6

MASCULINITIES AMONG 'THE DEVELOPMENT SET'¹

An International Scientist
Harp Example

Introduction to masculinities at work

In this chapter, I turn to the men (and women) with whom I have worked during my professional life. The analyses differ from those in Chapters 3 to 5 and 7, in relying on my personal experience without formal study (cf. Katila and Meriläinen 1999). For that reason, readers must take account of my own 'standpoint' (à la Harding 2004) more fully.² I share many of the ideals and values held by my colleagues (at least in the work setting), the most notable related to the muting of gender difference.

This analysis strives to understand the ideas that elite men in international forest-related conservation and development [appear to] have about their own masculinities. 'Studying up', as so many have urged us to do, has proven difficult and rare.³ It seems probable that structural issues that we know interfere with equality in our work settings are related to masculinities in unclear ways. Perhaps by analyzing my experience in settings widely deemed masculine, I can shed some light on these dynamics and their broader implications.

One factor that has made this process difficult is identified by Hearn (2011) and others; he notes that

much of what men do is not seen as 'about gender'. . . . Most of their practices, in public and in private – in work, negotiations, persuasion, networking, lobbying, pressurizing and so on – are neither seen nor experienced as gendered. They are done, perceived and felt as (if they were) 'normal'.

(p. 159)

And women, like myself, who have succeeded reasonably well in such masculine contexts, have taken on some of these same behaviours, attitudes and skills that were traditionally associated with men, complicating the task of differentiation still further. Yet . . . I plunge into the abyss.

I focus here primarily on masculinities in the work setting, with a short addendum on related home settings. Harp strings used and valued at work may differ from those used and valued at home, though as Katila and Meriläinen (2002) point out, this boundary can be porous; it can also be particularly drastic in these international settings. International work settings include inequities with widespread effects, including cognitive dissonance for those whose actions reinforce the inequities (typically unintentionally; examples below).

In the coming analysis, I have tried to disguise individuals insofar as I am able—many injustices are created and reinforced by structural features beyond individual control. I avoid personal names or invent pseudonyms; I use pseudonyms for the main organizations and projects; I use plurals when reality may have been singular; and I disguise dates (e.g., 199X), for further anonymity—all in an attempt to ensure anonymity. My feelings for my colleagues are overwhelmingly positive, as are my perception of their benign intentions and my

own unwitting collaboration in such injustices.⁴ Although I am committed to presenting this analysis in as intersectional a manner as possible, it has been necessary in maximizing anonymity, to leave out some details of age and ethnicity that could be significant.

I also recognize that two of the three institutions I discuss here have been far better than average, in terms of equity. All three have recognized the importance of attending to both biophysical and social elements of the worlds we have struggled to improve (Li 2007). Although I genuinely appreciate all the people whose behaviour I appear to criticize in the pages to follow, I have tried to analyze my experiences truthfully and as gently as I am able—in search of behaviour and values linked to masculinities at work.

The observations below take place in the office, in travel, in the field and in international meetings. The participants come from cultural systems from all over the world. So the masculinities that emerge in this breadwinning site, the harp strings that are plucked there, represent a particular segment of life rather than the totality of a given culture. One would expect that chords that include the breadwinning harp string might predominate, and that varying cultural systems (or harps) embodied in the different ethnicities present may clash and create discordant sounds. Still, I've found that some commonalities are identifiable.⁵

Connell's early (1995) book on masculinities discussed four groups of Australian men, two of which are relevant for this work: one, the most relevant, she labelled 'Men of Reason'; the other examined men involved in the environmental movement. The characteristics identified for these two groups have been the emphases of most of the men I've worked with, though age and historical period have impacts as well, as I try to show.

The harp strings that emerge in my own experience include rationality, control, love of nature, quantification, articulateness, adventure, caring and protection and sexuality and violence—in no particular order. I describe three different harp frames, reflective of different social contexts and times, though whether this analogy can legitimately be expanded to such work settings is for the reader to judge. The harp example shown by the title of this chapter is from the Forest Research Institute (FRI).

I present these observations chronologically, so we can keep in mind the historical trends in society, the dynamics of contexts, while maintaining awareness of the possible implications of changes in the observer herself (my own aging and experience). The amount of detail increases below as the time frame shortens.

I begin with memories of my early professional life in Bali and East Kalimantan, as a solitary scholar in my early 30s. I then describe the professional views and behaviour of my colleagues on the project wherein I conducted the research reported in Chapter 5 (Sitiung, West Sumatra). I differentiate the masculinities that characterized the Americans on the team and those that related to interactions between Americans and Indonesian personnel (almost all men).

The third section briefly describes the masculinities performed in the management of a conservation project in West Kalimantan. It presents conflicting views of masculinity between conservation-oriented Dutch men and business-oriented Scots, as demonstrated in the management of a project I worked on in remote Danau Sentarum Wildlife Reserve (now National Park), West Kalimantan in the early 1990s.

The fourth section is the most elaborate and based on two decades of shared work experience. It discusses masculine harp strings at FRI (headquartered on Java), in nine sub-sections, concluding with a discussion of the harp itself (insofar as that analogy remains suitable). I conclude with a summary of the findings and some thoughts on their implications.

The early years

What comes to mind when I think back on my earliest professional international work (initially in Bali and then East Kalimantan) is the centrality of the sexuality harp string (analyzed more fully by Katila and Meräinen 2002 in a more recent Finnish academic context). I was a young woman in my early 30s and alone; men's sexuality (and my own) emerged quickly as issues I would have to address. The following provide a few representative experiences related to sexuality and masculinities:

- One middle-aged American colleague in East Kalimantan, once we'd finalized our research proposal in 197X, made his sexual interest clear, later suggesting we marry—explicitly to make a sexual relationship acceptable in the field. He was also a good mentor, articulate, intelligent, competitive and controlling. He valued rationality, perhaps above all else.
- In Bali, an important administrator in the medical school flirted with me consistently (personal journal, 14 August 197X), but also plucked the caring harp string, by helping me with medical problems and with my research and expressing care and respect for the village people he served. He was also articulate, intelligent and skilled at networking and politics (see Chapter 4).
- The husband—a Balinese doctor and grad student in the US—of my hostess in Denpasar kindly arranged for me to stay with her. He also insisted that his female relatives sleep outside her bedroom to protect her sexual virtue while he was away (notes, 18 July 197X; Chapter 4).
- My 1980s sexual relationship with my same-aged Kenyah field assistant in Long Segar has already been described (Chapter 1)—initiated by him, but also serving to protect me from some advances by others. My protection from others' sexuality was not his concern, however; he considered it my responsibility to discourage such advances (Chapter 4).
- I was harangued in the early 1980s, as I waited in the Samarinda (East Kalimantan) phone office with lewd comments by a middle-aged Australian forester, who clearly saw me as 'prey'.

- In the early 1980s, I was invited for a weekend in Singapore with Joe, an American logger from the nearby timber concession.⁶ He assured me that it need not include sex, though my skepticism led me to refuse (see the next paragraph).
- In a 198X personal journal, I encountered reference to an attempt to seduce me by a Hungarian in Bangkok (22 June), another by a German in Pontianak (11 July) and a Swede, who offered to marry me, stay home and do childcare in Padang. Heterosexual opportunities were regularly on offer in those days from professional men I met, while away from home.

Joe was from the Pacific Northwest and he and his colleagues exhibited many of the work behaviours described for loggers in Bushler Bay (Chapter 3). Among themselves, the loggers behaved in very egalitarian ways, valuing independence, hard physical labour, physical strength and skill with heavy equipment (cf. Hendriks 2014, 2017 for European men in a logging concession in the Democratic Republic of Congo). These Americans in Indonesia operated within what was essentially a caste system. The American loggers (and wives) had American suburban-style housing atop a hill with American food flown in regularly. They interacted with Indonesians at work (the log dump, in the woods, etc.). Mid-way up the hill were clustered Filipinos, brought in to serve as foremen and in middle management. At the bottom of the hill, near the pre-existing Kutai village, were the Indonesian labourers—most brought in from other islands—housed in one-room, unfurnished, wooden apartments in 'longhouses'. There was also housing for prostitutes, reportedly mainly from Java. Elite Javanese counterparts, who rarely visited, predominantly dealt with the Americans, resenting any intrusion by the Kenyah, for instance, into the American space. My Kenyah colleague was totally ignored by the visiting official in a conversation I initiated, intended to be among the three of us; the hierarchically oriented official considered my colleague beneath his notice. I mention this setting in more detail than the others above, because it previews, to some degree, the conflicts that exist in subsequent international contexts: a clash of both social structures and masculinities that are discordant and uncomfortable for all.

In all these examples⁷ from the 1970s and '80s—surely familiar to many older readers—sexuality and men's sexual initiative (though often enjoyed by both genders) were linked with ideas about how men should and could behave—some representing the popular 'bad boy' image (Chapter 5).

During this time, my self-confidence blossomed. I was treated with great respect by Indonesian academic men at Mulawarman University, a response I had not encountered either as a graduate student or young professional in the US—very pleasant. But I was also aware (and embarrassed) that my skin colour and PhD, rather than my articulateness, rationality, intelligence or any other quality I might have valued in myself, were the bases on which this overt respect was granted.

American masculinities in Honolulu, Hawaii and Sitiung, West Sumatra, Indonesia (1981–1986)

Concerns about justice and equity have permeated my work contexts. My job in West Sumatra emerged out of an Island University committee (all men, but me), which I led with a colleague looking at Farming Systems Research and Development (FSR&D) as a potentially fruitful way to approach international agriculture. Although still single, I was not subjected to sexual advances by these men, who ranged in age from late 30s to late 60s, all older than I. As leader of the Farming Systems-Soils (FS-S) project, an older, Japanese-American member built on our discussions to determine the makeup of an ideal team for work in West Sumatra, including one role all agreed I was well qualified to perform.⁸ Relations among us were cooperative, curious and intellectually stimulating for all.

His (and the university's) expressed concerns about justice and rationality required an impartial and broad-based search for the 'best candidate'. We all thought I was well qualified (indeed, the terms of reference had been written with me in mind), but he was meticulous about waiting through a long search process reinforced by university requirements, thus contributing to equity, but also approval from his employer and thence to his own breadwinning commitments.

During this process, I also experienced numerous occasions when my colleagues (men) exhibited caring behaviour toward me: For instance, one older married colleague at a nearby centre (who had also unsuccessfully proposed a sexual relationship) expressed his dismay when he learned that my two children and I lived in a cement block apartment house under the freeway near the university—all I could afford on a single person's salary in Hawaii. The FS-S project leader initiated a process that resulted in a promotion from assistant specialist to associate researcher, an added financial burden for his project—partly stimulated, I believe, by his concerns about my inadequate income.

Americans interacting in field and forest

Leaving Hawaii to go to Sitiung, I worked initially with the team described in Chapter 5. My colleagues were intrigued by both FSR&D and anthropology and recognized me as usefully expert in those fields. Although not used to working with women, they were open and accepting about it.

Connell (1995) describes the masculinities he encountered among men involved in the environmental movement, which applied to most of the local FS-S team. The former accepted

A practice and ideology of equality. The common sense of the [environmental] movement includes these principles: no one is supposed to be boss; workplaces are run democratically; no group has rights over others;

decisions are made by consensus. There is a sharp critique of hierarchy and authoritarianism.

(p. 127)

Although one graduate student (who arrived later) came from a fundamentalist missionary background and kept tight control over his wife and children, this did not fit well with the team 'culture'.⁹ He was, however, able to deal equitably with me—perhaps because I was older, accepted by more senior team members and had my PhD. In general, the researchers tried to follow the principles Connell identified. Great efforts were made to include spouses, including my own, in our work, to take advantage of their skills, with recognition that women and men both had valuable contributions to make. The fact that only the men (excluding me) had 'real jobs' reinforced the breadwinner harp string that these men (and their wives) accepted and valued; and structurally strengthened a view of women as 'support'—regardless of the principles we all espoused and tried to live.

The team leader, in his mid-60s, was waiting for retirement, and hoping to increase his retirement pay, which would be increased by the higher salary offered in Sumatra, vis-à-vis that of an Island University professor in Honolulu. He also hoped to transfer some of his extensive knowledge.¹⁰ He expressed his masculinity primarily by a fascination with machinery, involvement in the politics of project management (including frequent trips to Jakarta and its attendant luxuries) and caring for the team. His wife was a homemaker, and he had the most conventional attitudes about women within the team (attitudes his wife appeared to share, usually accepting his dominance and control with equanimity).

Although we generally got along well, on 9 July 198X, I complained about him in my journal:

[He] stayed with me til the end, reminding me unnecessarily about my magazine every time I picked up my purse. His thoroughness can be handy . . . and also an aggravation. He acts as though I'm unable to do anything on my own, despite his need to rely on me for any Indonesian transactions. I know I shouldn't feel this way as he *is* trying to be helpful . . . It's just that I sense an attitude that underneath it all, somewhere I *must* be helpless or forgetful or somehow incompetent to manage on my own.¹¹

Later this attitude was again reiterated. The Honolulu-based team decided that the team leader needed to be replaced in July 198X and, to my surprise, asked if I would take over (something I already did informally for his frequent trips to Jakarta). I agreed but specified that they needed to tell him right away, as I didn't want to be working with him under false pretenses. Despite agreeing to do so, by September they had still not acted.¹² I wound up telling him myself, tears in my eyes, rather than continue with the dishonest fiction that all was well.

He interpreted my tears to mean I didn't want to be team leader! . . . [He] asked [the Southern State soil scientist] to be team leader while he was gone, because [he thought that] I was so upset about it! It all gives me a headache.
(*journal*, 18 September 198X)

His interpretation that I was upset about being team leader is additional evidence of both his caring and protectiveness—as well, perhaps, of a narrative of women's inferiority. The comforts of life in Jakarta were a draw to him, but they were also the best site for engaging in the political manoeuvring required for obtaining machinery and equipment for the project—all common masculine harp strings. Engaging with USAID, our donor, and to a lesser extent the Indonesian scientists at our partner organization on Java, allowed him to function in English; and functioning in English allowed him to exercise articulateness and sophisticated speech, something that was impossible in the field, where the sounds of Minang, Javanese and Sundanese surrounded him.

Interestingly, all these American men working in Sumatra were of a religious bent, an orientation often assumed to accompany sexist ideas. Yet their behaviour was among the least sexist I have encountered anywhere.¹³ Those in Honolulu worked for an American university, as hierarchical a structure as one can imagine. Yet all locally professed and tried to act out egalitarianism.

Americans and Indonesians interacting in field and forest

These egalitarian impulses, so strong among the Americans, came up against a very different world as we interacted with our Indonesian partners. The Indonesian academic world was dominated at that time by strongly hierarchical Javanese and Sundanese men from the Soils Center on Java. All our partners initially were Javanese men, led by a Javanese man with protective and paternalistic attitudes toward his team, which was reciprocated with extreme respect, loyalty and obedience toward him. Most team members had only bachelor's degrees from Indonesian universities, which at that time were 'bootstrap organizations'—new graduates from college taught classes, with very few advanced degree holders (or books) available. We always initially had one Indonesian scientist with a PhD from the West connected to the project, but that man was almost never on site—being drawn away by his superiors who required him for other projects. He was also drawn away by his commitments to his family, living on Java. Besides missing their families and homes, these Indonesian men saw being in the field as detrimental in terms of office politics: they feared 'out of sight, out of mind'.

Another difficulty in implementing the egalitarian ideals of the American team members was the dramatically inequitable access to resources.¹⁴ Funded externally, the Americans each had new jeeps with drivers available to them, with adequate funding for fuel; the Indonesians had one ancient Landrover for all 15 team members, with themselves as drivers, and very limited funds available for fuelling and repair of their old gas-guzzler. Each expat worker had his/her

own quite adequate house provided; the Indonesian team members were initially all housed in one tiny concrete block room, sleeping on mats on the floor for over a year, until a larger facility could be built for them. Expats brought their families with them; Indonesian staff came alone. Salaries for expats were at least ten times those of Indonesian staff members (enforced by the government of Indonesia to prevent low-ranking employees from getting salaries greater than high-ranking bosses). Efforts to implement an egalitarian workplace were seriously hampered by these harsh realities. The American team shared transport, inputs and field expenses, but Indonesian staff remained disadvantaged vis-à-vis Americans in terms of mobility, scientific knowledge, communication networks, resulting ability to act on their own initiative and independence. These disadvantages, combined with hierarchic world views, made real equity between the two teams impossible. Insofar as salaries were seen to represent breadwinning capabilities, the Americans' (unearned and inequitable) comparative success probably felt like failure to some particularly competitive partners, though most remained remarkably collaborative (aided perhaps by their sense that social hierarchies were 'natural').

A recurring disagreement between the international FS-S project and the Indonesian partners on Java related to their respective contributions. USAID and the US-based American men running the project complained that Indonesia was not holding up its part of the bargain, which specified equal financial contributions. The emphasis on these funds reflects another harp string of great masculine importance: a love of *quantification* (see e.g., Clarke and Hamilton 2013). The US-based Americans evaluated quantitatively and financially, and Indonesian field budgets were miniscule. Because Indonesian salaries were so low, even though the Indonesians were providing *three times* the number of people the Americans were providing, the total Indonesian budget, and thus externally perceived financial contribution, was far lower.

The comparatively minimal Indonesian gender differentiation may also have contributed (subconsciously) to the American team's acceptance of my own abilities. On the other hand, the perceived lack of masculinity (by American standards) of Indonesian scientists may have contributed to less respect for them.

The harp frame among Sitiung's researchers

Thinking in terms of the three sides of the harp's frame, the broader context in which these actions and beliefs played out, there was again a recurring balancing of *competition* and *cooperation*. At a macro level, there was competition between the two universities involved in the FS-S project. Although an element of this competition was based on *rationality* (concern for obtaining and maintaining funding, important also for *protecting* project employees), part was also based on an acrimonious disagreement between two intelligent, articulate, highly accomplished and well-respected men with significant power, *competing* within the world of soil science, for their respective universities (the 'combatants' discussed later).¹⁵ This

competition had the potential—a potential we were able largely to avoid—to affect adversely our work in the field, which was remarkably *cooperative*.

In related fashion, a balance was sought between *hierarchy* and *democracy*. The structure of the overall project (which included work in other countries), was hierarchical. A programme leader at Southern State was superordinate to the two scientist 'combatants' just mentioned, who in turn supervised those of us in the field (three from Island University, two from Southern State).¹⁶ Island U.'s scientific 'combatant' was responsible for the Indonesia site, so had some authority in theory over the on-site underlings of the Southern State 'combatant'. Southern State's 'combatant' was in charge of a comparable site in Latin America. Our site team's commitment to a democratic approach to decision-making and action (despite the existence of a team leader who *could have* approached decision-making autocratically), combined with geographical distance from these superordinate decision-makers, meant that we had significant autonomy to ignore the distant tensions and structure our interactions (at least among the Americans) in egalitarian ways.

Broader religious concerns also played a part, in the third side of the harp frame, in two ways. Locally, two of the particularly religious team members held opposite views on the *controlling–protecting* differentiation. One emphasized Christian religious injunctions to 'love thy neighbour', to protect the weak, and to experience and spread joy. The other emphasized the Christian religious tenets that a man should control his household as God controlled the world, and that straying into sin was an ever-present danger. These differing orientations had implications for the ways their households were run, their perceptions of *fatherhood* (important to both) and also tied back to the *hierarchy vs. cooperation* issue, on a micro-scale.

At a broader scale, ultimately a perception of *competition* from Muslim men (local, regional and national) about *Islam vs. Christianity* resulted in the expulsion of the man with a more loving, protecting orientation (see Box 5.2). His genuine generosity (*cooperative spirit*) was perceived by some local Muslims as an attempt to 'buy' villagers' faith, and thereby compete with Islam—a perception that made its way up through the Indonesian governmental bureaucracy, eventually reaching the American embassy (as well as long-enduring misperceptions within the international soil science world). In Indonesia, religion—then and now—has been closely linked with politics, both organized by men.

Men in a Dutch conservation organization and a Scottish consulting firm¹⁷

In Danau Sentarum, West Kalimantan (1992–1993), a seasonally flooded and lowland tropical forest conservation area, the on-site team included my husband and myself, for most of the year with only our boat drivers for partners.¹⁸ The project began because of the aforementioned 'will to improve' of a man who worked for a conservation non-governmental organization (NGO), Swamp, and

who had worked previously in the area. On this project too, the main decision-makers were men.

Swamp's Bogor office was perpetually short of funds and had a laissez-faire attitude toward financial management. The Danau Sentarum work was sub-contracted to them, under a British-funded project to manage Indonesian forests, via a commercial consulting firm ('the firm'). The firm was conservative in its orientation and used to rigid financial documentation—the firm leader linked his work tightly to the quantitative harp string, focused on financial management. Again, we see two world views (as well as masculine identities) collide, far from the local research site.

Clothing represents a useful symbol of this division, as it did in Bushler Bay:¹⁹

The [Firm] Project Coordinator, Jives, was suave and sophisticated, perfectly groomed, impeccably dressed, and oozing charm in urbane, social and bureaucratic contexts. . . . [O]ur project officer, at [Swamp], was an ex-hippy who had abandoned his earring some years back under threat of expulsion from Indonesia, but had otherwise retained much of that demeanour. He was comfortable with fieldwork, science, and very casual attire.

(Colfer 2006, p. 4)

Elite Indonesian men, such as the head of the agency managing parks in Pontianak, dressed smartly, with strong disapproval of sandals and shorts, despite the tropical clime. This was reinforced to our dismay when a British NGO volunteer whose knowledge and labour we valued highly was summarily expelled from the country—his informal attire considered mainly to blame.

The difference in clothing between the two conservation project leaders captures within it, the values differentiation Connell (1995) identifies between corporate and scientific management—one that plagued this work:

Historically there has been an important division between forms of masculinity organized around direct domination (e.g., corporate management, military command) and forms organized around technical knowledge (e.g., professions, science).

(p. 165)

In terms of harp strings, the consulting firm project leader was into control and quantification²⁰ and the NGO leader was into science and the protection of nature. They did not mesh well.

My husband and I were both hired and wanted to share team leadership, fearing marital discord if one supervised the other. Swamp did not like the idea, despite our both having had team leadership experience; they feared a lack of accountability. I was surprised to see this commitment to hierarchy in an organization that seemed to accept many of the egalitarian ideals Connell identified above. I wondered, for instance,

Why were they unwilling to explain their rationale in determining our salaries? Was the heavy-handed, authoritarian tone to their faxes something that would continue throughout the project?

(Colfer 2006, p. 5)

Other masculinity-related issues bedevilled our work, including debilitating competition between the two coordinating institutions, an enduring lack of faith in social science and qualitative approaches and an utter lack of responsiveness, caring, about field needs (Colfer 2006, p. 34). This may have been related to a perception, at least in the consulting firm, that, as workers in the field, we represented the lowest rung of the prestige ladder. The absence of anyone plucking the caring or protective harp strings for people was a surprise, given my prior experience; Swamp personnel did express such feelings for nature.

Technically formal forest management in this site included the Natural Resources Office of the National Park Service, though the absence of such personnel has already been mentioned. The central government had also given a concession to the Indonesian military (Jamaker), designed to (a) ensure their presence to protect the adjacent border with Malaysia and (b) contribute to funding normal military operations through timber sales. No one knew, however, where the protection forest ended and the production forest began. Logging was conducted via contracts with local loggers, even less transparently than in East Kalimantan (Chapter 4).

Men in the Forestry Research Institute of Indonesia and beyond (1994–2009)

Turning to my experience with the Forestry Research Institute (FRI), I found, as did Killick (1995), an expat in Korea, that “a surprisingly coherent culture has been created by people of diverse backgrounds whose only common bond is not being Korean” (p. 88). My co-workers at FRI had more in common than simply not being Indonesian—we were all interested in forests and most of us were also interested in people—but we came from diverse backgrounds, ethnicities, religions and nationalities, as well as genders and ages. Below, I turn to the masculinities I encountered every day while employed by FRI at their headquarters in Indonesia.

The office was in an experimental research forest managed by the Indonesian forestry research agency. My professional co-workers, for the most part, had PhDs, in a variety of fields. The central mission of FRI was to improve forest management in ways that benefitted both the forests and the people residing therein. FRI was unusual in its acceptance and involvement of social scientists as comparative equals in the research agenda when I worked there full time. In 1994, when I served as a consultant, there was one full-time woman scientist (also American). By 1997, FRI was singled out as doing an exceptional job,

compared to other international centres, of hiring women as international hires at 25% (Merrill-Sands 1997). In those days, a couple of members of the management group were usually women,²¹ and one director general was a woman (200X–201X). I was a programme leader (an intermediate position) for several years and was also the staff rep on the management group for eight years. Most of those providing administrative and secretarial backstopping were Indonesian women (including a number of Chinese Indonesians). Drivers were all Indonesian men, most Sundanese; and there were mainly Sundanese men as office assistants.²²

Ethnically there was always a preponderance of white men from the global North in charge (as is common in international organizations), with higher percentages of professional women from such countries as well. However, by the early 2000s, a few Indonesians (men and women) were hired as 'international staff' (a designation that included much more generous salary and benefits than 'national staff' received).²³ Throughout my life at headquarters, there were serious efforts to recruit professionals from all over the world, with varying degrees of success. Recruiting women professionals from the South proved the most difficult. Experiences recounted later in the chapter may shed light on this difficulty.

Masculine harp strings and forest professionals

Forestry is typically portrayed as a masculine discipline; dealing with forests is seen as a task for men. Traditionally, men work as loggers and foresters, not women. The field has had a para-military tradition, including wearing uniforms, handling heavy equipment, shooting poachers and growing, protecting and felling big trees. The necessity to fight forest fires in many regions has emphasized military-style chains of command, *esprit de corps* and dangerous physical work—all associated with masculinity, at least in the global North (see e.g., Eriksen 2013, on Australia and the US).²⁴ This tradition had begun in Europe, specifically Germany where scientific forestry began, and was taken up by many former European colonies, including the US and Indonesia.

Whereas this was a tradition with which my colleagues were familiar, it was not the gist of their own daily lives. FRI researchers were basically academics, *studying* forests (and forest peoples) rather than *managing* them—many had however been exposed to forestry's hyper-masculine context and narrative for several years in grad school and/or their home cultures, and all were aware of it. We confronted more intact versions of this view among our partners in many countries of the South. As worldly and educated men, however, FRI staff had also been exposed to ideals of gender equity. We were under pressure from donors, our Board of Trustees, and others, to increase the number of women and researchers from the South. Most tried to comply with, in some cases actively support, efforts to address women's professional disadvantages. Indeed, Anderson (2009) concluded, based on his study of university men in the US and UK, that "in the process of inclusive masculinities proliferating, gender itself, as a constructed

binary of opposites, may be somewhat eroding" (p. 155);²⁵ this may have been the case at FRI, as a work context, as well.

Similar to the Kenyah in muting gender differences in office life, there was one important difference: Most FRI staff came from national and sometimes personal traditions marked by ideologies of female inferiority, some with strict, somewhat oppressive gender roles. We all had to fight such underlying, often subconscious assumptions and tendencies.

In the next sections, I identify the relevant harp strings operative in this context that was marked by such cultural and ethnic diversity, by its definition as a breadwinning site and with a topic widely considered masculine as its central mandate.

Men as breadwinners

We were all workers at FRI or partners. The assumption that men were the breadwinners was evident early on. The subsequent discussions in this chapter all relate to masculinities in the breadwinning context. Here I only highlight evidence pertaining to gender dynamics in this predominantly masculine setting and the symbolic significance of attire.

Before I was hired in the 1990s, I was discussing the terms of possible employment with one of the men most interested in hiring me, a white economist of middle age, while walking down the stairs at FRI headquarters. As I recorded in my journal,

I was right to be skeptical. [Another senior European administrator] asked me two questions, 'What's your husband doing?' and 'When's his contract up?' 'Good bye.'

When I asked [the Australian man] my rank, [he] said, 'Does it matter?' When I asked the salary, he expressed astonishment . . .

(4 October 199X)

Why would I care? He clearly assumed that my gender, my obvious motivation to work and the probability that my husband's income would be adequate, meant he needn't worry about wage or benefit equity. The same day, I was also told by other personnel that the senior administrator did not like anthropologists, women researchers or Americans—a damning combination in my case. A few months later, another American woman social scientist applying for a job had a similar experience (journal, 19 August 199X). Later still, a French woman anthropologist whose methods were more typically qualitative and ethnographic than FRI work in general gave a talk in which she stressed the symbolic significance of benzoin trees in North Sumatra (where the milky exudate is described locally as mother's milk). The most quantitatively oriented staff members rejected her talk and her work, though legitimate from an anthropological perspective, treating both with disdain.

After a year there as a consultant, a longer-term job was advertised. I learned some time later that whereas the search committee had selected me as the best candidate, the senior administrator had hired instead three white men from the global North. Although eventually I was accepted as a legitimate member of staff, it took the prime decision-maker a couple of years that I found painful to decide I was capable.

As was the case of women in Bushler Bay's school, I recall much more public discussion and negotiation involved in hiring women than in hiring men, which may be partially, though not fully, responsible for the small number of women FRI managed to hire early on. Injustices occurred related to the hiring process for men as well, which seemed from my status as a researcher, to represent evidence of a harp chord composed of control, rationality and a lack of empathy (related to Northern notions of men's avoidance of emotionality).

The significance of attire as an indicator of work status and values has already been discussed (Chapter 3). It was less informative at FRI than in some locales, though it could affect employment. Northern men, and thus FRI's leaders, tended to wear slacks and short-sleeved shirts, rather than the business suits described by Brandth and Haugen (2000). One from Germany and another from South Africa wore colourful shirts outside their slacks, sandals and scruffy beards. These were not appreciated by the Indonesian bureaucrats we sometimes visited in their offices. Seen as a mark of disrespect, on occasion this demonstrably reduced Indonesian willingness to collaborate. We found suited elegance, à la France, among the African men we worked with as partners (academics and government officials) from Central and West Africa.

Rationality harp string

There is a common linking of rationality with masculinity,²⁶ with a long history, reinforced by religion, formal education and many government policies (also seen in Indonesia, Chapter 5). This link has been further reinforced by much spurious and previously mentioned 'science'. At FRI, being rational was often counterposed to being emotional, with the latter avoided. Northern men were taught, rather harshly, never to cry. I have never seen a man cry in a work setting, no matter how distressed he was.²⁷ Even remembering witnessing the genocide in Rwanda or a wife's infidelities, my colleagues were able to hold back their tears. When a woman scientist cried while complaining to a senior administrator about a negative performance appraisal, colleagues (and I) considered it a manipulative move. Northern men were expected to—and did—take pity on crying women (perhaps one reason some men prefer not to hire women). Allowing more emotional expression to both men and women would make the workplace more inclusive and more emotionally healthy.

Connell (1995) lays out a related dilemma: Rationality is supposedly for men, but rationality dictates making use of women's observable talents. Subsequent experience of rationality in women²⁸ weakens the narrative that rationality is only

for men. The very quality that can oppress, rationality, can also be used to contribute to treating women as equals. It includes in its nature its own demise (or at least weakening). However, in the process I suggest, it also strengthens the value of rationality vis-à-vis emotions, ethics and other values. This may in fact be counter-productive in the long run, as a more humane world would acknowledge emotions and other qualities deemed by many to be womanly (‘the feminine’) more fully.²⁹

FRI, as a research institute, put very high value on rationality, as did its research staff. This was evident in discussions, division of labour, performance appraisals, promotions and the regard of one’s colleagues and supervisors. It is unlikely that any FRI staff member would have denied that rationality was something he (or she) strove for. It was necessary to maintain one’s breadwinning role in this case. And it was also a key consideration in researchers’ antagonism to hierarchy³⁰ (discussed later). Hierarchy was seen as involving an often-illegitimate use of power (which was widely felt ‘should’ be based on rationality, which in turn would grant more legitimate authority).

The language harp string

Professional men were expected to be able to speak publicly and clearly. At FRI researchers appreciated, in themselves and others, the ability to speak articulately, rationally, concisely and in an interesting manner (see Box 6.1).

BOX 6.1 ANXIETIES ABOUT PUBLIC SPEAKING

I was standing in a garden with three professional men, during a ‘get-to-know-you’ wine bar at one of the hundreds of conferences and meetings I attended in a country I forget. One man from South America, with another international organization, was pontificating about how he was never nervous about giving a speech. He went on at some length about how no one who was competent at his profession would feel any anxiety about giving talks; the other men nodded appreciatively. One or two expressed their agreement. I suggested that some people were shy about speaking publicly, and I didn’t think it necessarily had anything to do with competence; I suffered myself from some such anxieties. The pontificator completely rejected this notion, insisting that if one were capable, one would have the self-confidence needed to avoid all such anxiety.

I have sometimes experienced what some have termed ‘mansplaining’ and other ways of dismissing women’s input, e.g. a case in Cameroon:

Gave my talk this AM—which generated a lot of discussion. Even though the chair convened the session 18 minutes late, talked for another 8 minutes

himself and then tried to cut me off about 5 minutes into my 15-minute speech, which was intended to leave 15 minutes for discussion!

(*journal*, 15 November 199X)

Since the language specified for FRI work was English,³¹ this gave native English speakers a considerable edge in the office (though not necessarily in the field). One young but capable Northern researcher struggled to overcome his inherent shyness and suffered horrid anxieties whenever he was called upon to speak up in a group (an issue seen as more common among women than men). He saw this as a major impediment to his professional advance.

An Australian researcher gave us all a lecture on good form in making presentations, and we were routinely called upon to speak publicly in many different fora. The fact that we worked in many linguistic contexts meant that we also depended on each other for help when called upon to give presentations in languages in which we were not necessarily fluent (see the section on the caring harp string). We were also expected to write articulately, logically, concisely and in an interesting manner in what we produced—qualities men (and I) also sought in ourselves.

Love of math harp string

In Chapter 3, I mentioned the links among math, science, prestige and masculinity within Bushler Bay's school, something that emerged again in other projects as a focus on finance. Americans of my age grew up thinking math was the quintessentially masculine subject—we were taught this in school via various mechanisms, whether role models or explicit statements about masculine abilities vis-à-vis feminine shortcomings.³² I remember being told by a teacher, a man, in high school, when I enrolled in a physics class, that this was a 'hard class', that girls weren't any good at it and that we girls would be better advised to drop it (which I foolishly did). Having heard such stories and advice throughout my childhood (my mother was dreadful at math), I grew up with a math phobia; I was only able to address it when I returned to graduate school in public health at the age of 35, determined specifically to overcome that fear.³³

Such beliefs and assumptions, expanded to quantitative methods and approaches generally, also pervaded the global scientific community. This pattern was particularly evident in the US, a country with disproportionate influence on the global stage. The US provided international assistance; it had a strong voice among multi-lateral donors, and within international organizations, whether research or implementation, whether industry or NGO. Americans' gender biases came along with us.

The most insistent about encouraging mathematical/quantitative interpretations and approaches at FRI have been 'Northern' men (who also tended to have higher positions within the organization).³⁴ These concerns in many cases represented genuine beliefs that quantification spelled science, our *raison d'être*;³⁵ but

in other cases, individuals convinced of the importance of qualitative methods continued to require quantification because of their perception that evaluations of FRI research would plunge if qualitative work were emphasized and accepted.

I see math, science and manliness as intimately connected at FRI and beyond.³⁶ If we add to this the fact that academically inclined men may *not* fulfill many of their own cultural 'ideals' of masculinity (e.g., physical strength, work outdoors, sports), a focus on math may be a sensible harp string to pluck.

How has this played out in practice? Around 2000, several of my colleagues and I decided to develop a research programme on adaptive collaborative management (ACM, Colfer 2005). By this we referred to attempts to build on the kind of collaborative work discussed in Chapter 5—working with forest peoples—but also incorporating more significant ecological components than we had in Sitiung. Although ACM included the probability of doing some quantitative analyses, the fundamental approach was qualitative, participatory action research. We were convinced that to change local systems such that management could be truly sustainable—as was FRI's mandate—we would have to involve local people in a serious way.

Unlike other teams doing more conventional, quantitative studies, we had to hone our proposal through 17 iterations, and I (as team leader) had to defend it and re-defend it at every meeting of our Board of Trustees for the first three years (Colfer 2013). That I was able to do so successfully each time suggests that our plans and implementation were solid. Senior administrators' initial discomfort with the approach was obvious,³⁷ despite broad recognition that our arguments in favour were compelling. Several subsequent research efforts built on this approach, including some by these administrators.

Masculinity and control harp strings

Some researchers emphasized and studied forests primarily for timber management; some for conservation; and some for plantation management. The common masculine harp string of control was differentially selected by these FRI staff. The desire to manage is a kind of control, with those concerned with plantation management the most interested in this harp string. For such researchers, control was closely linked with production, another idea affiliated with masculinity. The idea that production is to men as reproduction is to women is hegemonic among many groups. Production is linked as well to the provisioning harp string. There's a masculine chord—dominant on the global stage—that links control, production and provisioning (or being a breadwinner for one's family).

At FRI, plantation management was never dominant. FRI's umbrella organization had the formal mandate to increase production, protect the environment and focus on 'the poor' globally. But the group who created FRI, including all of its early Directors General (DG), wanted an institution that addressed policy and people issues more than production per se (the latter more common in most related centres). These institutional concerns strengthened FRI attention to more

'natural' forests, specifically those that were being managed for timber but might be managed in a more holistic fashion, and those managed for conservation.

Those researchers interested in conventional forest management were trained to manage for timber but were trying to understand and incorporate findings related to other forest uses, by the variety of forest users (differing by gender, ethnicity, class, etc.), and policies that might enhance forest sustainability. Such efforts also involved masculine control, but of a more open-ended variety than plantation management or agriculture.

One would think the control harp string would be least prominent for those interested in conservation management, where wildness was so valued. But the strength of their protection (of nature) harp string reinforced the concern for control (as shown also in the Swamp example earlier).

After a long period of considerable cooperation among staff, a new administration believed that excellence emerged from competition, and so competition began to be expressly encouraged among us. I do not believe this improved the quality of our work, and it certainly reduced the level of cooperation within the institution. Yet another administration strengthened control and hierarchy within the organization, firing or failing to renew the contracts of some people with valuable qualitative skills (mentoring, participatory action research, networking) who were less good at meeting deadlines or quantifying research results. This increased fear, which served to reduce the amount of selfless caring behaviour.

In the work setting, the internal conflict between the need or tendency to exert control and men's own resistance to hierarchy also created difficulties for them. The reluctance of the FS-S team member mentioned earlier to inform the Sitiung team leader that he was being fired was one example. Another was the assignment by a senior administrator to one of the most junior people on staff then, the only woman, the responsibility to withdraw a FRI contract the equity of which I had diplomatically questioned (journal, 13 November 199X).

Love of nature harp string

The love of nature and the outdoors were important values for most of my colleagues. Like the men of Bushler Bay, many (particularly those from the North) liked being in the woods and were proud of their ability to endure difficult conditions, hike long distances and withstand harsh temperatures. I remember the admiration my colleagues expressed around 1997, when a man in his 60s, a forester, was able to keep up, trekking all day long through rice fields and forests in East Kalimantan.

And I recall my own dismay when, in my mid-60s (2009), I found myself unable to keep up with my younger colleagues in Madagascar (all men) as we traversed steep terrain. I was aware that my pride in such abilities was related to my long-felt need to 'measure up' in a way deemed masculine by my peers. I, like many professional women, had cultivated such abilities partly in order to survive

in contexts defined as masculine, where I chose to work (as noted also by Eriksen 2013 and Reed 2003 for forestry women in the US, Australia and Canada).

Thirst for adventure harp string

The thirst for adventure—which I shared—is also more closely linked with men and ideas about masculinity than with women; it was a common interest at FRI (as among the Kenyah). Our jobs took us to many countries, mainly in the tropics. Exploring new places, experiencing alien conditions, meeting strange new people—these were common values among my colleagues. I remember the thrill of my first (1979) experience of travelling up a small stream in a canoe in Borneo, with foliage from each side meeting overhead. Or the excitement of recognizing similarities between the villages I was seeing along a river near Yurimaguas in Peru in 1983 and communities I'd studied in Kalimantan. Or how intrigued I was, surrounded by black people in Côte d'Ivoire on my first visit to Africa in 1995. These experiences were utter delights, and I saw the same excitement and thrill in the faces and words of the men I worked with as they visited new places and met new peoples. One of my research partners, an American academic, wrote a fictionalized version of his own life in a tropical country, which nicely captures this common masculine harp string (and others; Moro 2018). For anthropologists, this is often discussed with disapproval, as the lure of 'the other'. For biophysical scientists, curiosity about nature is more emphasized—but all these adventures include feelings of newness, of potential danger or discomfort, of challenge, of learning, of excitement. It's part of discovery.

The caring and protection harp strings

I described previously the uncaring attitudes and behaviour of project leaders in the Swamp project. But FRI's men were far more cooperative and helpful to each other (and to me). Caring was not so often discussed, in the way that quantification or rationality were, but it was evident in men's behaviour.³⁸

There was routine sharing of expertise among researchers. As noted, we often had to give presentations in languages other than our own. French speakers helped English speakers craft better talks in French (journal, 25 June 199X); sometimes one staff member would translate for another; colleagues would correct the English or French or Spanish or Indonesian of a colleague in written materials as well. We also routinely critiqued each other's papers, helping to improve them (e.g., journal, 7 July 199X).

Although the level of inter-programme cooperation varied over time, there was a five-year period when I was a programme leader, when we all willingly shared our budgets, allocating excess to those who had shortfalls. Overall the shared interest in better care of the forests and greater benefit to forest communities tied the researchers together with a common goal and strengthened caring behaviour.

Protection and caring share some elements, though protection can carry with it an element of control (as in the Balinese husband described earlier). FRI policies included institutional protections for staff members; once when I appeared to have disappeared in or on my way to Turkey, great efforts were put forth by my colleagues to find me. Additionally, when FRI staff members of either gender were robbed, as happened several times, long discussions ensued on ways to provide better protection or to avoid further exposure. When Jakarta erupted in 1997 and 1998 into widespread violence, administrators did everything in their power to protect all the staff (particularly the Chinese who had been so targeted). 'Protection' was not, however, used as an excuse to prevent women from performing our work (unlike in some places).

Sexuality and violence harp strings

Sexuality was not an overt part of office life at FRI. I was the staff member who dealt with anonymous complaints about sexual harassment during my tenure at headquarters. Such complaints were rare, and FRI administrators dealt promptly with them when so informed. Warnings were usually sufficient. No woman who complained was willing to make a formal complaint or come forward publicly for fear of reprisals both within FRI and more broadly (29 August 199X). In only one case was disciplinary action necessary (e.g., journal, 9 March 199X).

Such behaviour was said to be far more common within the Indonesian bureaucracy, and the most substantive complaints I heard were from Indonesian women in service positions regarding Indonesian men of high rank. Such harassment was surely more widespread than what came to my attention. One woman was subjected to repeated requests for sex and inappropriate touching; the other was locked in a 'superior's' office and kissed before she was able to escape. They felt both embarrassment and fear for their continued and future employment, because of the harassers' power within local institutions and the acceptability of such behaviour at that time within Indonesian bureaucracies.

Interestingly, I heard as many complaints from men as women. One Northern man complained about harassment from a Southern woman who wanted to make her husband jealous; and one gay man complained about harassment from another gay man, both from the South—neither involved physical actions. The men's fears were of a different kind than the women's. Women feared attacks on their persons. One man's fears were about his reputation; the other's more irritation than fear, though potential public exposure of his homosexuality probably also played a role—despite FRI's increasingly open policies about LGBTQ issues (including hiring at least one openly gay man and having a gay woman on their board at one point).³⁹

Shortly after I joined FRI, the DG sent the other woman researcher and me on a field trip to Kalimantan, one purpose of which was to develop public relations (PR) materials that would show FRI as a gender-equitable institution. The PR consultants were particularly interested in the prostitution that flourished

around timber base camps, so my colleague and I were filmed interviewing the prostitutes near the timber concession (Chapter 4). We incorporated what we learned in these interviews in a small box in a thick report that we generated a year or so later.

One evening, I was called about 10 PM and asked (by a Ministry of Forestry official, a man) if I were "encouraging prostitution in Kalimantan". It evolved that another man (Indonesian, researcher, forester) working in another country at an international forestry institution had read the small box in our report, photocopied that page, and distributed it throughout the Indonesian Ministry of Forestry with an accompanying letter of complaint against FRI. This struck me as the height of hypocrisy, given the informal support by government personnel for prostitution near timber camps and military establishments, and the 'open secret' about the frequenting of such establishments by ministry officials themselves. FRI's DG's response, thankfully, was to defend our report and our responsibility to publish the findings from our work, wherever they might lead.⁴⁰ The ministry eventually acquiesced.

The sexuality harp string tended to be muted at headquarters. Between 1994 and 2009, there were a few cases of marriages falling apart (some involving adultery) and/or re-marriage to a colleague or secretary, but these were rare, compared to other contexts I'd known. People of both genders had spouses who refused to join them, maintaining long-distance marriages; some left because no work was available for their spouses. For many, the choices were abstinence or the nightlife scene; my sense is that more chose the former.

A few (single, to my knowledge) researchers sought sexual release in bars in Jakarta; in our African locations, sexuality was more open. One happily married colleague of non-African ethnicity, a man, was offered a prostitute in West Africa by one of our African partners who had already made use of her services (journal, 23 June 199X). The scientist refused on the explicit grounds of fear of HIV/AIDS. Another African partner in Central Africa was criticized, not for making use of prostitutes' services, but for spending so much time at it—interfering with his work performance. He was explicitly admired by his African colleagues for his sexual prowess. An American, short-term team member on the same project (engaged to be married shortly in the US) availed himself of prostitutes' services and suffered guilt and fear about having done so. One of our woman board members and I were both approached by a considerably younger Cameroonian man, suggesting we invite him into our hotel room, and I spent an unpleasant day in a car with a Cameroonian forestry official who made suggestive remarks all day (journal, 20 October 199X).

One interesting twist for expat life in Indonesia was the fact that the inconvenient question of male control in the household could be partially set aside. Men (and their wives) could avoid confronting the incompatibility of 'modern' gender equity concerns and traditional gender roles. These men's wives did not do much in the way of household labour, as local women and some men were hired to perform such roles (discussed later). Childcare was also simplified, as help was

readily and inexpensively available. Relations among spouses were in most cases companionate (rather like the Public Employees discussed in Chapter 3 or my own marriages). The globally conventional male family provider harp string was evident and re-enforced (a) by the patterned but largely unconscious FRI preference for men as employees, (b) the difficulty of finding work for foreign spouses there and (c) Indonesian governmental reluctance to grant work permits to them.

The harp frame—FRI

Whether this analogy can be stretched to apply to a work context like FRI remains a question. But there were issues that transcended masculinities and structured life and debates within the organization (the frame of the harp). I have selected three,⁴¹ to continue with the harp frame analogy: the degree of hierarchy vs. democracy, international vs. national staffing (including ethnicities) and headquarters vs. branch offices. As will become clear, these three themes interconnect as they affect and are affected by individuals.

From the beginning, the narrative we told and heard was that we were a 'flat' organization, democratically run. This was a value to which both the organizational statement and the researchers themselves expressly subscribed and for which researchers fought. But from the very beginning, what was perceived (from below) to be autocratic decision-making on the part of DG occurred. The policy manual, after listing all sorts of democratic sounding procedures to be involved in hiring, for instance, concluded by saying basically that the final decision was up to the DG—a right several DGs regularly exercised. The degree to which a particular programme replicated this kind of control also depended on the personality of the leader. Some kept tight control of budgets, for instance, while others devolved such control to specific project leaders. Some gave explicit orders (with varying success), while others sought agreement from their 'underlings'. There was ongoing oscillation as leaders' felt needs for control varied. But certainly the exercise of control made those with formal authority, particularly those who regularly exercised it, exceedingly unpopular. FRI's researchers 'loved to hate' those in power.

Another factor influencing hierarchy was the growth of the institution. As an institution grows, some bureaucratization becomes inevitable due to the limit on how many people one can deal with meaningfully on a regular basis. A third factor was the amount of funding available. When funds were abundant, there was a loosening of control; when funds became scarce, a tightening occurred. But where we stood on the hierarchy-democracy continuum was a topic for continuing discussion and strong opinions—influenced by and influencing the strings of the harp.

The second side of the frame, the differences among ethnicities and nationalities, was a pervasive structural issue, as noted in footnote 23. At its most macro scale, it played out as the distinction between international and national staff, with the latter singularly disadvantaged in terms of salaries, benefits and prestige (cf. earlier discussion of FS-S project, also replicated in the Swamp project).

Although salaries and benefits were the inequities most typically raised, the prestige factor was probably more debilitating for national staff. The most vivid example in my memory came when a visiting Northern man met with a group of researchers, including a very well educated, articulate and capable Indonesian woman specializing in a technical field. As we sat in the meeting, the man kept turning to me—an anthropologist without significant knowledge of her field—with related questions. He kept this up, despite my repeatedly pointing to her as the expert. It simply 'did not compute' in his mind that an Indonesian woman could have such expertise.

A junior Indonesian man, a forester, led one project on which I also collaborated; when we met with outsiders, all assumed I was the leader, rather than the very capable Indonesian man. These kinds of experiences, repeated regularly at work, were demotivating and emotionally harmful for national staff. Many Indonesian staff indeed did not have the same academic skills that the international staff did, but many did, and many who began with low skill levels improved over time, without adequate acknowledgement from international staff or visitors.

In the battles over hierarchy vs. democracy, it was the international staff, those with greater power within the organization, whose voices were most strident. The national staff, Indonesians at headquarters, had more conflicted feelings about the situation. Their own cultures tended to be hierarchic (as discussed in Chapter 5), yet the crass inequities,⁴² obvious on a day-to-day basis, could not help but influence their thinking in this context where rationality and equity were so highly valued.

In Java, power was also very differently manifest than was the case among Americans, Europeans and Australians. Traditionally, a powerful Javanese was quiet, his authority taken for granted, emanating from spiritual strength and the respect of those beneath him in the hierarchy. Persuading Indonesian researchers to speak up, to share their thoughts or even to complain about what troubled them required special effort (which many international staff were unwilling to put forth). Some took the silence as acquiescence or acceptance, some as timidity or incompetence. Adherence to religious dictates was also highly valued among the national staff. The higher an Indonesian's education, the more likely was he to emphasize his religious observances. The reverse was true of those from the global North.

In the Central African branch office, FRI used the office complex that also housed another centre under the same umbrella organization. There, relations (in the 1990s) between international and national staff were far more conflictual. A triumvirate of American and European men ran the office with an iron hand, without apparent attention to equity issues (or common humanity) related to either gender or ethnicity.

[An American woman scientist] has a rough row to hoe. The only woman on staff not sleeping with one of the other scientists. She starts to talk and they begin reading something in meetings. They've driven away the

previous two women scientists [confirmed by me]. But she doesn't want to bring it up [with outsiders] for fear of this problem being used as an excuse to cut their funding. They're already barely scraping by.

(journal, 6 November 199X, also 27 October)

The FRI DG and other leaders at that time were sufficiently concerned to negotiate a sharing arrangement that kept FRI researchers outside these sexist, racist and authoritarian leaders' control (journal, 28 October 199X).

Later, in the 2000s, FRI's administrative structure took on a more controlling aspect, subscribing to the very American insistence on bureaucratic control and timeliness, both of which conflicted with Central African laissez-faire attitudes, particularly toward punctuality.⁴³ This resulted in the firing of some excellent people—people, both men and women, whose talents lay in mentoring, networking, policy influence, community action and the like. Some of these talents, though clearly related to FRI's mandate, did not sit well with masculine ideas of a Northern research institution's 'normal' functioning nor did they carry the same prestige weight as writing a paper or publishing a book—including under a woman DG.⁴⁴

There were also inequities that affected the international staff, particularly relating to language. The strong emphasis on being articulate was far easier for those whose native language was English than for those for whom it was a second (or third) language. This could affect researchers' appearance of rationality, their articulateness⁴⁵ and their productivity, thus potentially influencing their bread-winning capabilities, as well as their self-confidence as men.

The third frame, headquarters vs. branch offices (or centre vs. periphery), involved structural disadvantages in that the Indonesia office was far better equipped with modern technology, support personnel and other resources than were the branch offices. Yet a central FRI policy was for researchers to operate in interdisciplinary teams and in partnership with researchers in tropical countries. Almost any project involved people at headquarters and people in the branch offices, as well as partners in national institutions like national forest services, universities and NGOs, with even more exaggerated differential access to resources and conveniences.

FRI organizational policy began with the commitment to a 'flat' organization described earlier, but there was a tension and oscillation over time between an ideal of a top-down, centralized institution led from headquarters and a decentralized, bottom-up institution led by national needs and priorities. At most times, an ideal of cooperation among projects and units on a level playing field was espoused.

However, realities made this impossible. Branch offices, of which there were a varying number, operated in languages other than English, which added translation to almost any task they undertook. Although all were located in cities, much work was conducted in forests. Electricity, computers and later the internet were available (in most cases, sporadically) in the office, almost never in the

forests. Budgets for branch offices were lower, so access to computers and printers was more difficult. Disease was more rampant, particularly malaria and HIV/AIDS in FRI's African locations, meaning more absenteeism due to illness (of the researcher and his extended family). Whereas FRI had a library at headquarters, branch offices did not (in any meaningful sense), nor did other good local libraries exist to which researchers could turn. Political turmoil was a continuing problem.

These disadvantages of working in a branch office were partly compensated by researchers' interest in being 'close to the action', being closer to forests and outdoor work for some, being able to contribute to science that might be more directly applicable, more 'grounded', for others. But from other standpoints, in competition with other scientists (a common masculine harp string), it was a very uneven playing field.

From the standpoint of breadwinning success, as well as being able to demonstrate such masculine harp strings as productivity, industriousness and articulateness (all valued among this group), these were serious disadvantages. Productivity at FRI meant producing articles, books, workshops and policy briefs.⁴⁶ Doing that in a context without reliable electricity or easy access to libraries, computers and printers complicated the process significantly. Distance from headquarters also slowed down any of FRI's bureaucratic or budgetary requirements, as communications were not always quick and headquarters personnel often had other pressing demands on their time. 'The squeaky wheel gets greased', but it was hard to be very squeaky from a branch office.

Finally, there were qualitative regional differences in the forestry world that bear further research. What I can say here is stereotypical but represents broad patterns I observed as I travelled from one forest region to the next. It seemed, for instance, that men working in Latin America⁴⁷ were more comfortable with dramatic emotion than were those working in Asia or from the North. Latin American partners readily expressed their likes and affections. They also argued, sometimes passionately, showing anger, conflict, giving free vent to their dislikes . . . then returning to friendly relations—deemed 'too emotional' by many from the North. In Africa,⁴⁸ there was a willingness, once rapport was established, to engage in intellectual debate, showing their own rationality, cleverness at argument, linguistic skills and store of knowledge. Strong African commitments to family in a context of much disease (and thus missed work, ignored deadlines) was an issue for those from the North. In Asia,⁴⁹ emotions seemed subdued, with efforts made usually to present a respectful, patient, gentle and caring demeanour . . . until some drastic conflict occurred, a tipping point was reached and relations might then be cut utterly and forever. Those from the North and Africa were frustrated by Asian reluctance to engage in debate, to contribute their ideas.

Masculinities in the domestic world

This discussion would not be complete without some attention to the world outside work which these men (and women) inhabited. At work, there was at least

a fiction, and sometimes a reality, of equality between men and women—with women tending to fit in with this masculine context.⁵⁰ But this was quite distinct from domestic arrangements, where wives, whether working or not, typically remained the household managers, in many cases complicit in encouraging or accepting the control of their husbands,⁵¹ and often managing men from local ethnic groups. At home, at least when husbands were away, the gender hierarchy was partially flipped, with an ethnic hierarchy gaining prominence. The work these wives did managing the household contributed a vital support function that their professional husbands would have had difficulty doing without (organizing meals, hygiene, childcare, etc.). Such support was particularly important because of the heavy travel schedules of FRI staff. At the same time, wives did not tend to have onerous domestic tasks beyond household supervision, as these were performed by men and women from the country of residence. Unemployed husbands were rarer, but most working women continued to do most of the household management, at least when in country. My own husband did not suffer as much as many did by the disregard such men sometimes encountered. Although FRI had policies to help find work for spouses, these were not particularly effective. Being a trailing spouse was not easy for most.

The philosophical quandaries manifest in the harp's frame invaded the home as well as the office, though people's abilities to compartmentalize varied.⁵² Some were able to maintain strong gender egalitarian attitudes at work, but still expect their wives to manage all domestic work at home—expectations their wives may or may not have shared. Although most FRI marriages I knew well were companionate in form, others involved stark masculine dominance or major decisions made without the wife's knowledge.⁵³ Some spouses simply left (as was very common among wives in 1979–1980 among the European expats in East Kalimantan).

In marriages where the wife had been professionally active, both men and women were likely to suffer as these women were limited, by the absence of job opportunities and governmental reluctance to grant work permits, to lives of household management. The only option, short of leaving their husbands or persuading them to quit their jobs, was to create lives as household managers.⁵⁴ All unemployed FRI husbands had been professionally active. I know of none who regularly took over household management. Some of these men worked as consultants part time, some left, some simply suffered, while taking up some of the slack at home when their wives travelled.

The inequities described with regard to national staff vis-à-vis international staff were magnified in the home context, where household staff tended to be paid considerably less even than national staff at the office. There were various rationales for paying such low wages. On one side, FRI researchers almost always paid higher wages than the average wages Indonesians paid their household helpers. But on the other, when compared with international staff wages, the differences were shocking.⁵⁵

Nor did most workers have what would have been considered fair working conditions in the North: Drivers often worked from early in the morning until

late into the night; cooks were likely to do the same, making early breakfasts and cleaning up after late dinners. There was little awareness of 'workers' rights' or fair employment conditions among Indonesian workers, nor did most FRI staff, to the best of my knowledge, tend to share such ideas or implement such practices with their staff. Taking advantage of such workers was the custom and following suit was the path of least resistance (to our shame).⁵⁶

I do not suggest that answers to these inequities were simple. It is quite true that international workers were likely to have ongoing expenses in their home countries, encouraging wage inequities; they were likely to suffer emotionally by being distant from loved ones and missing out on family obligations and pleasures; domestic tasks took more time in developing countries than in the global North, so there was more *need* for household help; hiring more people provided more employment for the local population; etc. It was equally true that women were more likely than men to have had household management experience and skills (though FRI wives were almost as likely as their husbands to have had professional experience and skills). These structural inequities remained shocking nonetheless—and they intersected and interwove with the strings of the harp, which together created this world in need of change.

Significant effort was put forth to create better 'work-life balance' at FRI, as there was always a recognition that people were working too hard, spending too much time away from home, putting undesirable strain on marriages, parenthood and home life in general. Most men at FRI were fathers and valued being fathers, but the harp string they plucked was being a 'family man' (being a responsible provider, usually not straying sexually, engaging with their children), more often than producing many children as evidence of their virility (as is common among some African and Latin American masculinities).

There was always a frenetic element to time management. Everyone felt over-worked; system dynamics models showing how 'burn-out' occurred were circulated. But people were unable to stop over-working. This was partially related to the genuine commitments people felt to what they were trying to do: solve forest management problems, make communities more equitable, influence conservation policies, etc. But intertwined with such commitments were compulsions related to the masculine work environment: Be productive! Work hard! Prove your articulateness and rationality! Don't waste time! These were internal commands more than external ones, though they were reinforced by annual performance appraisals in which all had to list exactly what they had accomplished; a continual reminder requiring both competition with colleagues and cooperation with partners in the work setting.

Conclusions

This chapter analyzes work life in international conservation and development contexts that relate to forests (though I imagine the patterns observed extend beyond forest-related efforts), with an emphasis on masculinities there.⁵⁷ I began with my early experiences in which sexuality and caring were dominant themes

for the men I worked with (1970s and 1980s). In West Sumatra, we looked at national vs. international staff conditions and values, the significance of quantification to American and hierarchy to Indonesian scientists, the see-saw for American men between competition and hierarchy vis-à-vis cooperation, the differing harp strings of controlling and protecting in the mid-1980s.

In West Kalimantan, we encounter again quantification, control and competition as masculine harp strings; a caring harp string that focused on nature rather than colleagues; and attire as symbolic of differentiating masculinities, in the early 1990s.

We then turn, in the mid-1990s to 2000s, to the most recent observations, at FRI, an institution devoted to understanding and improving forests and the lives of people living in or near them. The majority of professional workers at FRI have always been men, and they have been addressing a context that has been defined as masculine (the forest). The women who have worked at FRI have attempted to fit into this masculine domain, many nibbling away at the edges to insert concerns that might be called feminine.

Meanwhile the world at large has, over time, also been nibbling away at the idea that men and women, masculine and feminine, are polar opposites. In recent years, the number of women who study forestry-related fields has blossomed, sometimes surpassing the number of men enrolled; institutions are becoming more gender-balanced. We are beginning to recognize—as Kenyah Dayaks, for instance, have known for some time—the huge areas of life, thought and biology common to both.⁵⁸

Transformation of the world is always underway. The early emphasis I perceived on sexuality, for instance, was surely not unrelated to my own age and that of my colleagues. At FRI, in more recent times, I as well as my colleagues, were generally older than in the previous experiences described. The aging process is surely an important factor in this shift in emphasis away from sexuality and toward issues like knowledge and articulateness.⁵⁹

All in all, greater acceptance of the legitimacy of plucking harp strings like fatherhood, caring, protectiveness, emotional vulnerability, holistic thinking and others often deemed feminine, can, I believe, open up new understandings of the world around us. It can also help to capture the creativity of those whose voices have been so muffled (women, people from the South, forest peoples, etc.). Part of that muffling derives from some men's (and some women's) desires to prove they are in control (thus, for instance, not *controlled by* women or village people and their wishes); that they are articulate (thus failing to create or seek out opportunities to listen to women or village peoples); and that they are quantitatively skilled (thus failing to comprehend the values, systems, interactions and intersections that characterize life in forests and are more accessible by qualitative means).

Notes

- 1 See Hancock (1989), where the poem, 'The Development Set' appears (4th unnumbered page). The material in this chapter comes from two main sources: my personal

- journals, which I have kept throughout most of my life; and my memories, with some reference to field materials at my home and in Cornell's archives under my name.
- 2 Feminist standpoint theory, used partially here, "uses women's perspectives to describe men's behavior at work" (McGinley 2004, p. 373); see also Chopra's (2011) similar approach.
 - 3 Dove's (1999) study of planters across Indonesia represents a useful and relevant study. He argues the importance of studying power among the powerful as well as the powerless, as I attempt here.
 - 4 As global awareness of gender dynamics has strengthened, many of the men I've worked with now have greater sensitivity to the gender implications of values, behaviour and institutions than these historical experiences suggest.
 - 5 Tim Babcock, who kindly reviewed an earlier version of this chapter, suggested that, "Commonality of international (western derived) organizational structures, rules and regulations might be behind some of this [commonality]" (personal communication, 2 October 2019). Quite probable.
 - 6 Subsequently taken over by an Indonesian firm with close ties with President Soeharto.
 - 7 Another example represents danger: One of my colleagues sexually molested an 11-year-old girl (May 198X)—still representative of some men's ideas of legitimate sexuality.
 - 8 The FS-S team leader was *not* seeking the qualities that McGinley (2004) attributes to men at work, which she sees as reinforcing ideas about men's superiority over women (see fn 9, p. 42).
 - 9 He was also an avid basketball fan (Southern State)—the sports harp string—and an extremely competitive and agile player in our neighbourhood pick-up games.
 - 10 The motivations of all these men (and myself) were influenced by what Tania Li, from a critical perspective, calls, 'the will to improve' (2007).
 - 11 My journal in July 198X lists a whole string of helpful actions on the part of men from the collaborating institutions (Island University, Southern State University, Cornell University and Soils Center) to support me professionally (offering to hire my husband, invite me to Cornell University, give talks at the World Bank, professional meetings, etc.).
 - 12 The Honolulu office's reluctance to do so surely related to their commitment to egalitarian relations, like Connell's (1995) example of the "librarian . . . [who] is wrestling with how to supervise other staff and reconcile his actual authority with his belief in equality. So far the result is a draw" (p. 174).
 - 13 Pascoe (2007), writing about an American high school, says, "In fact the table at which the Latter Day Saints students convened during lunch was (apart from Gay/Straight Alliance meetings and the drama classroom) the least homophobic and sexist location on campus!" (p. 112), though she goes on to note, "Their respective religions buttressed male power through their teachings such that the interactional accomplishment of masculinity was less central to their identity projects" (p. 113).
 - 14 "Today was an emotional one for me as I struggled with inequity on our team. Unfairness. We met and discussed it" (journal, 28 February 198X).
 - 15 Language, for academic men, *can* represent the weaponry in a narrative of warfare. In a book on anthropologist Derek Freeman and his academic conflicts with Margaret Mead and others, Hempenstall (2017) says, "Language was warfare now, and both sides [Freeman vs. Cote] practiced open aggression" (p. 216). He adds later, "On both sides the language of the debates [between Freeman and a number of prominent anthropologists] was the language of rolling warfare" (pp. 252–253). It can of course also be used for a variety of more benign purposes.
 - 16 I encountered no other women (other than secretaries) employed on the broader project, though we occasionally hired spouses and two other women as short-term consultants. Our Indonesian partners had one woman technician, with ~15 men scientists and technicians.

- 17 Material for this section comes from Colfer (2006), my journals and memories; see also Yasmi et al. 2007; Wadley et al. 2010a, b; Yasmi and Colfer 2010; Colfer, Wadley, and Widjanarti 1996; Colfer, Wadley, et al. 2001; Colfer, Woelfel, et al. 2001; Wadley and Colfer 2004, for more on this site.
- 18 Like the Sumatran example, the donors had been promised a greater contribution from the Indonesian side, however, unlike in Sitiung, the governmental agency in Pontianak was unable to persuade any staff to join us in such a remote area for any length of time.
- 19 Brandth and Haugen (2000) discuss two versions of forest men in Norway:

The power of the forestry worker is based on bodily strength as required when 'battling' with the natural environment. It is displayed by means of working clothes and machinery [see Chapter 3]. The power of the organisational man is based on control over economic resources as he leads and manages other men's interests, displaying masculinity by means of the power 'look' of business suits, conference tables and rostrums.

(p. 354)

- 20 This reminded me of a job interview I had for a job in Bangladesh, funded by USAID, with a population NGO in the late 1970s: I was told that all my work would be evaluated strictly based on the 'number of family planning acceptors' I recruited and that I could not publish without permission. I withdrew my application.
- 21 During the 1990s, the management group was composed only of men, and usually 75–80% of the researchers were men. By 2019, the management group was 65% men (though staff of both genders complained in 2018 that the decision-makers were four autocratic men); between 2013 and 2019, the percentage of professional men staff was in the mid- to high 60s (15 May 2019 email from FRI's human resources division).
- 22 Men (compared to women) currently in FRI 'services' (non-'professional') have averaged 40% for the last seven years (2013–2019) with very little year-to-year variation, which is probably about the same as in earlier days.
- 23 This inequity, which pervades the world of international organizations, is a complex issue: People from the country where the institution is housed were paid lower salaries. At FRI, they were paid, according to the head of admin, a man, 'what the market would bear', which resulted in grossly inequitable conditions. Within my own programme, for instance, two women with equivalent skills doing the same job received widely divergent salaries and benefits—both unjust and destructive of motivation.
- 24 See Fowler (2012) for an Indonesian context in which fire management is closely linked with women.
- 25 Boylan's (2008) quote bears repeating: "I remembered a T-shirt I'd seen someone wearing at a conference once: *There are only two kinds of people: Those who reject the binary, and those who don't*" (p. 258).
- 26 Indeed, Connell (1995) remarks, speaking about 'the affluent': "Hegemonic masculinity is culturally linked to both authority and rationality, key themes in the legitimization of patriarchy" (p. 90).
- 27 Kenyah men, on the other hand, did not avoid emotional expression. In my own personal background and in Bushler Bay, men never cried in public and rarely in private. I recall my astonishment when my Kenyah colleague, a local leader, stood up to speak at a community meeting on his return in 1980 after a long absence. He said a few words and then began quietly to cry, tears streaming down his face. He cried for several minutes, as those assembled listened silently and with acceptance. Then he resumed his talk.
- 28 The aforementioned senior administrator's attitude toward me shifted markedly upwards after I wrote a logical and evidence-based memo analyzing the inequities and practical implications of hiring senior biophysical scientists and only junior social scientists for an organization ostensibly interested in interdisciplinary collaboration and people-oriented research (e.g., journal, 4 September 199X).

- 29 Hempenstall (2017) discusses Derek Freeman's arguments with various other anthropologists: "But Shore was more sad that Freeman persisted in seeing Shore's position as 'fuzzy or weak and unmanly', as though only Freeman's strongly masculine interpretations told the truth about Samoa" (p. 192).
- 30 My own antagonism to this is reflected in this quote from my journal:

The National Working Group on C&I [is] an endurance contest. Mostly powerful men, some with hidden agendas, most not wanting to work. How *do* you work thru the system? The higher up I go, the less I see that I like. But I guess this is not a new discovery, just further confirmation of a suspicion I've had for a long time . . . I do not feel comfortable in the 'halls of power'. I don't like their smell.

(19 November 199X)

- 31 In the early days, a Malaysian researcher, a man, wanted to sanction secretaries who spoke Indonesian when at their leisure, because "This is a scientific institution and English is the language of science". Thankfully most were not so rigid about it.
- 32 See e.g., Fine (2010) or Saini (2017) for careful analysis of both lay and 'scientific' fallacies related to gender, including men's purported superiority in this field.
- 33 A recent Twitter feed invited 'Women in Computational Social Sciences' to a workshop in Switzerland, saying, "So far the field of computational social sciences is male dominated and short of female perspectives and insights. . . ." (https://twitter.com/Kressin_L/status/1189147458116427782, viewed on 12 January 2020).
- 34 One of my early journal entries when I began work at FRI:

The 'science meeting' met from 2–5:45, and they smeared [a European man, a forester with social science interests] all over the floor, and [behaved] generally as white, Anglo Saxon male know-it-alls who gave no credence to alternative ways of looking at the world.

(journal, 31 August 199X)

- This was in fact the meeting that prompted the aforementioned memo (footnote 28).
- 35 I recall recognizing and bemoaning the *impenetrability* of some quantitative analyses—so elegant, so admired by society, their adherents so self-confident; yet forming conclusions so fundamentally wrong, based on erroneous assumptions . . .
- 36 One reviewer, a man, rejected the idea that math is related to masculinity, linking quantification instead with the need for generalization. However, one can do research (perhaps of a more feminine nature?) the purpose of which is not generalization, but rather understanding of particular contexts, both for practical use in that context, and also for insights about possible interactions and phenomena elsewhere.
- 37 At one point, one even hired a consultant *on the sly* to evaluate what we were doing!
- 38 I describe my immediate boss as "such a 'family substitute' on these [work] trips. A nice person whom I value" (journal, 7 November 199X). On another occasion, he said "Did I ever tell you I'm glad you're on the project?" (journal, 5 February 199X).
- 39 In a recent visit to FRI, one of my longstanding Northern heterosexual men friends, a colleague in a sister institution, initially approached me with caution, not giving me the hug he probably would have in the past. He knew I held feminist concerns, and he acknowledged that the me-too movement had made him skittish.
- 40 His role as DG required frequent plucking of the political harp string, something the rest of the staff did most consistently in relations with partners in host countries.
- 41 Other important themes I considered included disciplinary distinctions, particularly those between biophysical and social sciences (far less intrusive at FRI than at other centres under FRI's umbrella organization), top-down vs. bottom-up approaches (all of which were routinely attempted) and FRI's location on the academic vs. applied spectrum. Officially FRI was supposed to produce 'strategic' research, lying mid-way between these latter two poles.

42 I went to Central Africa in the early years:

You could easily come here and fail to realize the disparity between what the whites have and what the blacks have. The same salary discrepancy here as in Indonesia. Men who really want the jobs discussed (ours, WWF's) are dressed in their best (shabby suits) and their hunger is palpable. . . . People should not have to *want* like that. I wanted the [FRI] job in 199X, but the fact that I didn't *need* it vastly reduces the importance of my own desire.

(*journal*, 4 April 199X)

43 Not that such attitudes were *limited* to Central Africans!

44 Connell (1995) refers to a "pattern of a technical peer group sustaining a strongly masculinized definition of expertise" (p. 181). I have already noted the tendency of professional women in such contexts to take on attitudes and skill sets defined as masculine. The higher the woman's status, the more likely such a shift would have occurred, or a natural inclination been realized—though this necessity may well be changing under the more equitable gender relations of recent years.

45 See Colfer (1983), which discusses the ways in which narratives of inequality effectively reduce a person's perceived articulateness, in Iran, in the forests of the US and in academic discourse, or more recently, Colfer, Sijapati Basnett and Ihlainen (2018).

46 Of course, FRI scientists were also genuinely interested in discovery, in learning new things, in producing knowledge that could be used constructively. Issues of masculinity were only one lens—the one emphasized here—through which to view their behaviour and goals.

47 My time was spent in Brazil, Peru and Bolivia and my knowledge of Spanish was minimal, of Portuguese non-existent.

48 I worked most in Cameroon, with shorter stays in Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon, Kenya, Madagascar, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda and Zimbabwe. French and English were the languages I used.

49 My work in Indonesia predominates, but I also spent time in Laos, Malaysia, Thailand and Vietnam. I speak Indonesian (making Malaysian intelligible) and have varying degrees of fluency in several other Indonesian languages; no Lao, Thai or Vietnamese.

50 See Arora-Jonsson (2009) for the incompatibilities between Swedish and Indian women's vs. men's ways of organizing and relating to forests.

51 See Mabsout and Van Staveren (2010) for evidence of employed Ethiopian women more assiduously performing household tasks to 'make up for' their intrusion into the masculine sphere of wage labour.

52 In Sitiung, West Sumatra, I wrote in my journal,

[an Indonesian partner soil scientist] came by, and we discussed unfairness. I have tried not to think about that. I truly think it makes me sick [I *was* sick]. But . . . it still comes unbidden . . . Is that why I cry?

(*journal*, 10 September, 198X)

53 Among the environmentally oriented men Connell (1995) studied, "[one man's] renunciation of his masculine career was a highly masculine act. Among other things, he did not tell his wife about it until after he had bought their farm". Similar events occurred at FRI.

54 In the FS-S project, so far from government oversight, we were able to make creative and professional use of the talents available from our spouses, though many of their contributions were unpaid.

55 I was not innocent in this issue: In my own household, where we paid more than most of my colleagues to our household staff, I was paid around 100 times what I paid my household workers. This differentiation was almost as shockingly inequitable as that between low-paid American workers vis-à-vis the now-infamous 1%.

56 A few of us made special efforts to be fairer, paying more, organizing health insurance and paying for schooling, but such behaviour was 'rowing upstream' against the 'development set' context in which we lived.

- 57 One scientist reviewer, a man, said: “Often I was confused because males have so much dominated outside-the-home work life, that I can’t separate the male from the dominant”. This is true, as many scholars have pointed out—what is masculine is what is considered ‘normal’, particularly in these contexts where there are so many more men than women in positions of power and where the subject of concern is a sphere dominated by men and manliness in the global North.
- 58 Although I do see progress, it is important to acknowledge that I also still heard stories in 2019, showing that sexism remains alive and well in the forestry world. We must further analyze and correct the elements of masculinities (and femininities) that reinforce such experiences.
- 59 Bribiescas (2016) notes, “As the importance of physical strength declined [evolutionarily], knowledge and experience took on more central roles in the daily lives of older men” (p. 11).

References

- Anderson, Eric. 2009. *Inclusive Masculinity*. New York: Routledge.
- Arora-Jonsson, Seema. 2009. “Discordant Connections: Discourses on Gender and Grassroots Activism in Two Forest Communities in India and Sweden: Winner of the 2009 Catharine Stimpson Prize.” *Signs* 35 (1):213–240.
- Boylan, Jennifer Finney. 2008. *I’m Looking Through You: Growing up Haunted: A Memoir*. New York: Broadway Books.
- Brandth, Berit, and Marit S. Haugen. 2000. “From Lumberjack to Business Manager: Masculinity in the Norwegian Forestry Press.” *Journal of Rural Studies* 16:343–355.
- Bribiescas, Richard G. 2016. *How Men Age: What Evolution Reveals about Male Health and Mortality*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Chopra, Radhika. 2011. “Local Lives, Global Dialogues: Shifting Discourses of Masculinity in India.” In *Men and Development: Politicizing Masculinities*, edited by Andrea Cornwall, Jerker Edström, and Alan Greig, 139–152. London: Zed Books.
- Clarke, Paula K., and W. Ted Hamilton. 2013. “The Value of Anthropology: Noticing and Challenging the Magic Counting Dragon.” *Anthropology News*:31.
- Colfer, Carol J. Pierce. 1983. “On Communication Among ‘Unequals’.” *International Journal of Intercultural Communication* 7:263–283.
- Colfer, Carol J. Pierce. 2005. *The Complex Forest: Communities, Uncertainty, and Adaptive Collaborative Management*. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future/CIFOR. book manuscript.
- Colfer, Carol J. Pierce. 2006. *Vignettes from a Year in Borneo: Local People and Conservation*. Lulu.com.
- Colfer, Carol J. Pierce. 2013. “The Ups and Downs of Institutional Learning: Reflections on the Emergence and Conduct of Adaptive Collaborative Management at the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR).” In *Adaptive Collaborative Approaches in Natural Resource Governance*, edited by Hemant Ojha, Andy Hall, and Rasheed Sulaiman V, 48–101. London: Routledge.
- Colfer, Carol J. Pierce, Bimbika Sijapati Basnett, and Markus Ihalainen. 2018. “Making Sense of ‘Intersectionality’: A Manual for Lovers of People and Forests.” *CIFOR Occasional Paper* 184:40.
- Colfer, Carol J. Pierce, Reed L. Wadley, Emily Harwell, and Ravi Prabhu. 2001. “Assessing Intergenerational Access to Resources: Using Criteria and Indicators in West Kalimantan, Indonesia.” In *People Managing Forests: The Links Between Human Well-Being and Sustainability*, edited by Carol J. Pierce Colfer and Yvonne Byron, 190–213. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future.

- Colfer, Carol J. Pierce, Reed L. Wadley, and Enis Widjanarti. 1996. "Using Indigenous Organizations from West Kalimantan." In *Indigenous Organisations and Development*, edited by D. Michael Warren, Peter Blunt, and David Marsden, 228–238. London: Kegan Paul International.
- Colfer, Carol J. Pierce, Joe Woelfel, Reed L. Wadley, and Emily Harwell. 2001. "Assessing People's Perceptions of Forests: Research in West Kalimantan, Indonesia." In *People Managing Forests: The Links Between Human Well-Being and Forests*, edited by Carol J. Pierce Colfer and Yvonne Byron, 135–154. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future.
- Connell, R. W. 1995. *Masculinity*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Dove, Michael R. 1999. "Representations of the 'Other' by Others: The Ethnographic Challenge Posed by Planters' Views of Peasants in Indonesia." In *Transforming the Indonesian Uplands: Marginality, Power and Production*, edited by Tania Murray Li, 203–229. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Harwood Academic Publishers.
- Eriksen, C. 2013. *Gender and Wildfire: Landscapes of Uncertainty*. New York: Routledge.
- Fine, Cordelia. 2010. *Delusions of Gender: How Our Minds, Society and Neurosexism Create Difference*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.
- Fowler, Cynthia. 2012. *Ignition Stories: Indigenous Fire Ecology in the Indo-Australian Monsoon Zone*. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.
- Freeman, Derek. 1979. "Severed Heads that Germinate." In *Fantasy and Symbol*, edited by R. H. Hook, 233–246. London: Academic Press.
- Hancock, Graham. 1989. *Lords of Poverty*. London: MacMillan (A Mandarin Paperback).
- Harding, Sandra. 2004. "A Socially Relevant Philosophy of Science? Resources from Standpoint Theory's Controversiality." *Hypatia* 19 (1):25–46.
- Hearn, Jeff. 2011. "Gender Regimes Changing Men or Men Changing Gender Regimes? Challenges for National and Transnational Social Policy, Gender Equality and Organizing with Men." In *Men and Development: Politicizing Masculinities*, edited by Andrea Cornwall, Jerker Edström, and Alan Greig, 155–169. London: Zed Books.
- Hempenstall, Peter. 2017. *Truth's Fool: Derek Freeman and the War Over Cultural Anthropology*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Hendriks, Thomas. 2014. "Race and Desire in the Porno-tropics: Ethnographic Perspectives from the Post-colony." *Sexualities* 17 (1/2):213–229.
- Hendriks, Thomas. 2017. "A Darker Shade of White: Expat Self-making in a Congolese Rainforest Enclave." *Africa* 87 (4):683–701. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0001972017000316>.
- Katila, Saija, and Susan Meriläinen. 1999. "A Serious Researcher or Just Another Nice Girl?: Doing Gender in a Male-Dominated Scientific Community." *Gender, Work and Organization* 6 (3).
- Katila, Saija, and Susan Meriläinen. 2002. "Metamorphosis: From 'Nice Girls' to 'Nice Bitches': Resisting Patriarchal Articulations of Professional Identity." *Gender, Work and Organization* 9 (3):336–354.
- Killick, Andrew P. 1995. "The Penetrating Intellect: On Being White, Straight and Male in Korea." In *Taboo: Sex, Identity and Erotic Subjectivity in Anthropological Fieldwork*, edited by Don Kulick and Margaret Willson, 76–106. London and New York: Routledge.
- Li, Tania. 2007. *The Will to Improve—Governmentality, Development, and the Practice of Politics*. Durham: Durham University Press.
- Mabsout, R., and I. Van Staveren. 2010. "Disentangling Bargaining Power from Individual and Household Level to Institutions: Evidence on Women's Position in Ethiopia." *World Development* 38 (5):783–796.
- McGinley, Ann C. 2004. "Masculinities at Work." *Oregon Law Review* 83 (2):359–434.

- Merrill-Sands, Deborah. 1997. “1997 CGIAR Human Resources Survey: International Staffing at the CGIAR Centers with a Focus on Gender.” *CGIAR Gender Program Working Paper* 15. Washington, DC: CGIAR.
- Moro, Juan Camilo. 2018. *Borneo Dammed*. Middletown, DE: Juan Camilo Moro.
- Pascoe, C. J. 2007. *Dude, You’re a Fag: Masculinity and Sexuality in High School*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Reed, Maureen G. 2003. “Marginality and Gender at Work in Forestry Communities of British Columbia, Canada.” *Journal of Rural Studies* 19:373–389.
- Reed, L. Wadley, and Carol J. Pierce Colfer. 2004. “Sacred Forest, Hunting, and Conservation in West Kalimantan, Indonesia.” *Human Ecology* 32 (3):313–338.
- Reed, L. Wadley, Carol J. Pierce Colfer, Rona Dennis, and Julia Aglionby. 2010a. “The ‘Social Life’ of Conservation: Lessons from Danau Sentarum.” *Ecology and Society* 15 (4).
- Reed, L. Wadley, Carol J. Pierce Colfer, Rona Dennis, and Julia Aglionby. 2010b. “‘Paper Park’ and the Social Life of Conservation: Lessons from Danau Sentarum.” *Borneo Research Bulletin (Special Issue)* 41.
- Saini, Angela. 2017. *Inferior: How Science Got Women Wrong—And the New Research That’s Rewriting the Story*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Yasmi, Yurdi, and Carol J. Pierce Colfer. 2010. “Forestry and Fishery Conflict in Danau Sentarum: Application of an Impairment Approach.” *Borneo Research Bulletin, Special Issue on Danau Sentarum* 41:145–161.
- Yasmi, Yurdi, Carol J. Pierce Colfer, Linda Yuliani, Yayan Indriatmoko, and Valentinus Heri. 2007. “Conflict Management Approaches Under Unclear Boundaries of the Commons: Experiences from Danau Sentarum National Park, Indonesia.” *International Forestry Review* 9 (2):597–609.