Introduction

Sam Beck

This issue forms the second of a two-part issue focused on Public Anthropology (Beck and Maida 2009). In this second part, the articles by Judith Goode, Udi Mandel Butler, Raul Acosta and Billie Jean Isbell continue the discussion of Public Anthropology and provide examples of a specific form of something I am calling Critical Applied Anthropology. What I had in mind in developing a Special Issue on Public Anthropology is a deepening and expansion of Public Anthropology beyond that which is text-based. Although, for most anthropologists, inside and outside the academy, the text is a prerequisite upon which professional advancement is based and hence inevitable, the non-text-based acts of public anthropology are not and most of the time are dismissed.

If we can agree that anthropological fieldwork is an act of intervention, then it should easily follow that anthropologists in the field ought to have goals, objectives and strategies (agenda) that determine what these interventions should look like and be sensitive to their impact in- context and more widely. This is not only an aspect of the methodology or technique in carrying out fieldwork but very much about anthropological theory, method and ethics. I want to emphasize the idea 'in-context' since participant observation is a dialogic process, not objective and not value free. It necessitates a continual process of reflection and reflective practice that acknowledges the act of knowledge production as dialectically produced, based on a partnership or collaboration between the researcher and the researched. From this point of view, the notion of 'researched' is no longer a viable concept since, by design, the researched in non-text-based public anthropology are understood to have expertise of their own, an expertise that in the normal carrying out of research the anthropologist is looking to extract.

It is not by coincidence that others are exploring the non-textual component of anthropological research. Marcus, in a recent AIA issue pointed out that 'It is on ethnography's frontiers or edges of contemporary application, where anthropologists are redefining the time-space and practical boundaries of their projects in multiple theatres of reception, that basic questions of scale, function, purpose and ethics are being asked anew' (2008: 48). Marcus made a vital point when observing a shift in ethnography, away from the study of culture and toward the process of knowledge production (ibid. 52). This a recognition that ethnography is a multi-sited field, a context in which indigenous people are now the partners in the ethnographic project, not merely the object of research as under normal anthropological circumstances. In some ways, this has always been the case since 'informants' were necessary in producing ethnographic constructs, although informants only became part of story development or mentioned in acknowledgements. Now they bring themselves forward.

Early on in her article, Goode refers to a contradiction inherent in public anthropology. This is 'the drive to raise the worth of disciplinary expertise and stake a claim to authority in the world of policy elites' and simultaneously 'cogently offer critiques of the very institutions which are gatekeepers for public knowledge'. The solution is to reframe issues to make them

more palatable and jargon free, to ask questions that are shaped by the kinds of questions the public is asking while at the same time tutor the public to understand the complexities of political economy better, and how they are manifested and experienced at the local level. Goode's article is at once autobiographical and reflexive, but also provides a developmental chronology of anthropology as she experienced it in the U.S. with a focus on power relations. She emphasizes that the forces of invisible power relations must be brought to the surface in the growth of public anthropology.

To illustrate this important point, I refer to a story told recently to my students by my colleague, Roman Catholic priest Jim O'Shea. He told them the story of a village located next to a river where, one day, villagers found bodies floating by. They started to pull them out to revive the people or bury them. However, the number of bodies floating downstream continued to grow in number and became so numerous, it was impossible to pull out all of them. One person halted the others and asked everyone else in the village to reconsider this situation because they were spending night and day pulling out bodies, neglecting all else. He said, instead of pulling out the bodies let's find out why the bodies are being put into the river in the first place. What is it that is going on upstream?

Butler discusses the work being carried out in Rio de Janeiro in which a dialogical anthropology was used as a plan of action in working with young *favela* residents. He points out the unequal power relationship inherent in this kind of work, but instead of leaving it at that he points us towards reflection, not reflexivity, in this case, but in-context 'self-reflection' in which collaborative partners are sentient of the power relations in the process. This kind of public anthropology, then, is as much about process as it is about products, and if process is taken to central stage then it is necessary to pay much closer attention to it and identify it as also a 'product'. In this sense, the partners in

a project are members of one part of the public that anthropology engages. By not recognizing this, Butler points out, we 'may limit not only the kinds of anthropological products made but may also constrain the possibilities of dialogue with those we research'. This, of course, is riskier business than the more extractive forms of anthropological research or using the pretence of an objective and value-free approach.

As Butler points out, it is about fifty years since Sol Tax encouraged making anthropological knowledge useful to those being studied to 'solve a problem *and* to learn something in the process', coining the term 'action anthropology'. This kind of public anthropology, as is true for 'advocacy' forms, provides the context for a Freireian type of liberatory anthropology. Under such conditions the research enterprise also becomes an instrument for community organizing. Maida's (2009) article on participatory research in Pacoima, in part one of this issue, provides a good example of this kind of work.

Acosta, in this part, discusses an example of action and advocacy anthropology and points out the importance of the process-as-product feature of collaborative knowledge production in public anthropology. He states that under conditions of advocacy networks, in which 'stakeholders from contrasting backgrounds' highlight 'intercultural challenges, anthropologists can help explain current relations and processes within fluid structures in order to improve their practices and results'. This not only entails the role of the anthropologist as translator or interpreter but as mediator as well. He uses the notion of the map, and mapping as a product and metaphor, as a key in facilitating successful interchanges among stakeholders. This puts public anthropologists into the position of creating and interpreting such maps with their informants. In Acosta's words, 'This entails that the analyses and deductions stemming from anthropological observations provide an understanding of the complexities of dialogues, linkages and relations across cultural practices, histories and contexts'. Such 'maps'

and mapping processes help to establish social solidarity among participants whose diversity may not necessarily produce common interests, but who may come to share a common discourse and values in the course of producing maps. One central feature in collaborative knowledge production is a vigilant levelling of power within the working group in which the anthropologist is one member, especially difficult when group membership is dynamic, fluid and in constant change. As Fischer points out, 'collaboration itself is an intense field of political competition for resources, status, and power' (2009: 228). According to Acosta, 'In an evolution of democratic ideals and practice, advocacy networks are reclaiming the public sphere for citizens of different backgrounds and places'. Acosta echoes Marcus by observing that as anthropology moves into the public sphere, it moves advocacy networks into new terrain 'by forcing governments and society at large to take them seriously, while avoiding becoming static institutions. By mapping their actions and interactions, we [anthropologists] are not merely describing spaces and relations between their components, but also helping to shape them'.

Isbell complements Goode's autobiographical analysis of theory and method developments over her anthropological career, providing a biography of what must be one of the longest research projects carried out by Cornell University anthropologists, a total of over 50 years. It is instructive to understand the initial project as a consequence of the Cold War in which the United States saw itself in competition for the hearts and minds of those areas of the world that were perceived as underdeveloped. This went hand-in-hand with efforts that started well before the Second World War to increase agricultural production in different parts of the world. The colonization and expropriation of indigenous lands generated the Vicos hacienda in Peru where 'Seventeen hundred serfs who were close to starvation were listed in the lease as chattel'. Vicos was identified as the re-

search site in 1949, perceived as 'isolated' and needing 'modernization' through the diffusion of agricultural techniques and 'democratic' constructs supplied by the US-based University. Cornell purchased the hacienda with the intent of returning the land to the indigenous population of this mountain region. Due to the increase in potato production, after the introduction of 'improved varieties, chemical fertilizers and insecticides' and after 'ten years of commercialization of production' (Isbell, this issue), Vicos purchased the hacienda. Cornell left in 1966.

Isbell identifies as a major project contribution 'that it made the conditions of subjugation of the hacienda system visible to a larger public'. However, it is not clear that such visibility generated any changes. By today's ethics, this project was flawed from the outset. Yet, it does need to be understood within its own historical context, the hegemony of modernization theory at the time and the assumptions that scientific research could be carried out on people who had little power without their consent. Stein's work, according to Isbell, concluded that while life for Vicosinos improved, perhaps prolonging the lives of some, their regional integration declined. It seems that from this perspective the project was successful. The larger forces, conditions and processes at work in Peru left indigenous people in states of underdevelopment and subjugated them to exploitation, locally, regionally, nationally and transnationally. Still, Vicosinos were able to develop a democratization of sorts in their self-determination capacities and by 'being politically aggressive outside of Vicos', although it will remain unclear whether this was linked with the Vicos project, or with the wider forces of change that were underway during the life of the project.

Academic work is about knowledge production and furthering our collective understanding of the realities we face and engage. Of course, anthropology is very much part of the academy as it is generally represented in universities and it is here that 'pure research' is

carried out. While this is a necessary function of the work for which universities are responsible, we are at present facing dramatic global changes, and enduring intransigent issues that seem irresolvable. Producing knowledge only for knowledge's sake is no longer enough, if it ever was. We require a global effort, one that moves anthropology beyond the production of texts alone and encourages anthropologists to collaborate and participate with people 'they study' in bringing about the changes that the people feel need to be made. This does not necessarily mean that the anthropologist is now working for such people, but instead it means that they are working *with* them, using their expertise to inform the decisions being made by people using their indigenous knowledge. In German, there is a word which is difficult to translate, *mitmachen* (participating together), that comes close to the methodology necessary for a public ethnographic project to take place. Each of the articles in this Special Issue on Public Anthropology sought to do that by participating with people and their communities to bring about change, advocate on their behalf and, when possible, mediate between institutions and local populations and among diverse members of an action collaboration or network, as well as to develop more generalisable knowledge. In Isbell's final words (and also see Boyer 2008 who discusses this point well), 'time and again we have learned that 'the natives' have a lot to teach us and the best innovations come from collaboration between users and sources of research …'.

References

Beck, S. (2009), 'Introduction: Public Anthropology' [Introduction to Special Two-part Issue on Public Anthropology: Part One], *Anthropology in Action* 16, no. 2 (summer): 1–13.

Boyer, D. (2008), 'Thinking through the Anthropology of Experts', *Anthropology in Action* 15, no. 2 (summer): 38–46.

Fischer, M. J. (2009), 'Emergent Forms of Life in Corporate Arenas', in *Ethnography and the Corporate Encounter: Reflections on Research in and of Corporations,* (ed.) M. Cefkin (New York: Berghahn Books), 227–228.

Maida, C. (2009), 'Expert and Lay Knowledge in Pacoima: Public Anthropology and an Essential Tension in Community-based Participatory Action Research', *Anthropology in Action* 16, no. 2 (summer): 14–26.

Marcus, G. E. (2008), 'Collaborative Options and Pedagogical Experiment in Anthropological Research on Experts and Policy Processes', *Anthropology in Action* 15, no. 2 (summer): 47–57.