to issue/concern. See below
  iv. A list of other groups supporting effort/cause (for submissions addressing international issues, a list of local contacts/advocates) already provided
  v. Contact information for lead advocate/commission or committee member working on the issue/concern. Contact information for outside (i.e. non-AAA committee or board member) experts should be provided as well.
  vi. Deadline for answer/response (not to be less than two weeks)
  vii. Any plans for follow-up or description of next steps

- b. Supplemental information including reference documents, published articles, etc.”.

**CfHR response to SOP #3:**

a(i): The CfHR already provides this in both the body of the letters it drafts concerning cases of human rights violations

a(ii): This point is inapplicable for most human rights letters for several reasons. First, the purpose of human rights action is to reveal that human rights violations are public knowledge and thereby to provide some additional protection for victims of such violations by making their cases
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visible. Second, human rights violations are often complex and do not have clear cut “remedies” that we can presume to recommend, other than simple cessation of the violations and violence. Third, the AAA does not have the juridical authority that would be required to “remedy” or intervene in such situations. Fourth, and perhaps most importantly, CfHR letters are valued by human rights activists precisely because they are generated by a professional and scientific organization whose status as an informed, scientific and (therefore) neutral observer gives added weight to the letters. The CfHR, therefore, cannot and should not presume to propose remedies other than the simple cessation of violence or human rights violations in letters addressed to sovereign governments, heads of state or other violators of human rights. Nor does the request for “follow up” (#vii) make sense for most human rights letters.

a(iii): It is unclear how this requirement would affect the CfHR’s letters. Lack of such advocacy does not necessarily lessen the validity of a human rights situation, nor is it clear how a history of such advocacy would necessarily strengthen such a letter. In those cases where the AAA or other organizations (AI, HRW, etc) have issued previous appeals, we reference them in our letters. For other activities of the CfHR, we do not have a problem with this requirement (for example, for “white papers,” “task force” reports, etc.)

a(iv): See our response to SOP #5 below.

a(vi): A two week deadline is not viable for urgent action issues, although we have no problem with it for other less urgent letters and advocacy statements issued by the CfHR

b.: We do extensive research on each case we forward, and we ground it in CfHR members combined expertise in Human Rights. The CfHR is nominated by the nominations committee and elected by the membership as an expert body to address human rights concerns whereas, while members of the EB, as anthropologists, may claim expertise, it is not as an elected member of the CfHR, with the specific requisite roles and responsibilities that membership entails.]

In sum: The requirements delineated in SOP #3 constitute an unreasonable burden of extra work on the CfHR and its chairs and further obstructs its ability to respond to evolving human rights scenarios. We estimate that with the entire CfHR of 8 members dedicated to the above tasks, fulfilling these requirements would take at least 3 weeks. The CfHR therefore recommends amendments that reduce the requirements to a one page cover letter outlining (a) the need for the letter, (b) details about actions taken by other human rights organizations on the same issue, and (c) the history of our correspondence with other anthropologists and informed human rights organizations concerning the case in question.

SOP No. 4 “Executive Board members reserve the right to edit submissions to provide additional clarity or context.”

CfHR response: This provision allows EB members who may have no background or expertise in human rights advocacy to rewrite, without further review, letters that are generated, discussed and approved by a committee (the CfHR) which is elected by the AAA membership for its expertise in human rights. This is unacceptable and places excessive power, authority and discretion in the EB. We recommend an amendment whereby the EB may indeed recommend editorial changes to any letter, and that stipulates that these edits are subject to approval by the CfHR.
SOP No. 5 “When possible/practical, all correspondence addressing international concerns or issues should be crafted and/or signed in conjunction with an anthropological or social science group based in the country of concern.”

CfHR response: We recognize the view that human rights may be arrogantly imposed from the outside and indeed this point has been articulated in the research writing of virtually all present CfHR members. We therefore acknowledge that this provision is desirable in theory—and in practice many of our letters and actions are generated in collaboration with local anthropologists. However, this provision may be difficult, not to mention risky, to implement in all cases and furthermore, it does not recognize the very difficult position that local anthropological organizations may occupy in their national settings. Because of the particular nature of human rights situations, the CfHR—which research specific cases and has accumulated expertise on the dynamics of human rights scenarios I is the AAA body best positioned to determine when a letter warrants or necessitates inclusion of local partners. The CfHR thus accepts the desirability of local partners and approves the language “when possible” but recommends that this requirement not serve as grounds to reject a letter.

SOP No. 6 “The AAA President reserves the right to decline submissions for EB review.”

CfHR response: This provision — concentrates exceptional decision-making power concerning which letters can go forward in the hands of the AAA president. Further, it abnegates the mandate of the CfHR as a committee which is elected by the AAA membership and charged in the AAA bylaws with the responsibility of advocating and furthering the AAA’s commitment to furthering human rights. We recommend that the President be required to justify in writing all such rejections - and that these rejections be made available to the CfHR and the AAA membership.

SOP No. 7 “Only the AAA Executive Director and President (or their designees) are allowed to speak on behalf of the association as a whole.”

CfHR response: This provision, “speak on behalf of the association as a whole,” is unclear. Does it mean that all letters, or some letters, generated by the CfHR are to be signed by the president? If so, the CfHR objects to this provision and requests clarification.

Overall, the CfHR maintains that the newly revised SOPs represent a radical break with established practice, centralize power and authority excessively in the Executive Board, and undermine the autonomy and mandate of the CfHR and other committees of the AAA. As outlined, the SOPs violate the democratic spirit and practice of AAA elections by disempowering the ability of committees to act on the very issues they were elected to address. The SOPs are unworkable as written and we have requested amendments in a spirit of constructive criticism, since our ultimate aim is to work cooperatively with the EB and the AAA President to advance the AAA’s work on human rights issues and fulfill the mandate of the CfHR.

We look forward to your reply.

Best wishes,

Deborah Poole
Anthropology, Johns Hopkins University
dpoole1@jhu.edu

Robin Root
Anthropology, CUNY
robin.root@baruch.cuny.edu

Co-Chairs, The American Anthropological Association Committee for Human Rights
Appendix B
AAA Executive Board’s Revised Procedures For Advocacy and Policy Statements
(October 2010)

Procedures for Advocacy and Policy Statements

Preamble

The American Anthropological Association encourages its members, committees, commissions, and task forces to bring anthropological perspectives on timely issues into policy, media, and other public venues. In addition to ongoing efforts by such AAA units as the Committee for Human Rights and the Committee on Public Policy, it is sometimes important for either the AAA or one of its units to take a public stand. The AAA has periodically sent advocacy and policy statements and letters in the name of its President in order to bring the full weight of the organization and its leadership to bear on an important issue. While the AAA supports its units and members in this way, respects their right to present statements and letters in their own voices, and recognizes the need for intellectual diversity and freedom, a set of simple steps is necessary to ensure that statements issued in the AAA’s name and directed to audiences outside the AAA represent as broad a consensus of AAA members as possible, reflect relevant anthropological scholarship, and do not unnecessarily jeopardize the AAA.

Procedures

As a result, the Executive Board has adopted the following procedures for considering requests by AAA members and units to issue letters and advocacy and policy statements in the name of the AAA. Once a draft statement has been approved by no less than a majority of a committee, commission or task force, it should be submitted to the AAA President who will consult with AAA EB officers, the AAA Executive Director, and AAA’s legal counsel as needed before statements are forwarded to the addressees or published on the AAA website. In most cases, advocacy and policy statements will be given expedited review and signed by the President (or his or her designee) or returned to the signatories by the AAA President within two weeks of their submission to the AAA Office.

I. In general, a minimum of two weeks lead time is necessary for review of advocacy letters and or statements.

Correspondence should contain the following elements in a cover letter:

i. Summary of the issue.

ii. Brief history, if any, of relevant AAA positions or advocacy, statements, or resolutions, as well as those of other social science associations or other relevant organizations, if known.

iii. List of other groups supporting the effort or cause (with contact information, if possible).
iv. Contact information for lead advocate/commission or committee working on the issue/concern and contact information for outside experts (i.e., non-AAA committee or board member, if possible).

v. Response deadline and reason why response is needed by this date (no less than two weeks from time of submission).

vi. Follow-up plans or description of next steps, where appropriate.

vii. Brief appendices, where appropriate, including reference documents, bibliography of published articles, etc.

II. Provisions for expedited review.

Correspondence should contain the following elements in a cover letter:

i. Summary of the issue.

ii. Clear and compelling reasons why the issue must be considered in less than two weeks and the deadline for AAA response.

iii. Contact information for lead advocate/commission or committee member working on the issue/concern, and, if available and appropriate, for AAA members and/or others with relevant research or advocacy engagement with the issue.

iv. If information on the history (if any) of advocacy by the AAA, other anthropological associations, other social science associations, or other relevant organizations adopting positions on the issue is available, it may be included as well. Such information is not required for expedited reviews in order to avoid imposing stipulations that would prevent timely submission of requests.

III. In the rare event that the AAA President declines the request or requires a change in the original text that is not deemed acceptable to the submitting unit or AAA member, the unit may appeal the decision through the following process:

i. A cover letter that specifies why the President's decision is unsatisfactory and the desired result (i.e., approval of the original statement or of a modified statement), along with the original request, original cover letter, the President's response, and all relevant correspondence, must be submitted to the Section & Governance Coordinator, an AAA staff member.

ii. The Section & Governance Coordinator will solicit from the President a statement regarding why she or he declined to approve the letter or statement or requested changes.
iii. The Section & Governance Coordinator will circulate these materials to the AAA Executive Board (EB). The AAA Secretary (who sits on the EB) will moderate discussion by the EB, which will consider both positions and then take a vote as to whether or not AAA support should be granted.

iv. If a majority of EB members deem it appropriate to grant AAA support for the letter or statement, the EB may delegate an EB member sign on behalf of the Executive Board. The EB may also suggest that a unit issue a statement in its own name, provided that it is clear that she or he is speaking as an individual in the unit and not on behalf of the AAA.