Introduction: Public Anthropology

Sam Beck

Cornell University

What if we use theory and method to benefit the people we study and with whom we partner to develop an increasingly just world in which inequities are reduced and all people may believe in their ability to reach their potentials by having access to resources that are more or less equally available, distributed and accessible? Each in her or his way, the contributors to this 'Special Issue on Public Anthropology' provide example trajectories which move anthropologists in this direction.

In responding to an article on public sociology by Burawoy (2005), Aranowitz indicated the importance of public engagement and its origins based on a discourse of the 'public' in participatory democracy. While we are far from reaching what appears to be a utopian dream, there are anthropologists who are working towards such a goal. Little disagreement appears within the discipline about the aim of anthropology as an intellectual discipline constructed to benefit humankind, an issue most recently broached by a number of people engaged in thinking about 'public scholarship' in general (Mitchell 2008).

Despite periodic deviations that move anthropology away from its tacit ethical centre, anthropology in the first part of the twenty-first century has returned to constructing an intellectual discipline that is not only concerned with historical processes, political economic forces and conditions, or discourse analysis, but in addition involves itself in shaping the direction of present and future domestic and international politics; activist agendas of local communities; the general public's deeper understanding of sociocultural, eco-

nomic and political issues; and conflict and misunderstanding between and among societies through mediation. The intent of this issue is to provide a roadmap for anthropologists seeking a larger role in society that we can name 'Public Anthropology'. Very much like any concept, there is no one definition that limits this idea's meaning. Public anthropology is fertile ground for anthropologists to explore opportunities for involvement and engagement inside and outside the discipline, and inside and outside their objects of research. What all share is the idea that local groups and communities should be able to control their own well-being and quality of life with the sophistication of corporate or governmental institutions. Central to this work is a method that takes us away from a solely enquiry-based methodology and towards one that is dialogic and change oriented.¹ This is an anthropology that requires people at the local level to be full participants in research and publications. Cammarota put it this way: 'the researcher is consistently changing his or her questions and perspectives via the collective input of community members, while the community learns through the researcher's involvement' (2008: 46). Knowledge, in this approach, becomes a public good in its 'orientation and application that furthers the general vitality of the marginalized community' (2008: 48). Moreover, ethics here, as Pels noted, is not something that is tacked on, but is 'internal to our research' (2005: 96).

The thrust and movement towards connecting anthropology to real world contexts, conditions and processes occur episodically

in the history of the discipline and though we can make linkages to produce a linear history which demonstrates the formation of a 'tradition' for and of a public anthropology, by doing only this we miss the very nature of what is pressing anthropology into the public domain at this particular moment. Borofsky and others in academic circles have defined the public anthropologist as one who 'engages issues and audiences beyond today's self-imposed disciplinary boundaries' (2000; reproduced in his Public Anthropology website) by writing, publishing or speaking in public media. Many other anthropologists use public anthropology's theories and methods in a broader sense that reach beyond the academic form of public anthropology. Borofsky put the focus 'on conversations with broad audiences about broad concerns'.² Cox perceives public anthropology 'to be an anthropology of the public that disrupts the traditional academy-community dichotomy by locating the intellectual and political strategies necessary to effectively address social concerns with the dialogues that occur in the public sphere as well as in disciplinary based discussions – loosening the hinged border that artificially separate the two' (2009: 53). Her position radicalizes Borofsky's understanding of public anthropology. Yet both perspectives, for me, are not enough. I believe that public anthropology must include not only or just conversations, dialogues or discussions.³ The articles in this Special Issue are a start of a larger project that seeks to demonstrate how far the reach of a broad Public Anthropology presently exists in the discipline. This is a sign of vigour in anthropology because this kind of anthropology breaks down the barriers that isolate anthropologists in a discourse limited to themselves.

I follow Burawoy's inclusive direction for 'public sociology' by advocating for a public anthropology among other anthropologies.⁴ It is not as if anthropology, academic anthropology ('professional' in Burawoy's terms) in particular, has ever been independent of publics. The

discipline never existed and at present cannot exist without publics.⁵ Field and Fox asserted that 'most anthropology has been "engaged" and public in intention' (2007: 4). This is particularly true, at least since the Second World War, as the mission of the academy changed dramatically and as universities increasingly were penetrated by what Giroux called the 'military-industrial-academic complex' (2007) and pernicious 'audit culture' (Strathern 2000). This is not to assert that the academic and universities were ever independent of publics (see Bender 1997, Boren 2001). However, it is with which publics, how and with what intensity public engagement occurs that defines a public anthropology and differentiates it from other anthropological practices, theories and methods. And this is something for which anthropology must account. Moreover, the discipline must recognize it as a central component of professional practice and not allow it to be marginalized as applied anthropology had been, similarly locking out public anthropologists as somehow less valued, and forcing their sub-discipline like a minority position to reinvent itself, perhaps by creating a 'Public Anthropology Association'. Nor should anthropology place public anthropology within a stratified, hierarchical division of labour in the discipline, a condition against which Singer warned us (2000).

In her work as an employee of a Detroit homeless shelter for young women, with whom she identifies as being involved in the same struggle and with whom she worked, Cox indicates that the young women 'have shown me one way to explode public anthropology to accommodate co-theorising and co-authorship through performance' (2009: 60). Smith's notions complement those identified by Cox. Her approach moves research into the hands of those we normally research (2007). Her work entailed working with her own people, the Maori of New Zealand. She critiques Western knowledge production and suggests research based on developing indigenous people's re-

search capacities, with outsiders invited to participate in research that the people identify and determine – a very different sort of public anthropology. This kind of research confirms the capacity and power of local-level knowledge production, legitimizing people's own perceptions of their culture.

The American Anthropology Association (AAA) did recognize public anthropology in a unique way in the November 1986 amended 'Principles of Professional Responsibility', first adapted by the Council of the American Anthropological Association in May 1971 (see <http://www.aaanet.org/stmts/ethnstmnt.htm>), which claimed public engagement as a central tenet of what anthropologists were ethically obliged to do.

Public anthropology has implications for theory, method and methodologies. The controversy that brewed regarding the engagement of anthropology with military purposes is an example (see Glenn 2007, Griffin 2007, Vine 2007), one that is, in many ways, not so new (Wolf and Jorgensen 1970, Price 2005; also see Wakin 1992). How anthropologists participated in the Vietnam War anticipated what is now happening in the Middle East and Central Asia. This particular issue raises into relief a set of values, professional practices and ethical principles that members of the American Anthropology Association share.

The discipline is reawakening central issues regarding what anthropology and anthropologists stand for. This is presently expressed through controversy and conflict over the role of a few anthropologists involved in the wars associated with oil sources and delivery routes (Gonzalez 2004, 2007; Price 2005, 2007). Some might argue that this is a form of public anthropology.⁶

Until recently, anthropologists accepted without question a shared ethical stance regarding the relationship between anthropologists and vulnerable populations. We accepted the idea that 'Anthropologists must respect, protect and promote the rights and the wel-

fare of all those affected by their work' (see the American Anthropology Association's Code of Ethics). At present, we are conflicted because nationalism, expressed as patriotism, brought some anthropologists to position themselves as participants in what they might consider a 'just war', or understand the work in which they are engaged as protecting vulnerable Western, especially American, interests.⁷

Anthropologists study processes and issues affecting general human welfare and conditions. It is safe to say that not all anthropologists do this, especially where contractual arrangements may vitiate the ethical stance quoted above. This is not to say that other practitioners of anthropology, who do not see themselves as applied anthropologists, are 'pure' in the work they do, especially when carrying out fieldwork, as they generate the data they use to increase their credibility in the discipline. I can safely say that many of us often work in grey areas, even when we try hard to protect and safeguard 'our people'.

The AAA backed away from forms of ethical engagements with 'research populations'. In 1986 the AAA statement on ethics was an expression of what was deemed essential to the practice of anthropology that had moral implications. 'In research, anthropologists' paramount responsibility is to those they study. When there is a conflict of interest, these individuals must come first. Anthropologists must do everything in their power to protect the physical, social and psychological welfare and to honor the dignity and privacy of those studied' (www.aaanet.org/stmts/ethstmnt.htm; 1986). The first section, 'Relations with those studied', of the 'Statement of Ethics; Principles of Professional Responsibility' (AAA 1986) states: 'Every effort should be exerted to cooperate with members of the host society in the planning and execution of research projects'. Moreover, section 2: 'Responsibility to the public' is central to the importance of a public anthropology. I quote it here in full because it most likely eludes most anthropologists. I con-

sider it to be central to professional practice: research, teaching and, in university parlance, outreach:

Anthropologists are also **responsible** [my emphasis] to the public – all presumed consumers of their professional efforts. To them they **owe a commitment** [my emphasis] to candor and to truth in the dissemination of their research results and in the statement of their opinions as students of humanity.

- a. Anthropologists should not communicate findings secretly to some and withhold them from others.
- b. Anthropologists should not knowingly falsify or color their findings.
- c. In providing professional opinions, anthropologists are responsible not only for their content but also for integrity in explaining both these opinions and their bases.
- d. As people who devote their professional lives to understanding people, anthropologists bear a **positive responsibility** [my emphasis] to contribute to an 'adequate definition of reality' upon which public opinion and public policy may be based.
- e. In public discourse, anthropologists should be honest about their qualifications and cognizant of the limitations of anthropological expertise.

These statements of anthropological ethics obviously implicate public anthropology. However, the 1998 approved Code of Ethics of the AAA was much less prescriptive. It did address the issue in section C under Research, 'Responsibility to the public'. I quote in full.

1. Anthropological researchers should make the results of their research appropriately available to sponsors, students, decision makers, and other non anthropologists. In so doing, they must be truthful; they are not only responsible for the factual content of their statements but also must consider carefully the social and political implications of the information they disseminate. They must do everything in their power to ensure that such information is well understood, properly contextualized, and responsibly utilized. They should make clear the empirical bases upon which their reports stand, be candid about

their qualifications and philosophical or political biases, and recognize and make clear the limits of anthropological expertise. At the same time, they must be alert to possible harm their information may cause people with whom they work or colleagues.

2. **Anthropologists may choose to move beyond disseminating research results to a position of advocacy. This is an individual decision, but not an ethical responsibility** [my emphasis]. (<http://www.aaanet.org/committees/ethics/ethcode.htm>)

This shift indicates that professional ethics are a reflection of their historical context, but also that the field in the US moved to an individualization of ethics. I find the last statement in the AAA ethics quoted above to be overly cautious and a move away from the prescriptions that followed the Vietnam War and the involvement of anthropologists. Many anthropologists refer to the centrality of advocacy in their practice because advocacy supports the idea of making the voices of the voiceless, vulnerable, socioculturally marginalized and politically and economically silenced heard. Scheper-Hughes took an even stronger position in her article on a more militant anthropology. She asked, 'What makes anthropology and anthropologists exempt from the human responsibility to take an ethical (and even a political) stand on the working out of historical events as we are privileged to witness them?' (1995: 411). Or, at least, anthropologists often see their work as mediating and making cultures understandable to each other.

I have always thought of this as an anthropological principle, an ethical stance. I also understand this to be a stance of advocacy, an observation made by Harries-Jones (1985), perhaps even 'activist'.⁸ He said, 'the revelations of advocacy are usually those of making the socially invisible, observable; that is, by reframing the relation of the audience to their social surroundings' (1985: 227). In this sense, I suggest that advocacy is inherent in much of the anthropology that is carried out by academic anthropologists. And if this is so, the

AAA should develop an ethical stance for this part of our practice and not leave it as 'an individual decision'. Lamphere (2003) suggests that graduate students, as they develop their research proposals, should include statements about the implications their research will have for the population being studied. Her position articulates an idea that moves graduate study and eventual professional work at least towards the consideration that research has an impact on the people studied.

The movement away from ethical prescriptions for advocacy also distances the work that anthropologists carry out as 'activists', something increasingly disciplined by university administrators. The disassociation of advocacy, activist and even participatory anthropology has a silencing impact through which conformity results, instead of innovation. Sansom added that:

in anthropology [canons of disciplinary practice] is an empty category. What we have is non-canonical practice: work conducted by individual practitioners each of whom works on his/her own cognizance. At workshops in applied anthropology we thus seem to be trying to alter the situation and find remedies for solitude and the onus of personal rather than professional responsibility of anthropological endeavor, especially in those instances where anthropological representations are not merely academic but representations that are made to a purpose and so count as acts of advocacy. (1985: 4)

Wallman (1985) points to an inconsistency in participant-observation. It contradicts any idea of anthropological neutrality and distance. Anthropological practice is by its very nature involved; the people being researched are also a 'public'.⁹ In responding to Scheper-Hughes (1995), Harris remarked that Tylor identified anthropology as 'essentially a reformer's science ... active at once in aiding progress and in removing hindrance' (Lowie 1938: 83, cited in Harris 1995: 424).

We should not be surprised that 'engaged anthropologists' are more apt to be involved

in the public sphere as writers (Eriksen 2006). This is what we do as academicians. We carry out our research and hopefully we teach it, write about it and publish it. The issue that Eriksen addresses in his book is anthropology's invisibility in the public sphere. In the first few pages of his well-conceived book he provides a short history of engagement and remarks that engagement took place as an aspect of the development of science for public consumption in the nineteenth century based in museums. This was the period in which British imperialism reigned and agrarian political economy gave way to industrialization and urbanization particularly in the West. This was also the period of American imperialism, one that continues to this day.¹⁰

It is no coincidence that the Royal Anthropological Institute in London was founded in 1871, nor that the U.S. Bureau of Ethnology was established in 1879.¹¹ The academic world at this time had not segmented itself as it did in the twentieth century, with the specializations of various sorts splitting off and creating self-referential languages, jargons and discourses. Academicians and public scholars outside the academy mixed and mingled and engaged in discourses that cut across disciplinary boundaries. Of particular importance is that academics, including explorers, found access to a lay audience through public print media, presentations and debates. We should not be surprised that those at the margins of the academic discipline could be responsible for greater experimentation and innovation. This fits the ecological principles associated with frontiers or margins.

Eriksen notes that a 'culture war' was fought on two fronts between the two world wars. One was 'against ethnocentric supremacism'. The other was 'against biological determinism' (2006: 5). In the United States, Mead, Benedict and Boas of course were iconic notables in these wars, but also Montague (1951) and Benedict (1946) sought to make the cultures of enemies available to the U.S. government

as well as to the general public by founding Columbia University's Research in Contemporary Cultures (Mead 2000; Mead and Metraux 2000; Mead, Rickman and Gorer 2001). Each of these issues has remained central to Western discourses tied to colonial, neo-colonial, imperial and neo-imperial forces. Clearly these wars are not over, either in physical conflicts or in the arena of public discourse. Recently, the AAA stepped into the fray with its own public, award-winning project on 'Race'.

As far as writing is concerned, Eriksen believes that after the Second World War anthropology began to withdraw from the public. I am uncomfortable with this notion since there are too many notable exceptions, for example Claude Levi-Strauss, Marvin Harris, Edmund Leach, Colin Turnbull, David Maybury-Lewis, Janet Siskind, Oscar Lewis, Elenore Smith Bowen, Marjorie Shostak, Clifford Geertz, Eric Wolf, and many more who have written for the public. Gonzalez asserted the following, 'Today few anthropologists could be considered celebrities in the United States, but that does not mean that none speak to the public' (2004: 2). Furthermore, he said, 'There is a wide range of projects under way to disseminate anthropology within the United States' (ibid.). Beeman (1987) advocated for the role of anthropology in the print media. He stressed: 'Questions that anthropologists can address with some effectiveness exist on three levels of abstraction. The first level addresses overt questions – questions that the public is asking openly. The second level deals with unspoken questions. The third, and most difficult, deals with anticipated questions' (Beeman 2001: 2).

In a recent issue, the *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* editorial team wrote in its 'Introductory Note' that 'the field [Anthropology and Education] is becoming more, not less activist in orientation and practice' (2008: 1). This is an intriguing declaration that may point us towards learning which aspects of the anthropological discipline are more or less activist. It seems to me that anthropology and

education do not stand alone. Medical anthropology, archaeology, and visual anthropology are strong candidates within the discipline that worked on a public anthropology agenda early on and became increasingly activist and participatory.

A public anthropology has earlier antecedents. Chambers mentions that in 1838 professional anthropologists were involved in the Aboriginal Protection Society in London and that the Women's Anthropological Society, established in 1885, supported housing improvements for Washington, DC's poor (1989: 20, see also Schensul and Schensul 1978). Mediating between clients (in an applied anthropology sense) and subjects has had an advocacy twist to it. On the extreme end of advocacy falls the Vicos Project, carried out by Holmberg and other Cornell University anthropologists (Holmberg 1962 Ross 2005). The project became a landowner with the peasantry. Eventually the peasants took control over the land. Sol Tax engaged in 'action anthropology' in the Fox Indian Project (1958), perhaps more aptly referred to as 'activist anthropology' in as much as 'the anthropologist must operate within the framework of goals and activities initiated by groups seeking to direct the course of their own development' (Chambers 1989: 22). The work at the Hispanic Health Council in Hartford, Connecticut, exemplifies participatory, action, advocacy and activist forms of anthropology by having communities participate as co-investigators of their own communities, advocating for change, and activist as the distinction between 'researcher' and 'client' is radically blurred.

Writing for or speaking to a broad, general public is not the only means for carrying out public anthropology. Sanday coined 'Public Interest Anthropology' a decade ago (1998), to which she referred as a paradigm, in Thomas Kuhn's sense, that it is a perspective with its own theory and method made up, according to Sanday, of two trends. The first offers theory and analysis in the service of problem solving

to bring about change. The second is to make anthropology available to the general public. In both instances central to Public Interest Anthropology (PIA) is a dedication to social justice, human rights, in the broadest sense of the term, and democratic principles. While writing as an anthropological public practice is central to Sanday's expression of PIA, it is not the only possibility of practice (see Sanday 2002). Her suggestion to blur the distinction between action (or practice) and theory leaves the door open for research-based action as another sort of public anthropology, a praxis (see Keene and Colligan 2004) that I understand as a dialectic of theory and practice intentionally oriented to bring about change.

This brings us to a relatively new invented approach, really a re-invention, what is referred to as participatory and participatory action research (PAR) (see Greenwood and Levin 1998). This is a research approach that integrates the expertise of the scholar/researcher with local level (indigenous) expertise for the purpose of sociocultural change, political engagement and economic development. While on the face of it, PAR seems simple to apply, its implementation generates all sorts of contradictions that must be resolved in-context and in-process, as research and action is carried out (Hampshire, Hills, and Iqbal 2005). This is not surprising since this is what most of us do during fieldwork. This type of public anthropology, I dare say any type of public anthropology, must consider knowledge production, rather than knowledge transference, as a dialectical process which uses people's own experiences as a starting point for learning – what Freire (1996, 1997) referred to as an 'open learning paradigm' (see also Giroux 1983, Schoen 1983, Shor and Freire 1986 Beck 2002 2005, 2006).

Additional conceptual and methodological knowledge and skills are needed to implement PAR successfully. The very nature of the relationship created in the mixing of expertise, variously called cooperation, partnership, collaboration, contractual and consultative,

creates methodological questions, more often than not, related to power. What is the work? Who controls the work? Who makes decisions about what data to use? Who does the data analysis? What forms do the products of research take? Who presents the findings and to whom? The rationale for the project itself may be contested unless clear understanding is reached among all participants, an understanding that most likely must be renegotiated over time as things change.

On a positive note, Hemment recently discussed PAR as offering 'a framework through which we can bring critical anthropological insights to collaborative projects with research participants in the field' (2007). As Lyon-Callo and Hyatt suggest 'Through long-term collaborations with community-based activists, engaged ethnographers can contribute to creating a space for the realization of new policies, new subject positions, and the emergence of new political possibilities beyond what the global economy and its neoliberal rationalizations have set for us' (2003: 136).

PAR practitioners do not evade the political side of fieldwork practice or the political consequences of their work. In fact, social change is at least equal to the written product of their practice, usually the goal established by PAR partners (see Wali 2006 as a wonderful example). The tension that is often raised in fieldwork by focusing on the impact the researcher may have on those being studied is part of the methodology used in this kind of public anthropology. The work being carried out by the Chicago Field Museum stands out as an example not only of anthropological praxis, but also the transformation of museum work from a relatively passive approach to one that is activist in design and purpose, another public anthropology effort.

Complemented to PAR, mostly seen as a pedagogical device, is Community Service Learning (see Hyatt 2000. Community Service Learning (CSL) emerged as a pedagogy, research strategy and community engagement vehicle (see

Beck 2002, 2005, 2006, Keene and Colligan 2004). While anthropologists were slow in using the term 'community service learning', the result was that CSL advocates assumed that anthropologists were not involved in this type of anthropological practice and knowledge production. Anthropology certainly was not represented in the CSL literature. This resulted in the silencing of an important trend in our discipline that we can trace back to the very origins of anthropology in the United States (see Hymes 1969). We must also be mindful that this type of work, practice and knowledge production has appeared in other parts of the world, if not by anthropologists by anthropology-like practitioners in earlier historic periods (Cernea 1981, Beck 2002 and grew out of nation-state creation and development whose outcomes are a double-edged sword (see Eriksen in this issue). Take Romania's 'monograph school' developed by Gusti (Cernea 1981) in the inter-war period, whose students represented the political right (Traian Herseni) and the political left (Henri Stahl). CSL today has similar features.

CSL is a way of learning and teaching. The normative approach focuses on service projects that enhance and enrich classroom coursework. A more critical approach focuses on service as the principle device for learning. One goal of CSL is to increase student awareness of civic responsibilities while providing support for a community in need. Pedagogically, service learning provides students with the context and conditions for critical thinking through reflection and empowers students who learn that they too are knowledge producers (see Beck 2002, 2005, 2006). From the perspective of institutional higher learning, CSL is supposed to extend the university into the community in some sort of imagined partnership. In too many cases the relationship is rarely mutually beneficial. Academic interests tend to prevail and community service remains a pedagogy that supports student learning and faculty research interests, rather than community-based

interests and necessities. The exceptions are when the instructor/researcher is a member of the community being engaged.

Keep in mind that the public anthropology movement is not a disciplinary isolate. Enormous pressures brought the academy to express itself through universities and colleges that commit themselves, their faculties and students to community engagement. This is an expression of long-term trends that started in the USA in the 1860s with the development of the Land-Grant system of practical education, research and extension. Pressure, inducement and support continues to come from government, business and foundation sectors with the presence of middle-class families seeking to provide their children the basis for secure futures. This movement towards 'university-community' engagement has support from government and corporations, but clearly for different reasons than progressively minded educators. Inasmuch as higher education produces little of its own funding for research, a dependency relationship exists between universities, foundations and the government, who are able to provide large sums of money and in the process direct research and education agendas. A case in point is the Human Terrain System in which anthropologists were used by the US military. The CSL movement was energized right at the moment neoliberal policies reduced social service expenditures. Volunteerism was to take the place of government support masked by the American ideology of neighbours helping neighbours.

Some Conclusions

Field and Fox insightfully acknowledge that anthropological work has changed and continues to change, and that anthropology must adjust to these changes with new or different research methods, innovate different types of social relationships in research-practice, clarify 'research for whom' and even consider a set of

different 'products' as outcomes of anthropological work that is acceptable and legitimate within and outside of the academy (2007). Change often produces fear. Changes in the discipline and within the academy carry with them dangers and threats. Public anthropology's position within the discipline carries little status. Field and Fox, rightfully point out that at this time involvement in this kind of work among junior academics, who have not secured long-term contractual employment with their institutions, carries with it significant liabilities and may limit opportunities for protected life-long employment. Moreover, when the discipline increases its permeability, it may be threatened by a loss of intellectual integrity and purpose as a separate field of knowledge production. Be this as it may, I believe that public anthropology provides a critical edge at a time when it is sorely needed. Within the academy and, as important, outside it, in what students refer to as the real world. Public anthropology enables more people to enter the field and disperse among diverse professional fields beyond the academy, allowing growth of the discipline at a time of shrinkage, while innovating theory and practice to create change for social, economic and political justice in partnership with those who are most vulnerable.

The Contributions

This issue on Public Anthropology is divided into two parts: the current, summer issue, and the autumn/winter issue that follows. In part one, Maida reflects an important approach in public anthropology that is advocacy, action, activist and participatory in nature. His project uses a dialogic approach to produce texts, generate mutual learning and, importantly, become instrumental in creating change. Maida's analysis of Pacoima, California, provides an example of how a consortium of groups, led by the community group Pacoima Beautiful,

moved to ameliorate a public health problem. He also demonstrates how a public anthropology approach (actually public intellectual because the project was interdisciplinary) can assist in community building. This project is an example of the use of a political, economic and ecological framework to understand the state of California and its relationship to Pacoima, and as a basis of reflecting on the research process itself – an example of 'reflective practice'. Here is an example of what can be done in public anthropology when the concern is less on textual results and more on the empowerment of local people to resolve local issues, using their knowledge in partnership in an engaged consortium, with scientists, social scientists and their students to bring about change. The work accomplished in Pacoima underscores some of the essentials of this type of public anthropology. Some of these are: developing trusting relationships; sharing information; implementing mutual learning strategies through dialogue and by the participation of non-experts in the research itself; developing local level leaders who represent different constituents; recognizing lay people's knowledge and their ability to contribute to the research as equals; including youth development through community service learning and other means as an aspect of community involvement and leadership development; consistent and regular interaction among all consortium members and community leaders; a long-term commitment to carry out the research; and support changes that need to take place to correct injustices as they appear.

Eriksen provides us with a fascinating and revealing account of the relationship between Scandinavian anthropology and the public. In some important ways, Scandinavian anthropologists are public anthropologists by their participation in public discourse. This resulted from the integration of the discipline within the functions of the state, a result of nation-state formation, development and identity creation. According to Eriksen, Scandinavians

have a reading culture in which what academics write influences the public, and public discourse in turn impacts on public politics and government policies. In this sense the boundaries between research and politics are continuously blurred. In his example of Norway, he demonstrates how anthropologists are actively sought out by political parties to inform them on Sami and non-ethno-national (and non-Sami) Norwegian integration policies.

McKenna uses his academic acumen to make visible the disguised relationship between Michigan State University (MSU) in the U.S. and the Dow Chemical Company. In the context of presently existing capitalism, Dow not only successfully penetrated MSU but also the state of Michigan, influencing what is researched. McKenna asserts that as a result of the political pressure Dow was able to unleash MSU allowed itself to be used to become a 'knowledge factory', rather than a place where critical perspectives may innovate. In addition, he declared that education for the market undermines education produced for critical citizenship. The present economic calamity confirms McKenna's position that 'markets do not reward moral behaviour'. Too many contemporary examples exist to contest this idea. Using his own efforts as an example, he advocates for social science praxis that 'demands [an] unrelenting public voice about injustice'. In his public work, he has used various forms of media to make his point, including print, video and film, and public programming.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Marianne A. Cocchini, my companion and colleague, for discussions about the ethics of community work and how to create solidarity with underserved but empowered communities. I thank Carl Maida, a most generous friend and colleague, whose persistence motivated me to do the work and

whose insights continue to enrich me. He is a gentle critic and a helpful editor. I look forward to a long partnership with him. I also want to thank the contributors to this Special Issue for their involvement and stimulating further work in Public Anthropology as we bring the discipline into the twenty-first century. Chris McCourt is the kind of editor and colleague that is sorely needed in our discipline. She is encouraging, supporting, motivating and delightful throughout the process of producing the following insightful articles. Many thanks.

Sam Beck is the Director of the New York City Urban Semester Program of the College of Human Ecology of Cornell University, an ethnographically informed experiential learning programme that facilitates the development and maturation of bright, highly goal oriented students. He has carried out research in a variety of locations: Iran, Yugoslavia, Romania, Germany, Austria, Utah, Providence (Rhode Island) and in New York City. He has worked with migrant workers, peasant workers, US workers, nomadic pastoralists, sedenterizing pastoral nomads, higher education as an institution, artists and students. In his work among the Roma of Romania and then with Cape Verdeans in Providence, his interests moved towards understanding how a social justice agenda may be used to move anthropology towards a more enlightened form of research. At the same time he is interested in developing an anthropology that works with people and organizations who are seeking to bring about changes in their communities and neighbourhoods, and who work to enhance the resources for their communities, especially children and youth, to flourish and reach for their potential. While such communities may be financially poor and ill equipped to enter the highly competitive market economy, it is not enough to refer to them as impoverished. Their wealth is situated in their strong kin ties and social networks and the assets that are linked to well-integrated communities.

Notes

1. This was one of Freire's ideas. The notion here is that there is an inherent relationship between the teacher and student [researcher and the people studied], based on dialogue that informs both. It is egalitarian and democratizing in its very nature (1996).
2. Beeman took a slightly different, alternative decision for media outreach. He addressed the concern in anthropology that the discipline is 'not taken seriously by the world at large' (1987: 2).
3. Cox does understand that 'Public anthropology is, indeed, both intellectually curious and action oriented and, as such erases the lines drawn between scholarship and activism, academy and community' (2009: 54).
4. In multiple publications, Burawoy referred to four aspects of sociology that 'represent an organic division of labor of mutual enrichment' (2004: 10). He said that sociology's public face 'cannot be separated from its professional, policy and critical dimensions' (ibid.).
5. Sansom recognized this. He wrote, 'In the main the discipline has also been self-sustaining, producing its own consumers through also relying on some generalized public support' (1985: 6).
6. I do not take this position. Not only do I consider the Iraq War illegal, I believe in an anthropology that benefits the vulnerable and oppressed and that is committed to working against injustices and for increasing democracy.
7. I do not want to oversimplify a highly complex issue. Those anthropologists who are working in embedded positions in Iraq, Afghanistan and other places make the argument that a better knowledge of the 'people' and their culture will reduce death, injury and destruction. However, such action – research of a people that brings harm to them and producing knowledge that is not publicly circulated – is antithetical to acceptable anthropological ethics and practices.
8. Hale defines activist anthropology as 'the practice [that] ... involves a basic decision to align oneself with an organized group in a struggle for rights, redress, and empowerment and a commitment to produce knowledge in collaboration and dialogue with the members of that group' (2007: 105).
9. Normally, here is where the discourse around 'science' enters the discussion and the matter

of objectivity and value free neutrality are argued. Here is where anthropologists also take a stance regarding how they understand their work as something also embedded in humanistic disciplines in addition to social science or even science.

10. The United States incorporated Texas in 1845 and California in 1850, taking it from Mexico, for example. In 1898, with the Spanish–American War, the United States took control over Puerto Rico and the Philippines. New Mexico was added in 1912. In 1959, Alaska was purchased and Hawaii was seized from the indigenous inheritors of these islands. Imperialist expansion, particularly as part of an economic strategy for political domination, continues unabated.
11. In 1897, the name changed to the Bureau of American Ethnology.

References

- American Anthropology Association 1971, (1986), 'Statements on Ethics: Principles of Professional Responsibility' <www.aaanet.org/stmnts/ethstmnt.htm>.
- 1998, 'Code of Ethics of the American Anthropological Association' <www.aaanet.org/stmnts/ethstmnt.htm>.
- Anthropology and Education Quarterly* editorial team (2008), 'Introductory Note on Activist Educational Anthropology', *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 39, no. 1: 1–2.
- Aronowitz, S. (2005), 'Comments on Michael Burawoy's The Critical Turn to Public Sociology', *Critical Sociology* 31, no. 2: 333–338.
- Beck, S. (2002), 'Radicalizing Anthropology: Community Service Learning', *Special Issue*, (ed.) Sam Beck, *The Anthropology of Work Review* 22, no. 2: 1–5.
- (2005), 'Community Service Learning', *Bulletin of the General Anthropology Division* 12: 1–2.
- (2006), 'Introduction: Experiential Learning, lived Practice and Knowing-in-Action' *Special Issue*, (ed.) Sam Beck, *The Anthropology of Work Review*, 26, no. 2: 1–5.
- Beeman, W. O. (1987), 'Anthropology and the Print Media', *Anthropology Today* 3, no. 3: 2–4.
- (2001), 'Writing for the Crisis', *Anthropology Today* 17, no. 6: 1–3.
- Bender, T. (1997), 'Politics, Intellect, and the American University, 1945–1995', (eds.) T. Bender and

- C. E. Schorske, *American Academic Culture in Transformation: Fifty Years, Four Disciplines* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press), 17–54.
- Benedict, R. (1946), *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese Culture* (Cambridge: Houghton Mifflin).
- Boren, M. E. (2001), *Student Resistance: A History of the Unruly Subject* (New York: Routledge).
- Borofsky, R. (2000), 'Public Anthropology. Where To? What Next?', *Anthropology News* 41, no. 5: 9–10. Reproduced in <<http://www.publicanthropology.org/Defining/publicanth-07Oct10.htm>>.
- Burawoy, M. (2004), 'The Critical Turn to Public Sociology', *Critical Sociology* 31, no. 3: 313–326.
- (2005), 'The World Needs Public Sociology', *Sociologisk tidskrift* 12, no. 3: 255–272.
- Cammarota, J. (2008), 'The Cultural Organizing of Youth Ethnographers: Formalizing a Praxis-Based Pedagogy', *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 39, no. 1: 45–58.
- Cerne, M. (1981), *Rural Community Studies in Rumania* (Oxford: Pergamon Press).
- Chambers, E. (1989), *Applied Anthropology: A Practical Guide* (Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press).
- Cox, A. (2009), 'The BlackLight Project and Public Scholarship: Young Black Women Perform Against and Through the Boundaries of Anthropology', *Transforming Anthropology* 17, no. 1: 51–64.
- Eriksen, T. H. (2006), *Engaging Anthropology: The Case for a Public Presence* (Oxford: Berg).
- Field, L. W. and Fox, R. G. (2007), 'Introduction: How Does Anthropology Work Today?', in *Anthropology Put to Work*, (eds.) L. W. Field and R. G. Fox (Oxford: Berg), 1–19.
- Freire, P. (1996), *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: Continuum).
- (1997), *Pedagogy of Hope: Reliving Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: Continuum).
- Giroux, H. A. (1983), *Theory and Resistance in Education: A Pedagogy for the Opposition*, *Critical Perspectives in Social Theory* (South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey).
- (2007), *The University in Chains: Confronting the Military-Industrial-Academic Complex* (Boulder: Paradigm Publishers).
- Glenn, D. (2007), 'Anthropologists in a War Zone: Scholars Debate Their Role', *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 20 November.
- Gonzalez, R. J. (ed.) (2004), *Anthropologists in The Public Sphere: Speaking Out on War, Peace, and American Power* (Austin: University of Texas Press).
- Greenwood, D. and Levin, M. (1998), *Introduction to Action Research* (London: Sage).
- Griffin, M. B. (2007), 'Research to Reduce Bloodshed', *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 30 November.
- Hale, C. R. (2007), 'In Praise of "Reckless Minds": Making a Case for Activist Anthropology', in *Anthropology Put to Work*, (eds.) L. Field and R. G. Fox (Oxford: Berg) 103–128.
- Hampshire, K., Hills, E. and Iqbal, N. (2005), 'Power Relations in Participatory Research and Community Development: A Case Study from Northern England', *Human Organization* 64, no. 4: 340–349.
- Harries-Jones, P. (1985), 'From Cultural Translator to Advocate: Changing Circles of Interpretation', *Advocacy and Anthropology*, (ed.) R. Pain (Newfoundland, Canada: Institute of Social and Economic Research) 224–248.
- Harris, M. (1995), 'Objectivity and Militancy' [response], *Current Anthropology* 36, no. 3: 423–424.
- Hemment, J. (2007), 'Public Anthropology and the Paradoxes of Participation: Participatory Action Research and Critical Ethnography in Provincial Russia', *Human Organization* 66, no. 3: 301–314.
- Holmberg, A. (1962), 'Community and Regional Development: The Joint Cornell-Peru Experiment', *Human Organization* 17: 12–16.
- Hyatt, S. B. (2000), '"Service Learning"', *Applied Anthropology and the Production of Neo Liberal Citizens*, *Anthropology in Action* 8, no. 1: 7–13.
- Hyatt, S.B. and Lyon-Callo, V. (2003) 'Introduction: Anthropology and Political Engagement', *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural systems and World Economic Development* 32, no. 2: 133–146.
- Hymes, D. (1969), *Reinventing Anthropology* (New York: Random House).
- Keene, A. S. and Colligan, S. (eds.) (2004), 'Service Learning and Anthropology', *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 10, no. 3: 1–7.
- Lamphere, L. (2003), 'The Perils and Prospects for an Engaged Anthropology: A View from the United States', *Social Anthropology* 11, no. 2: 153–168.
- Lowie, R. (1938), *History of Ethnological Theory* (New York: Farrar and Rinehart).
- Lyon-Callo, V. and Hyatt, S. B. (2003), 'Introduction: Anthropology and Political Engagement', *Urban Anthropology* 32, no. 2: 133–146.
- Mead, M. (2000), *And Keep Your Powder Dry* (New York: Berghahn Books).

- Mead, M. and Metraux, R. (2000), *The Study of Culture at a Distance* (New York: Berghahn Books).
- Mead, M., Rickman, J. and Gorer, G. (2001), *Russian Culture*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Mitchell, K. (ed.) (2008), *Practicing Public Scholarship: Experiences and Possibilities Beyond the Academy* (West Sussex, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell).
- Montague, A. (1951), *Statement on Race: An Extended Discussion in Plain Language of the Unesco Statement* (New York: Schuman) <<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o8&d=242476#>>.
- Pain, R. (ed.) (1985), *Advocacy and Anthropology* (Newfoundland, Canada: Institute of Social and Economic Research).
- Pels, P. (2005), "'Where There Aren't No Ten Commandments': Redefining Ethics during the Darkness in El Dorado Scandal', in *Embedding Ethics: Shifting Boundaries of the Anthropological Profession*, (eds.) L. Meskell and P. Pels (Oxford: Berg), 69–99.
- Price, H. D. (2005), 'Anthropology and Total Warfare: The Office of Strategic Services' 1943 "Preliminary Report on Japanese Anthropology"', *Anthropology in Action* 12, no. 3: 12–20.
- Ross, E.B. (2005), 'Vicos as Cold War Strategy: Anthropology, Peasants and "Community Development"', *Anthropology in Action* 12, no. 3: 21–33.
- (2007), 'Buying a Piece of Anthropology, Part 1: Human Ecology and Unwitting Anthropological Research for the CIA', *Anthropology Today* 23, no. 3: 8–14.
- Sanday, P. R. (1998), 'Opening Statement: Defining Public Interest Anthropology', Presented at AAA Symposium, Defining a Public Interest Anthropology, 97th Annual Meetings of the American Anthropological Association. 3 December, Philadelphia, Peggy Reeves Sanday home page, 1–4 <<http://www.sas.upenn.edu/anthro/CPIA/whatispia/pia198.html>>.
- (2002), 'Science and Engagement in Public Interest Anthropology: Lessons from Boas and Bourdieu', AAA Panel: Public and Public Interest Anthropology, New Orleans, 1–6. <<http://www.sas.upenn.edu/anthro/CPIA/PAPERS/sanday.aaa.2002.pdf>>.
- Sansom, B. (1985), 'Canons of Anthropology', in *Advocacy and Anthropology*, (ed.) Paine, R. St. John's, (Newfoundland, Memorial University, Canada: Institute of Social and Economic Research), 3–15.
- Schensul, S. L. and Schensul, J. J. (1978), 'Advocacy and Applied Anthropology', in *Social Scientists as Advocates*, (eds.) G. Weber and G. McCall (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications), 211–219.
- Scheper-Hughes, N. (1995), 'The Primacy of the Ethical: Propositions for a Militant Anthropology', *Current Anthropology* 36, no. 3: 409–428.
- Schoen, D. A. (1983), *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action* (New York: Basic Books).
- Shor, I. and Freire, P. (1986), *A Pedagogy for Liberation: Dialogue on Transforming Education* (Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey Publishers).
- Singer, M. (2000), 'Why I Am Not a Public Anthropologist', *Anthropology News* 41, no. 16: 6–7.
- Smith, T. S. (2007), *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (London: Zed Books).
- Strathern, M. (ed.) (2000), *Audit Cultures: Anthropological Studies in Accountability, Ethics and the Academy* (New York: Routledge).
- Tax, S. (1958), 'The Fox Project', *Human Organization*, 17: 17–19.
- Vine, D. (2007), 'Enabling the Kill Chain', *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 26 November.
- Wakin, E. (1992), *Anthropology Goes to War: Professional Ethics and Counterinsurgency in Thailand* (Madison, WI: Center for Southeast Asian Studies, University of Wisconsin-Madison).
- Wali, A. (2006), *Collaborative Research: A Practical Introduction to Participatory Action Research (PAR) for Communities and Scholars* (Chicago: Field Museum Center for Cultural Understanding and Change).
- Wallman, S. (1985) 'Rules of Thumb' in *Advocacy and Anthropology: First Encounters* (ed) R. Paine, R., St. John's, Newfoundland, Memorial University, Canada Institute of Social and Economic Research. 13–15.
- Wolf, E. R. and Jorgensen, J. G. (1970), 'Anthropology on the Warpath in Thailand', *New York Review of Books*, 19 November.