

A little more than six years ago, over dinner during an annual meeting of the then new Society for the Study of Culture and Psychiatry, I had an opportunity to discuss with Dr. Edward Foulks the series of events that led to the controversy surrounding the Barrow Alcohol Study. His surprise at the nature and degree of criticism that emanated from so many different sources was still evident. I remember other reactions as well - - confusion, frustration, embarrassment, and some anger. Most of us would have felt, indeed some have felt such emotions when facing similar circumstances. I was deeply impressed by Dr. Foulks' sincerity, intentions, and desire to understand what had transpired. He probably also had a need to bring closure to this chapter of his professional work. We talked late into the night, debating a number of the issues raised by the contributors to this special issue. At the close of our discussion, I suggested that the subject deserved a fuller airing, perhaps in a forum like *Current Anthropology's* "Star Commentary", which is characterized by a principal article, followed by critiques from the field, and closed with a rejoinder. Four years later, as we were about to establish *American Indian and Alaska Native Mental Health Research*, I asked Dr. Foulks if he would consider preparing such a manuscript for publication. Indeed, as it turned out, he had already begun this effort, describing the events in question and analyzing the resulting conflict as a consequence of the misalliance of models among the central participants: hence, the title of his article.

Dr. Foulks has written a remarkable piece. One might have expected a great deal more defensiveness, even bitter attack of his original detractors. Instead, Dr. Foulks provides us with a sensitive and detailed account of his view of this controversy. Without dodging responsibility for some of the problems that ensued, he analyzes the factors that contributed to them in a penetrating fashion. Many of the leading scholars in the Indian/Native mental health field have reacted to his manuscript, offering additional perspectives on the Barrow Alcohol Study, with special emphasis on its ethical and procedural aspects. The result is a fascinating polemic devoid of the diatribe that usually accompanies such debates.

As several of the contributors note, some of the people who were involved in or lived through this ordeal prefer that it not be exhumed. However, a decade has passed and a new generation of young scholars is gradually emerging, many of them Indians and Natives. Birthright and heritage are limited insurance against the commission of similar errors,

particularly when one is pressured to succeed in the academic world at the possible expense of that which is valued among kith and kin. Hopefully, this issue of the journal can serve as a valuable reminder of these tensions and can encourage us to continue to struggle with the accommodations that both demand.

Spero M. Manson, Ph.D.
Editor-in-Chief