INTRODUCTION

—✺—

Carl A. Maida and Sam Beck

> But what must anthropology look like if it is to be the study of human free-
> dom and liberation, of human possibility and necessity? It must have a sense
> of shared humanity.
> —Eric R. Wolf, Foreword to Stanley Diamond's *In Search of the Primitive*

The Prospect of Transformational Research for Public Anthropology

For more than a century, anthropologists have been called upon to act as
experts and educators on the nature and lifeways of people worldwide,
and to understand the human condition in broader comparative perspec-
tives. As a discipline, anthropology has been public arbiter, advocate,
and even defender of the cultural integrity, authenticity, and autonomy
of indigenous people across the globe. Public anthropology today fulfills
the discipline's original purpose through ongoing praxis, the dialectical
and polemical relationship of theory and practice, grounding theories in
lived experience and placing empirical knowledge in deeper historical
and comparative frameworks. As such, public anthropology questions its
own culturally based epistemology and is now answering calls to engage
with and give voice to issues of concern to a global public facing natural,
social, economic, and cultural crises. At the same time, public anthropol-
ogists can, and arguably should, act as experts and advocates, critiquing
the oversimplified assertions of politicians, government officials, and the
media, and attempting to redress human problems associated with ineq-
uities and injustices. Public anthropology, then, is anthropology of a crit-
ical nature.

Anthropologists wishing to pursue this approach to improving the
human condition can do so by producing texts, films, and exhibits for

public consumption, and by actively engaging *with* people on the ground to make change through research, education, and political action based on dialogue. Public engagement necessitates choices about how to carry out fieldwork—namely, how we consciously choose those we do research with, together determine our conceptual frames, decide on collaborative research methods, and construct ways of communicating about our work to the appropriate audiences. It also requires careful and critical elucidation of issues needing attention and the people who raise them.

This particular sense of engagement with people in the field (Beck and Maida 2013; Low and Merry 2010) points to Paulo Freire's (1970) important contribution to this vision of public anthropology. We embrace the centrality of what Freire called critical consciousness (*conscientizacao*), which implies raising the consciousness of the educator—the anthropologist, in this case—*and* the public, as their relationship must engage each in dialogue, co-participation, and co-construction. Brian McKenna (2013: 448–449) suggests that Freire's work also overlaps with anthropological engagement practices: "Freire was, in fact, an anthropological educator. He founded an educational movement based, in part, on conducting an ethnographic evaluation of a community to identify the generative themes (or 'dangerous words') which matter profoundly to people and which, for just this reason, contain their own catalytic power." This style of reflexive, engaged practice within anthropology also entails tracing a particular form of history making and understanding both the relationship between anthropology and history on the one hand (Cole and Wolf 1974; Roseberry 1989; Wolf 1982)—notably the global history of capitalism, political expansion, and state power—and the significance of frontiers on the other. Such an approach can be a powerful tool to make the invisible visible, surface assumptions, identify contradictions, and improve possibilities for critical practice.

In this book we advocate a transformational approach to public anthropology. Transformational research shifts consciousness toward recognizing that anthropology provides grounded perspectives on the structural factors and power relationships underlying social and economic disparities in marginalized populations (S. Schensul et al. 2014). This approach, based on principles of personal and group transformation, holds researchers responsible for collaborating with communities and groups to *co-construct* research, thereby enhancing the constituents' ability to carry out subsequent transformational change studies rooted in and shaped by the local community. Defining and securing a satisfactory quality of life for the world's most vulnerable and exposing the market-based commodification of the global natural and cultural commons (Harvey 2011; Nonini 2007) are key priorities of transformational research. Local communities'

responses to macro forces "range from adaptation, social networking, organizing, and coalition building, to various types of resistance" (Hyland and Bennett 2005). Social suffering—that is, the assemblage of human problems caused by inequitable distribution of political, economic, and social power—and the various human responses to the social problems that are subject to these forms of power are central to transformational work (Kleinman, Das, and Lock 1997). A transformational research approach addresses multiple and diverse publics, whether students, academicians, policy makers, the general public, or people and groups encountered in the field, and always accounts for the structures of power and differentiation that facilitate or constrain desired social change.

Public anthropology, then, is fertile ground for anthropological exploration of opportunities for engagement inside and outside both the discipline and the objects of research, with specific reference to transformative change at the individual, group, and societal levels. This volume offers a roadmap for those seeking praxis, a bigger role for anthropological knowledge, and societal action.

The Continuing Debate over Public Anthropology

Calls to connect anthropology to real-world contexts, conditions, and processes have episodically elicited movement in the discipline's history. A history of public anthropology as we frame it is yet to be written. We are more concerned with illuminating the very nature of what is now pressing anthropology to address a wider range of public concerns and nontraditional audiences. Beyond its disciplinary history, anthropology gives ethnographic practice a deep historical dimension that is critical to contextualizing the material world and lived experience as foundational and authentic, and transformative when anthropological knowledge is made public. At the same time, we seek to highlight multiple and different points of view in this project. Whereas Robert Borofsky (2007) defined public anthropology as a field that "engages issues and audiences beyond today's self-imposed disciplinary boundaries," our more specific conception of the term reaches beyond public anthropology as audience for academic knowledge to anthropology as a means to support and bring about positive change. Borofsky focused "on conversations with broad audiences about broad concerns," but public anthropology necessarily includes much more than just conversations and narrowly confined intellectual exchanges: it embraces the co-construction of knowledge, the communication of that knowledge to diverse publics, and as appropriate, various forms of intervention, including political action.

In 2000, Merrill Singer's widely circulated article in *Anthropology News*, titled "Why I Am Not a Public Anthropologist," essentially rearticulated a major disciplinary divide between those who practice applied anthropology and those who do not. We could pose a dichotomy between anthropologists who work in the academy and those who do not, but this would fail to acknowledge that anthropology departments teach applied anthropology and academically employed anthropologists practice application; further, anthropologists employed outside the university may also teach in academic departments. Also misguided, Singer observed, is the notion that "the life of the mind" (scholarly work) and the life of practice (application) are separate, distinct activities. Indeed, some (e.g., S. Schensul 1985) argue that scholarly work is best understood as social "experimentation" (practices) because regardless of whether it is conducted inside or outside of academia, it requires conceptualization, methodology, and results. Anthropology cannot afford a division between research and practice.

Moreover, anthropological knowledge claims and expertise can and do play a significant role in today's civil society and should be acknowledged accordingly. More than 70 percent of the field is employed outside the university, contributing to theory and practices from the vantage points of multiple settings, disciplines, and institutions (Wasson et al. 2012). Anthropologists work in the private, nonprofit, and government sectors. They partake in media discussions, news and editorial writing, filmmaking, performance, criticism, and evaluation. They also engage in policy arenas at local, state, national, and global levels, and many are active players in public policy development. Their perspectives cannot and should not be ignored.

Nevertheless, some sectors of the anthropological academy continue to stigmatize any anthropological work that goes beyond writing published in journal articles and books, or involves policy research, interventions, or other activities besides teaching, publishing, and academic service. However, we tend to concur with Paul Rabinow (2011: 115), who stated "that the social sciences have been linked—and will continue to be linked—in multiple ways with policy and politics for as long as they have been (or are) in existence." In the same vein, Martha Balshem (1993: 134) described false dividing lines within anthropology, such as "theory versus practice, pure science versus human needs, concern versus competencies and intellectual ferment versus practical affairs." These reifications persist, even as universities entreat researchers to produce scholarship that is "engaged with the community," providing expertise for local and broader problem solving and learning at the same time.

Judith Goode (1981: 320) discovered early on that social science was being used "to explain failure" rather than attempting "to contribute to achieving

goals" through a research style bridging academic and problem-solving models, an approach Goode and her students used in their work on the neighborhood movement in Philadelphia. Encouraging students to do socially meaningful work as part of their academic anthropological training can further destigmatize the image of alternative styles of research. The work of the Hispanic Health Council in Hartford, Connecticut, also represents this methodological alternative: community residents collaborate on research and program development, produce common products, and advocate for change, radically blurring the distinction between "researcher" and "client" by design (S. Schensul and Borrero 1982; Singer 2003). The Institute for Community Research, founded in Hartford in 1987 to build model programs in partnership with communities and organizations that promote justice and equity, uses participatory action research to address disparities in health, education, and culture (J. Schensul 2005).

Public anthropology plays a crucial role in responding to pressing issues; however, it need not, as Singer implied, serve merely as an academic vehicle that dismisses or supplants applied anthropology. Across the discipline, anthropologists will have to engage in an anthropological praxis that makes their own position in society a part of professional practice, not just a function of self-reflection or reflexivity. This position is especially controversial for academic anthropology, as it questions the very basis of what the academy understands as professional social science research (McKenna 2010). However, to agree that anthropology is neither objective nor value-free is to acknowledge that fieldwork can be an act of intervention as well as interpretation and thus warrants use of a conceptual framework that understands the nature of such interventions and interpretations, and is sensitive to their broader impacts. By its very name, public anthropology recognizes something about the anthropologist's social position, the nature of the work, and the forces, ideas, and processes that inform this disciplinary construct. If anthropology is a form of knowledge production, the question remains: "Knowledge for whom and for what purpose?" In response, the discipline can participate in uncovering conditions that generate socioeconomic and other disparities and injustices in vulnerable and marginalized social groups.

George Marcus (2008: 48) pointed out that the edges of ethnography's contemporary application are where anthropologists are redefining practical boundaries of their projects in multiple theaters of reception, asking basic questions of scale, function, purpose, and ethics as ethnography shifts away from the study of culture and toward the process of knowledge production. Similarly, Aihwa Ong (2010: 101) envisions a new analytical approach whereby contemporary anthropologists are "shaping truth claims about the human in different domains of human action," ar-

guing that "anthropology is really the study of how cultures and knowledges define what it means to be human in a particular context." Hence, knowledge changes constantly as humans adapt by constructing new approaches to solve the problems of survival and everyday life, and contemporary anthropological practice must come to terms with the evolving struggles between humans and their environments. Active participation in knowledge production will allow a more accurate representation of the challenges facing the groups and communities we study. This shift toward active creation of knowledge holds the promise of ethnography as a multi-sited field where groups are not just the objects of research but become partners in the ethnographic project (Smith 1999). In some ways this has always been the case, since informants were needed to produce ethnographic constructs. In the past, informants were part of story development or rated mention in acknowledgments; now, they bring themselves in as collaborators, co-constructing research and weighing in on how research findings are communicated.

Following the lead of Michael Burawoy, who took public sociology in an inclusive direction, we advocate for a public anthropology among other anthropologies. Burawoy maintained that "public sociology is part of a broader division of labor that also includes policy sociology, professional sociology, and critical sociology" (2005: 9), and that sociology's public face cannot be separated from its professional, policy, and critical dimensions. To be sure, anthropology—particularly academic (or "professional," in Burawoy's terms) anthropology—has never been independent of publics; indeed, "most anthropology has been 'engaged' and 'public' in intention" (Field and Fox 2007: 4). Similarly, Basil Sansom (1985: 6) recognized that "in the main the discipline has also been self-sustaining, producing its own consumers though also relying on some generalized public support."

The same can be said of universities, which were never independent of publics. This especially concerns what are tellingly called public universities, but private educational institutions sustained by donations also have their relevant publics. However, it is questions of engagement—with which publics, how, and with what intensity—that define a public anthropology and differentiate it from other anthropological practices. As a form of community-engaged scholarship, this style of practice can create environments for transformation challenging disparities and inequalities. And the transformative process is bi-directional, because co-produced research, as an educational and empowering set of experiences, returns to the university through dialogue and can inform scholarly questions like those asked by Ester Barinaga and Patricia S. Parker (2013: 9): "How can we learn from organized civic forces without silencing the voices of those we work with? How can we be part of a political dialogue without re-

producing the symbolic and economic distance between the academy and civil society?" Eventually, the discipline can promote public anthropology, as we have defined it, as central to professional practice and begin to respond to these questions.

Many anthropologists have mentioned the centrality of advocacy in their work (S. Schensul and J. Schensul 1978), inasmuch as engaged anthropology does not itself *speak for* (advocate), but *speaks with* by helping to amplify the voices of the vulnerable, marginalized, and silenced through the co-construction of knowledge about problems affecting the study community. Others in the discipline often see their job as mediating to improve mutual understanding between cultures by either writing about them or acting as translational agents. Although writing and being read is a more passive approach to helping others grasp and adjust to cultural diversity, it is also an act of advocacy, since "the revelations of advocacy are usually those of making the socially invisible, observable; that is, by re-framing the relation of the audience to their social surroundings," as Peter Harries-Jones (1985: 227) observed. By contrast, Charles R. Hale (2007: 105) defines activist anthropology as a 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."

Anthropologists' negotiation or mediation with informants, clients, and research subjects can arrive at either an advocacy or an activist position. An example of advocacy is the Vicos Project carried out by Alan Homberg and other Cornell University anthropologists (Isbell 2013; Ross 2010), in which the project became a landowner and a peasantry eventually took control of the land. Sol Tax (1988), on the other hand, derived his concept of "action anthropology" from his work on the Fox Project among the Meskwaki Indians, where he realized that the anthropologist's influence needed to be better understood and used to benefit the group under study. Tax's method more closely resembles activist anthropology, given that "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). In line with Tax and his work are David and Pia Maybury-Lewis, who founded Cultural Survival in 1972 to advocate for the rights of the world's indigenous peoples (Lamphere 2009), and Sheldon Davis, who started the Anthropology Resource Center in 1975 to promote the human rights of indigenous people in the Americas (Wali 2012). And Alaka Wali founded the Center for Cultural Understanding and Change at the Field Museum to integrate the museum's arts and sciences programs through participatory action research with Chicago-area community organizations, promoting widespread participation in the arts

and civic activism in environmental conservation, restoration, and education projects (Wali 2006; Wali et al. 2003).

In a similar vein, Peggy Sanday (1976; 1998) coined the term "public interest anthropology," a perspective with its own theory and method. Its purpose is twofold: to offer theory and analysis in the service of problem solving to make change, and to make anthropology available to the general public. Dedication to social justice, human rights in the broadest sense of the term, and democratic principles is central to public interest anthropology. While writing, as an anthropological public practice, is Sanday's chief expression of public interest anthropology, it is not the only possible practice. Her suggestion to blur the distinction between action and theory leaves the door open for research-based action as another form of public anthropology. Still, this ethically grounded style of practice remains rooted in anthropological holism and relies on ethnographic data and conceptual categories to guide engaged research and analysis of civil society and the public sphere of debate and action (Sanday 2004).

Public Anthropology and the Public Sphere

The idea of the public sphere emerged with the development of the nation-state, industrialization, and urbanization. "The public" came into being with mass literacy, government-printed pronouncements, the spread of popular literature and theatrical culture, and the intellectual and political culture that grew with the popularity of salons, coffeehouses, and taverns (Woloch and Brown 2012). It also took the form of politically engaged constituents asserting their power to determine their own fate, that is, a civil society actively engaged in the politics of the day. The public struggled against royalism and adapted to and challenged prevailing aristocratic elites, each case requiring its political will to enter the fray, improve its condition, and be heard (Thompson 1963; 1971). The advance of liberal market capitalism was key to the public sphere's development as an institutional space between private life and the state (Habermas 1991). Markets expanded as goods were traded over ever wider geographic areas, and with this surge in production and commerce came the requirement for more knowledge. A commercial class—the bourgeoisie—emerged and multiplied, and its urban domicile became the model for status and the aesthetics of urban consumption. This increasingly literate class promoted literary culture and a turn toward the politics of civic issues, becoming part of an "Enlightened" public sphere of middle-class and aristocratic elements that appeared first in eighteenth-century Britain, France, and Germany (Melton 2001).

In the colonial era and then the new republic of the United States, civic culture was maintained by a few educated, powerful individuals who shared a sensibility and adhered to common rules of discourse. The broader educated classes cultivated a civic role through self-improvement and the nurturance of an urban cultural legacy, chiefly through libraries, philosophical and historical societies, mechanical and agricultural associations, and informal discussion groups (Bender 1993a). After the Civil War, America's civic culture was eroded by an urban order increasingly oriented to cultural diversity and egalitarianism, and by social and cultural segregation in spatial and institutional configurations, although these trends were clearly present in earlier periods too. By the late nineteenth century, two major hubs of public engagement had emerged: the urban labor and agrarian populist movements; and the universities, where civic activity promoted professional knowledge and practical interests (Bender 1993b). The federal Morrill Act of 1862 established land-grant colleges in the United States to further these goals.

Anthropological engagement, as an aspect of the nineteenth-century development of science for public use, was typically based in museums such as the American Museum of Natural History in New York and the Pitt Rivers Museum in Oxford. At this time British imperialism reigned, and the agrarian political economy was giving way to industrialization and urbanization. It was also a period of American expansionism and territorial annexation. This was the setting of the founding of the Royal Anthropological Institute in London in 1871, and the Bureau of Ethnology in 1879 (which became the Bureau of American Ethnology in 1897). The academic world was still far from its twentieth-century self-segmentation, in which specializations of various sorts split off to create self-referential languages and discourses. Academicians and public scholars outside the academy engaged in discourses that cut across disciplines and reached a lay audience through public print media, presentations, and debates. Erve Chambers (1989) noted that as early as 1838, professional anthropologists were involved in the Aboriginal Protection Society in London, and Michele Hanks (2004) documented the history of the Women's Anthropological Society, established in 1885, which supported housing improvements for the poor in the nation's capital. Because these activities and institutions lay outside the world of the academy, they lost ground as the academy took over the social science disciplines.

In the 1920s and 1930s, a "culture war" was fought on two fronts (Hegeman 1999; Manganaro 2002): "against ethnocentric supremacism," and "against biological determinism" (Eriksen 2006: 5). Margaret Mead, Ruth Benedict, and Franz Boas, of course, were notables in these culture wars, as were Zora Neale Hurston (1935) and Ashley Montagu (1951). In the 1930s

and 1940s, Alan Lomax (1993) collected thousands of field recordings of rural Southern folk songs and interviews with legendary folk, blues, and jazz musicians for the Library of Congress's Archive of Folk Song. During World War II and the early Cold War years, Mead and Benedict sought to make the cultures of allies and enemies alike available to both the U.S. government (Price 2002a) and the general public by founding a research project entitled Columbia University Research in Contemporary Cultures (Beeman 2000). At this time, the sociologist C. Wright Mills's work at Columbia University's Bureau for Applied Social Research included, among other projects, a study of Puerto Rican immigrants in New York City (Sterne 2005), and St. Clair Drake and Horace Cayton (1945) published a classic study of the Great Migration and African American life on Chicago's South Side based upon research conducted by Works Progress Administration fieldworkers.

The concerns of the early twentieth-century culture wars and the wartime uses of anthropology remain central to Western discourses tied to postcolonial and neoliberal interests. Faye Harrison (1991: 5) has suggested that collaborative relationships in the field, together with dissemination to wider audiences, could establish a cultural critique of hegemonic ideologies and discourses: "A decolonizing and decolonized anthropology can indeed benefit from an 'experimental moment,' but one directed toward the empowerment of its studied populations." The culture wars are certainly not over, and anthropology's position within the postcolonial situation is still being debated inside and outside the university.

Eriksen (2006) has described anthropology's withdrawal from the public soon after World War II, as social and cultural anthropology became institutionalized, dominant forces in academic debate, and at times public discourse, on world cultures. However, there were exceptions; many in the field had an impact outside of postwar anthropological circles, including Laura Bohannan (1954), Claude Lévi-Strauss (1955), Dorothy Lee (1959), Oscar Lewis (1961), Colin Turnbull (1961), Jules Henry (1963), Charles Keil (1966), Edward T. Hall (1966), Napoleon A. Chagnon (1968), Jane Goodall (1971), Marshall Sahlins (1974), Edmund Carpenter (1974), Marvin Harris (1977), John Gwaltney (1980), Marjorie Shostak (1981), Melvin Konner (1982), Eric Wolf (1982), and Sidney Mintz (1985). Today, according to Roberto J. Gonzalez (2004a: 2), "few anthropologists could be considered celebrities in the United States, but that does not mean that none speak to the public." Contemporary American anthropologists whose works reach a wider public include Nancy Scheper-Hughes (1992), Ruth Behar (1993), Meredith F. Small (1998), Paul Farmer (2003), Nina Jablonski (2006), Philippe Bourgois and Jeffrey Shonberg (2009), David Graeber (2011), and Agustín Fuentes (2012). The contemporary Mexican anthropologists Gon-

zalo Aguirre Beltrán, Salomón Nahmad Sitton, and Arturo Warman also have broad readerships (Gonzalez 2004b).

American anthropologists have a rich history of positioning themselves in the struggle for social justice and democratization (Rylko-Bauer et al. 2006). This history is the foundation of public anthropology. A public anthropologist brings *praxis* to bear in understanding the deep historical dimensions of the culture and society under study. Professional scholarship within anthropology, or scholarship for scholarship's sake, cannot by itself attain this. However, the discipline was slow to recognize anthropologically trained individuals doing public anthropology outside academic frameworks or anthropology departments. Only lately has public scholarship surfaced as a legitimate approach demonstrating scholarly acumen; therefore it has not been a basis for tenure and promotion decisions in this discipline or in others, especially regarding social scientists holding progressive perspectives. Working in a discipline with a critical tradition of values that give rise to progressive thinking, anthropologists are predisposed to express unpopular views, thereby making any public anthropology a threat to the mainstream. In this light, anthropologists, as public scholars, have often been cautious in the public sphere—especially in the 1960s—lest they be seen as antiestablishment social critics or countercultural leaders, or even labeled subversive.

Even as anthropology risked ostracism by mainstream academics outside the discipline, it also had to contend with attempts to keep the discipline marginalized so as to reduce its impact in the social arena itself, as when City University of New York administrators proposed to significantly reduce or eliminate funding for anthropology, along with philosophy, across the system during the mid-1970s New York City fiscal crisis. At some institutions, funding became a tool for manipulating departmental policies within the social sciences to align scholarship with hegemonic, rather than public, purpose. In the United States today, public intellectuals do not have unrestricted access to mainstream market media—indeed, even engaged journalists complain about self-censorship and the restricted flow of authentic information. It is ironic that journalists themselves are ostracized and marginalized in the media market of mainstream U.S. journalism. In certain European and Latin American countries, by contrast, public intellectuals participate considerably more in public discourse, and even radical ideas still crop up in normalized media.

Given the challenges humanity faces today, the idea of the public sphere and its usefulness for anthropological practice need critical examination. Habermas's idealized construct of the liberal public sphere follows from his model of communicative action, in which a lifeworld based on ideal speech situations is set off from an economic realm grounded in instru-

mental rationality (Kloppenberg 1994). Feminist historians like Nancy Fraser (1990: 59) pointed out that the liberal public sphere "rested on, indeed was importantly constituted by, a number of significant exclusions," notably bourgeois gender norms that assigned feminine domesticity to a separate private sphere. Moreover, the "separate spheres" notion that emerged in society and politics at the dawn of liberal modernity, which restricted the bourgeois public sphere to male domains of action, has become hegemonic, extending throughout society. Feminist critiques aim to broaden the idea of a public sphere to include, following Fraser (1990: 77), a "multiplicity of publics … both in stratified and egalitarian societies." This broader conception of multiple publics has the liberatory potential to expose more and more sectors of society to a wider range of issues. This clearly has an impact on anthropological practice, especially with respect to indigenous peoples and marginalized groups typically excluded from public debates over the global commons, sustainability, and the quality of life. Meanwhile, negotiations of major international agreements about these global issues are tending toward decreased transparency. These exclusionary practices exemplify, according to Richard Westra (personal communication), how an impetus that has, since the dawn of the liberal era, progressively opened a public sphere in society can be reversed by increased restriction today. We can construe this trajectory as a reversal of the liberatory dynamic of democratic modernity as well.

Coming to terms with this potential reversal of democratic modernity requires anthropological elucidation of the ways diverse societies reproduce their material existence, notably around the social demand for basic goods, the allocation of resources, and fair compensation for productive work (Westra 2006). Through critical study of changing institutional arrangements in the global economy, including acts of domination, and the various styles of resistance to these forms of power, anthropological inquiry and praxis can inform a modern idea of citizenship and social inclusion and help ensure continuation of public spheres in diverse societies.

A Critical Turn in Anthropological Knowledge

After World War II and the subsequent reorganization of U.S. higher education, prompted mainly by the Cold War, academicians often hid their political views by asserting a value-free, objective professional practice (Price 2004; 2008). In anthropology, this effectively silenced all but mainstream voices until *The New York Review of Books* printed Joseph Jorgensen and Eric Wolf's (1970) revelations about anthropologists' participation in the American war in Southeast Asia, specifically their role in U.S. counter-

insurgency efforts in Thailand (Price 1998; Wakin 1992; Wax 2008). This kind of silencing is complex. It entails avoiding political confrontation—what Laura Nader (1996) refers to as "coercive harmony." More recently, recruiting anthropologists to participate in the Human Terrain System program in the Iraq and Afghanistan wars (Glenn 2007; Gonzalez 2004a) provoked an outcry. "Embedded" in military units, anthropologists help shape military operations by providing information about the social and cultural context that is assumed to be advantageous in counterinsurgency. Neither the American Anthropological Association nor the Society for Applied Anthropology (American Anthropological Association 2009; Forte 2011) supports this role. Ironically, even anthropologists in the Human Terrain System program were apt to shift their sympathies to the people, redirecting their loyalties or, at the very least, taking an ethical stance based on the principle of non-maleficence ("do no harm"). The social scientists on the ground believed they would help prevent unnecessary deaths by collaborating with the U.S. military to communicate with "locals."

Anthropologists' efforts for the Allies in World War II, a "declared" war, differ from their involvement in "undeclared" wars or extended military engagements like Vietnam, Iraq, and Afghanistan, according to Thomas H. Eriksen (personal communication), in that the latter wars were invasions. When World War II revealed Americans' relative ignorance of the cultures and societies of enemies and allies alike, anthropologists were recruited to support the war effort. George Murdock's *Cross-Cultural Survey* at Yale University's Institute of Human Relations, funded by the Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations, hired anthropologists to assist the U.S. military's wartime operations in the Pacific, then to help govern Pacific nations liberated from the Japanese. With continued funding from the armed forces and the Central Intelligence Agency after the war, the Institute's Human Relations Area Files provided information to government agencies seeking anthropological knowledge (Price 2008; Rohde 2013). During the Cold War, programs funded federally and by foundations recruited students and academics to pursue language and cultural studies of specific interest to the national security state. Much of the netted information could be used in ways not intended by the researchers. These anthropologists' activities contributed to Cold War strategies not only because the fieldwork generated information about little studied cultures and societies, but because anthropologists, like Peace Corps volunteers and Fulbright Program scholars, were also there to struggle for "the hearts and minds" of the people.

At this time anthropologists also turned toward the study of revolutions, notably the revolutionary movements affecting peasantries in different parts of the world along with the expansion and penetration of

commercial agriculture (Wolf 1969). In predominantly peasant countries, disruptive exposure to the market forces of a capitalist world economy was sparking agrarian conflicts. Writing in *The New York Review of Books*, Stanley Diamond (1970) described how the Igbo in Biafra, who were predominantly farmers, were resisting a Nigerian state backed by global financial and oil interests. At the time, anthropology was starting to critique modernization and development theory by studying the dependency of countries at the periphery of the world system. Anthropologists and other social scientists studied dynamics of political patronage (Scott and Kerkvliet 1977), focusing on groups that mediate between peasants and the larger society and "connect the village to the wider ranging elites in markets or political networks" (Wolf 1969: xii). Writings on Third World peasant-based revolutions in the Vietnam War era reflected the sense of urgency felt by those conducting postwar anthropological fieldwork in peasant societies and thrust anthropology into public discourses on colonialism and neocolonialism. At the University of Michigan in 1965, Eric Wolf and Marshall Sahlins helped organize the anti-war movement's first "teach-in," which according to David Price (2002b: 5) is "a still vibrant model of public education that bypasses the filters and constraints of traditional media outlets." In Washington, DC, that same year, Wolf and Sahlins, together with Morton Fried, also helped organize the first national teach-in to advance public discussion of U.S. policies in Southeast Asia, an event that the national media covered widely (Price 2004).

Although anthropology has had a public face since its inception (Eriksen 2006; Lamphere 2004; Sanday 1976; Scheper-Hughes 1995; Vermeulen 2008), the notion of a public anthropology gained ground in the 1960s because domestic liberation movements in North American and European societies and national liberation movements in the colonized world opened the way to discovering "the other," and anthropology's core values enabled interpretation, translation, and amplification of the other's voice. Under postcolonial conditions today, the battle is as viable as ever. Stanley Diamond's (1974: 1) critique of the situation begins: "Civilization originates in conquest abroad and repression at home. Each is an aspect of the other." Diamond understood that "the search for the primitive" cannot be separated from civilization's longing for an idealized mode of existence that it projects onto "primitive societies." His critique extended to anthropologists who, through the colonial encounter, came to view the cultural "other" as "primitive" compared to imperial "civilizations" that produced anthropologists to provide "expert discourse" used to understand "primitive" lifeways in the interests of maintaining their hegemony. Diamond (1974: 94) then offered a corrective: "Unless the anthropologist confronts his own alienation, which is only a special instance of a general

condition, seeks to understand its roots and subsequently matures as a relentless critic of his own civilization, the very civilization which converts man into an object, he cannot understand or even recognize himself in the man of another culture or that other man in himself."

Commenting on Diamond's critique, Eric Wolf (1974: xi) locates dual epistemological crises in our civilization and our definition of human nature: "The crisis in the Western world and its imperial hinterland, which is also the crisis of humanity, cannot be confined to social, economic or technological 'problems': it inheres in our definition, our very understanding of man." Using abstract models to study humanity as a "problem" propagates an "official definition of reality" and thereby denies the "integral relation of theory and praxis," Wolf argues, calling for an anthropology that "can also posit new possibilities for ourselves" and "political action consistent with our insights" (1974: xii, xiii). Public anthropology, which likewise bridges theory and praxis, can help overcome these epistemological crises through its conscious methodological trajectory from dialogue and the co-construction of knowledge in the field situation to political action.

Yet anthropologists cannot be complacent about their capacity to produce this kind of knowledge. Knowledge made public can always be inverted—a "latent oppression" that is unseen but always present. Instead of advancing the cause of liberation and creating a context conducive to greater understanding and tolerance, anthropologists' knowledge production may cause cruelty and injury to a population because of how research is carried out and how, and by whom, research results are reported and used (Singer 2008). Here critical public anthropology is needed to elucidate power structures and their effects on global inequalities and disparities (Maida 2008; Nader 1969). A critique of traditional anthropology that emerged in the late 1960s and early 1970s (Asad 1973; Deloria 1969; Gough 1968, Huizer and Mannheim 1979; Hymes 1969; Said 1978) centered on anthropological fieldwork, which is unavoidably based on asymmetries of privilege and power, and the textual basis of professional practice in anthropology. Even public anthropology is normatively understood as textual (Eriksen 2006). Text-based work is an important product of public anthropology since its purpose is to educate and increase public consciousness, something we do not wish to minimize or reduce. However, in the context of late capitalist political economy and a critical anthropology (Arrighi 1994; Hedges 2009; Klein 2008; Maskovsky and Susser 2009; Wallerstein 1976), texts alone are insufficient.

The epistemological move toward public anthropology poses a challenge to the "normal scientific" anthropological paradigm, as Kuhn (1962) put it, amid internal calls for greater engagement and reflexivity, significant market pressure on the discipline, and higher learning institutions'

demands concerning curriculum, service, and development (Giroux 2007; Strathern 2001). Beyond their long-standing community-partnered activities, universities are strengthening ties with private corporations as a form of "engagement." Moreover, market pressures are affecting academic disciplines as well, especially their curricula. Government, corporate, and foundation funding is setting the parameters of academic research, and the marketplace even appears to influence teaching, as the Internet is used to educate tens of thousands at a time. In an academic arena where disciplines compete for funding and students, anthropology is seeking greater public recognition in response to complaints in the profession that anthropological knowledge is seldom found in public venues and is invisible in public spheres. The American Anthropological Association (AAA) has encouraged its members to become significantly more public-oriented, stressing op-ed articles and investigative journalism as vehicles (Bird 2009; 2010; Boyer 2010; Checker, Vine, and Wali 2010; Dyck and Waldram 1993; Fikry 1980; Geilhufe 1979; Peterson 2010; Shore and Wright 1997; Vesperi 2010; Wedel et al. 2005), although this move has also provoked critique (McKenna 2009). One effort by the AAA produced the traveling award-winning exhibit *Race: Are We So Different?* which directly engages the public to rethink conventional but unscientifically supported ideas about race; other AAA efforts in the works will focus on migration (Mullings 2013: 3).

Anthropologists have long been involved in addressing the public. We argue that a public anthropology was foundational to the discipline, at least in U.S. anthropology, Franz Boas's anti-racist and anti-xenophobic work being an early example. However, it took generations of anthropologists to establish this critical stance, often in the face of considerable pressure to silence questioning voices within and outside the discipline. In the 1970s and 1980s, tenure track appointments were few, relative to the number of doctorates conferred. Then as now, the most forward-thinking mentors advised graduate students to at least think about alternatives to academic careers and encouraged them to write for a general public. These decades witnessed the early development of anthropologies of Europe and North America, in part a response to limited funding for field research in more faraway environments. This prompted anthropology to expand into the world of complex societies because students were told that primitives and peasants were disappearing.

At this time, historically informed political economic anthropologists produced work exploring the nature of capitalism at the global and local levels, and the relations between capitalism and other modes of production. A critical anthropology of development also reached beyond traditional anthropological and policy audiences to address new publics. Sim-

ilarly, critical medical anthropology emerged to assert the fundamental importance of political economy in health (Biehl and Petryna 2013; Singer et al. 1992). With this changing disciplinary matrix came an academic public anthropology that not only addressed societal transformation but also supported desired change. This form of engagement is increasingly recognized and accepted as a necessary aspect of anthropological practice. This is not to deny that anthropologists were involved in making change in the past by applying anthropology in government or the private sector, or working to identify and resolve problems for private nonprofit organizations. Only now is an anthropology that addresses a wider public beginning to gain legitimacy in the academy. Within and beyond anthropology, efforts are on the rise to translate scientific knowledge for use in public discourse that can speed the address of problems experienced in the everyday lived world.

Over the last two decades, anthropologists began to self-consciously identify themselves as "public anthropologists." Within the discipline, *an anthropology for the public* gained prominence due to a unique set of circumstances. A "crisis of representation" (Denzin 1996: 135) and the reflexive turn in the human sciences pushed anthropologists toward a deeper understanding of ways people construct knowledge and of the relationship between a particular group's knowledge production and its behavior and lived experience. The anthropology of lived experience (Clifford and Marcus 1986; Geertz 2000; Marcus and Fisher 1986; Turner 1986) emerged in response to this crisis, raising issues of gender, class, and race. However, a fully reflexive interpretive anthropology clearly needs to study these issues in broader historical and political economic frames, and to critically evaluate the anthropologist's stance in the field encounter.

In this direction, Robert Desjarlais and C. Jason Throop call for phenomenological approaches and ethnographic field methods to "attend at once to the tangible realities of people's lives and to the often interrelated social, biological, corporeal, sensorial, discursive, cultural, political, economic, psychological, and environmental dimensions of those realities" (2011: 97). For example, anthropological studies of craft apprenticeships combine phenomenological, educational, historical, and economic approaches to understand the varieties of skilled practice (Marchand 2008), reflecting a move toward such methodological synergies. These concerns are, in part, a consequence of global economic penetration and political domination of the communities under study—and of academic knowledge itself, by neocolonial and neoliberal design. In critical anthropological circles, how anthropology constructs its knowledge in response to these forms of control and domination was a signal concern (Hymes 1969) well before this epistemological crisis of the mid 1980s.

What counts as knowledge is socially constructed (Berger and Luckmann 1967); each discipline defines its varied approaches to knowledge production and what its particular sense of knowledge is. Acknowledging academic knowledge production as the object of research, Michael Gibbons et al. (1994) identified the emergence, during the post–World War II era, of a new form of knowledge production that is context-driven, problem-focused, and interdisciplinary. Gibbons and his colleagues contrasted this newer form to an earlier mode of knowledge production that is academic, investigator-initiated, and discipline-based. Chris Argyris and Donald Schon discuss the specificities of the newer knowledge production in such terms as "theorizing-in-action" (1974) and "reflective practice" (Schon 1984) to define the situation. Many who do fieldwork find themselves changing the subject of research as new realities they confront in the field—that is, *in context* and *in process*—compel them to integrate theory with practice. Hence, context-driven research implies studies undertaken in the process of action that tries to solve lived problems encountered while conducting fieldwork. This transitional process, which actually occurs during graduate training in anthropology, is clearly what initial and subsequent fieldwork experiences are about; however, many academicians devote limited attention to this dialectical process.

Participatory action research (Greenwood and Levin 2006) and community-based participatory research (Israel et al. 1998) are kindred methods that acknowledge this dialectical process and integrate the scholar/researcher's expertise of with local-level (or indigenous) expertise to effect sociocultural change. The approach, which dates to the 1920s in Germany, was brought to the United States by the psychologist Kurt Lewin and spread to several disciplines, including sociology, anthropology, and most recently community development (Pottier 1997; Sillitoe 2002) and public health (Minkler and Wallerstein 2011). Lewin advanced understanding of the reality of social phenomena; the constancy of relations; and the relations among structural properties of a dynamic whole, the subparts within a social field, and the subjective and objective elements within that field. He proposed an analysis of group life that moves from perception to action, and from subjective to objective phenomena, concluding that "circular causal processes" regulate action in individuals and groups. This clearly points to the reflexivity at the core of transformational research. In Lewin's (1951: 199) field-theoretical psychology, individual perception or "fact-finding" is linked to both individual and group action through circular causality, as the content of the perception "depends upon the way in which the situation is changed by action. The result of the fact-finding in turn influences or steers action." Lewin (1935: 41) thus views human behavior as a dynamic interplay of forces "*derived from the relation of*

the concrete individual to the concrete situation, and, so far as internal forces are concerned, from the mutual relations of the various functional systems that make up the individual." His emphasis on dynamical systems nudged the social sciences toward the view that "a wider and wider realm of determinants must be treated as part of a single, interdependent field" (Cartwright 1951: xii).

Further, Lewin saw the need to move beyond disciplinary boundaries in order to study social phenomena through a coherent system of constructs. This "deterritorializing" of knowledge is evident in anthropological studies of biomedicine, sociolinguistics, and cross-cultural psychology, where an interdisciplinary framework combining neurobiology, culture, cognition, and narrative is key to understanding the range of social phenomena. Scientists in the emerging field of social neuroscience view encounters, such as participatory forms of research, as ways to enhance the social interaction essential to the reflective learning derived from, in this case, fieldwork based on grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss 1967). Interpersonal encounters that come about through participant-observation may, in turn, be supported by neural circuits linking perception and action for "close coupling and attunement between self and other," and for synaptic plasticity (Meltzoff et al. 2009: 285).

Participatory research methods seem straightforward enough at first blush, but their implementation generates numerous contradictions that must be resolved in context and in process, as research and action are carried out (Hampshire, Hills, and Iqbal 2005). Mixing expertise creates a relationship—variously called cooperative, partnered, collaborative, contractual, and consultative—whose very nature frequently leads to methodological concerns concerning power. Michael Burawoy (1998: 15) argued that action research cannot succeed without addressing the "multiple dimensions of power" and their hierarchies. He upheld the extended case method of the Manchester School (Evens and Handelman 2006) as a model for action research, one that informs his idea of a reflexive science that "elevates dialogue as its defining principle and intersubjectivity between participant and observer as a premise" (Burawoy 2009: 39). As a move toward this reflexive methodological innovation, the extended case method provides four extensions to legitimate the many alternative ethnographies that have "moved beyond thick description to incorporate historical and political sensibilities" but stop short of the model of science he proposes: "The extended case method undertakes four extensions, corresponding to intersubjectivity, process, structuration, and theory reconstruction. The first extension makes the observer a participant, experiencing the world of the Other; the second extends observations over time and space, allowing us to interpret those experiences as process; the third

extends from the local to the extralocal, historicizing our interpretation of process as shaped by forces; and the fourth extends theory, making the previous three extensions possible and connecting us to communities of theorists" (Burawoy 1998: 15). As participatory research methods continue to develop, additional conceptual and methodological knowledge frames like those Burawoy proposed, together with revised ethical guidelines (Finnis 2004), will further refine the practice within anthropology.

Toward a Redefined Public Anthropology

Since the mid twentieth century at least, significant shifts have affected both everyday consciousness and public thinking about the nature of work and community life. These changes clearly impact anthropological practice. It is safe to say that consciousness is based on what we do and where we are situated in society, the economy, and the work we do inside and out of academia. The organization of our daily lives is reflected in the way we think about things, our perception of our existence, the kind of world we create for ourselves, and our chances to improve ourselves and the world we live in. Throughout the postwar decades, a mix of corporate and state power increasingly reshaped the contours of everyday life in communities and workplaces, including the university. According to Louise Lamphere, Helena Rangoné, and Patricia Zavella (1997: 1), "cultural conceptions are being transformed by those who control hegemonic institutions *and* by workers, clients, patients, family members, and citizens affected by these institutions." Corporate power has increasingly insinuated itself into the decision-making processes of the state. This is no novelty: economic elites have always exerted influence on the politics of the state and the dominant values of society at large, clearly influencing what is considered "common sense." This "power elite," as Mills (1956) understood it, presents its own interests and projects as the indisputable common interest of all members of society. Antonio Gramsci (1971) termed the elite's influence over how society at large thinks and represents reality "ideological hegemony."

In this market-driven ideology, namely neoliberalism, anthropology must compete for funding and students. The business strategies universities have adopted to accommodate the neoliberal shift are changing the power structure and functions of higher education (Menand 2010). Public and private nonprofit universities alike have had to learn how to compete with ascendant for-profit institutions to benefit from government, foundation, and corporate largesse. This is not just a matter of how higher education organizes itself to produce knowledge, but also how its delivery

of educational services accommodates the marketplace where students seek employment. That is, "colleges and universities must accelerate the pace of curricula restructuring to expand the flexible interactive modes of teaching and learning that are sought by the workforce and made possible by the technology revolution" (Broad 1998: vi). The labor market seeks workers with particular skills and knowledge and pressures post-secondary institutions to deliver such individuals. The resultant restructuring of higher education has shifted beliefs about the value of college, and these changed views are now part of both the students' and their parents' social reality as consumers. As with any innovative product or service, a consumer may be unaware of the change in the original commodity and may not recall the move away from its original purpose, in this case from liberal education to workforce preparation. Like other products or services that change rapidly in late capitalism's current neoliberal mode, higher education has incorporated innovations that render it a revalued commodity, widely disseminated and socialized throughout the culture. A generation of parents now believes that institutions of higher education are training grounds for their children to acquire secure, well-paid jobs that will justify the high cost of education.

To be clear, neoliberalism is based on neoclassical theories of economics that posit private enterprise, made possible by liberal trade policies and open markets, as the most efficient economic form. According to neoliberalism, the private sector should determine state policies whenever it believes that government will be able to operate more efficiently and improve the economy. Privatization, a core ideological value of the neoliberal regime, has simultaneously pushed its way into a social sphere that values individual autonomy and choice, and shifted financial risk from government and corporations onto individual taxpayers. Under neoliberalism, the concept of class is abandoned for a neoliberal subjectivity characterized by personal consumption and sets of interpersonal transactions—an identity that is decontextualized and autonomous, most notably from labor processes. In Jean and John Comaroff's (2000: 306) view, class inequality under neoliberal conditions, or "millennial capitalism," is no longer rooted in work and production structures but in "mechanical solidarities of 'identity' in constructing selfhood and social being," and hence in "personal trait or lifestyle choice." A cogent example is the economic collapse during the first and second decades of this century, a transformation that has fragmented class consciousness and modernist forms of life, especially middle-class lifeways. In this crisis of neoliberalization and "millennial manifestation of market rule" (Peck, Theodore, and Brenner 2012: 268), financial institutions were rescued, whereas individual taxpayers were left to fend for themselves.

A recent shift in academic research as well causes the research university to function as an arm of the national and global economy, and as a source of the civilian knowledge workforce and military research. With these functions comes a two-pronged managerial regime. First, based upon Frederick Winslow Taylor's scientific management, it uses task analysis to control academic workplaces, including both administrative and curricular directions. Second, it carries out social management, transferring corporate-sector organizational and leadership styles, including entrepreneurship and monetization principles, to university governance oriented to the profit motive. Observing this shift, Pierre Bourdieu (2004: vii) warned: "Many research scientists or research teams are falling under the control of large industrial companies seeking to secure a monopoly on commercially very profitable products, through patents; and the boundary, which has long been blurred, between fundamental research, in university laboratories, and applied research, is tending to disappear completely." The monetizing of university-based knowledge production means that comparatively open-ended approaches, like those of anthropological research focused on interpretive analytics, are being eased out.

As an intervention, Paul Rabinow (2011: 114) suggests "rethinking" the styles of inquiry, accepted practices, and scholarly products of the interpretive sciences, beginning with "experimentation," or "simply trying out different configurations of inquiry or critique," notably through collaborative practices or "assemblages" of people and projects within common, or shared, venues for such experimentation. As in modernist experiments to create "spaces of critical practice," for Rabinow (2011: 117) the first step is "to invent practices of knowledge production, dissemination and critique that resolutely refuse the (liberal and symbolic capital-laden) individualism" of the human sciences as they are currently practiced. Abandoning methodological individualism for a more collaborative style would essentially "redesign" anthropology to more appropriately address the contemporary situation, so as to "remediate the practices, forms, and determinations of inquiry and pedagogy—and thereby make new capacities possible" (2011: 143). Following Bourdieu's notion of blurred boundaries in the research enterprise, Rabinow regards such collaborative research activities as "hybrid assemblages" within and at the edge of universities.

Along with these shifting knowledge structures, the roles of intellectuals—both private and public, within and outside of the corporate economy—have changed in the borderless world of the post–Cold War globalizing political order. Despite the politically stratified "three worlds" of the previous Cold War era, as characterized by Peter Worsley (1984), population flows across these geographical borders dramatically influenced intellectual life both in and outside the academy at the time. Ac-

cording to Richard A. Posner (2001: 5), many "of the most distinguished academic public intellectuals" in the second half of the twentieth century were foreigners, refugees, and immigrants. In U.S. anthropology, a tradition of foreign-born academic public intellectuals began with Franz Boas, was carried on by Eric Wolf and Talal Asad in the postwar years, and continues today in the public voices of Saba Mahmood, Didier Fassin, Aihwa Ong, Alaka Wali, and João Biehl, all strongly interested in human rights and social justice.

In a borderless world, many public intellectuals, native-born and émigré alike, find that the sum of their experiences at the margins of multiple social worlds is a cosmopolitan identity. Tony Judt (2010) referred to marginalized intellectuals like himself as "edge people" who, "born at intersecting margins," maintain tangential relationships to nation and community of origin and hence embrace cosmopolitanism as "the normal condition of life." Advantageously perched at the margins, public intellectuals can influence the public sphere; Judt even went on to cite a particular "obstinacy of character" that impels them to provide counterarguments, alternative views, and critiques of what human life can be, and moreover to encourage the public—that is, ordinary people—to take charge of public and common spaces and help manage the democratization of everyday life. In *Public Power in the Age of Empire,* Arundhati Roy (2004: 39) wrote: "If we want to reclaim the space for civil disobedience, we will have to liberate ourselves from the tyranny of crisis reportage and its fear of the mundane. We have to use our experience, our imagination, and our art to interrogate those instruments of the state that ensure that 'normality' remains what it is: cruel, unjust, unacceptable." Following Roy, anthropologists, as public intellectuals, will need to engage their various publics, or audiences, to understand the dynamics of war and peace in our time, namely that peace should not merely mean the absence of war (Rylko-Bauer and Singer 2011). Likewise, in the economic sphere the public must be convinced that normality should not reflect extreme disparities between a few wealthy individuals who control the vast bulk of wealth and a general population that must struggle to survive.

This book reflects its authors' experiences exploring an anthropologically informed approach of engagement that acknowledges that this discipline is at once value-based, historical, and scientific. Critical and political, it embraces advocacy and at times activism, not just as a strategy for generating data but as a commitment to support and effect change for society's most vulnerable members and for those living in oppressive conditions.

The first set of essays focuses on participatory action research. Jean Schensul focuses on the "co-construction" of public knowledge through participatory action research, whereby politically oriented activist research-

ers and politically motivated community actors create new knowledge together. She emphasizes the process by which individuals of different backgrounds, knowledge bases, and experiences integrate and synthesize multiple sources of information into a consensus perspective leading to action. Alaka Wali and Madeleine Tudor set out to rethink and experiment with participatory action research strategies based in a museum. Their applied research and public action work investigates how the process through which residents care for place and contest it relates to consequences for both the people and the built and natural environments. Multimedia strategies, when integrated into participatory action research methods, help forge pathways for community empowerment. Carl Maida explores how practitioners of professional and lay knowledge collaborated to improve urban quality of life in a working-class Latino community. Focusing on the building of a community of practice to address environmental justice concerns, the chapter demonstrates how professionals and residents moved toward common ground. Participatory action research turned community and academic stakeholders into partners designing and carrying out a research project to understand and reduce toxic risks.

The next set of essays attempts to come to terms with critical issues facing public anthropological engagement. Josiah Heyman accepts partisan engagement in public issues as a given and looks instead at what actually happens in such practices. He critically analyzes how engagement actually occurs and what this says about how the social process of political engagement affects value choices and tactical decisions in such politics. After reflecting on the distinction between radical and reformist approaches, he leaves this initial dichotomy behind to examine the social and political process of engagement. Merrill Singer explores how the anthropologist can at once serve as scientist and public social critic, and posits that social criticism can inform public anthropology. He examines anthropological involvement in knowledge-based assaults on the causes of social suffering and structural violence, attacks that respond to a core epistemological dilemma within the discipline—"Knowledge for what?"—with the applied reply "the practical transformation of the real world." Louise Lamphere's autobiographical take on public anthropology concerns the study of critical social issues, continued collaboration with communities, and public policy making. She elaborates on how her generation's participation in social movements initially catalyzed a change in anthropological research and teaching, opening up research on a host of critical social issues of concern to the populations studied.

Judith Goode discusses how, in anthropology's epistemological transition, research subjects changed from populations of "others" to "ourselves," and anthropologists' possible audiences for anthropological

knowledge production and related action roles broadened. With this transition came new ways of framing research in terms of critical theories of power-knowledge, which created complex, often critical views of professional "expertise" that complicated communication with publics. Asking "Anthropology for Whom?" Angela Stuesse reflects on the promises and pitfalls of activist research. The "Austin School" of activist anthropology promotes sustained collaboration with an organized collective and presupposes a concrete, bounded, organized group of individuals or organizations with whom one works throughout the various stages of research. Through fieldwork, however, Stuesse found that the "communities in struggle" with whom anthropologists align themselves are often much more amorphous and transitional, at times even metaphorical or imagined. Raúl Acosta also begins with a question: "Just how public is public anthropology supposed to be?" He then reflects on studies that highlight the dialogical character of anthropological research. In the new spaces—from grassroots dialogues to those fostered by emerging media—being carved out for anthropology's public engagement, activists' calls for "dialogue" and "democracy" are often appropriated by powerful governmental interests. Acosta offers an analytical framework for effective public use of anthropology to understand processes of grassroots resistance and hegemonic appropriation.

Authors of the final set of essays seek to understand public anthropology in diverse arenas, including radio and television, visual culture, and urban design. Thomas Hylland Eriksen recognizes how a public anthropology can contribute to a shift from a fragmented, reductionist view of humanity to an image of the world as a whole. Pointing to the need to reflect seriously on *what* we say, to *whom,* and *how,* he sees academic anthropologists as too often concentrating on problems that are internal to the discipline, that is, academically defined. While anthropologists have been busy doing other things, he claims, neoliberal, xenophobic, and reductionist perspectives on humanity have gained currency as "real science." Udi Mandel Butler asks: *Who* are the publics in a public anthropology? Should *the public* be regarded as the population sector interested in newspapers, books, and other media outlets where anthropologists can have a voice? Or should the public, in a public anthropology, be understood in a broader sense of promoting the use of anthropological knowledge outside the academy in domains that affect people's day-to-day lives? He frames his answers through the lens of a public anthropology of visual culture that emphasizes how subjects experience images that affect their emotions, identities, and imaginations.

Sam Beck shows how urban graffiti, an aesthetic created *in* and *of* low-income communities of color, became a commodity for mass consump-

tion, often without attribution. This brought graffiti artists into conflict with state authority as they fought to sustain graffiti as a lifestyle rather than a commodified art form. Today, gentrification and displacement have limited the movement, either eliminating it as a force and presence on the landscape or civilizing it for art gallery patrons. Graffiti survives as an urban aesthetic and a social movement of resistance, albeit tamed by the elite imaginary of urban planners, corporate real estate developers, and marketers of urban living. Finally, Tony Asare, Erika Mamley Osae, and Deborah Pellow show what it means to take anthropology out of the academy and use it to confront critical public concerns by collaborating with communities and thereby influencing social policies. They see slums as an outcome of urban poverty as well as failed policies, poor governance, inappropriate legal and regulatory frameworks, dysfunctional land markets, unresponsive financial systems, and not least a lack of political will. By documenting a project that helped solve a housing shortage through appropriate design and accessible financing, they illustrate how poor community residents became participants in a project that radically changed their living circumstances.

Together, the contributors to this volume reposition public anthropology as an anthropology of and in communities that meaningfully and productively engages in a world of intensifying disparities to fulfill a real-world purpose.

Acknowledgments

Carl A. Maida is a professor at the UCLA Institute of the Environment and Sustainability in the College of Letters and Science, where he teaches courses on action research methods and conducts community-based research on urban sustainability. His anthropological research in Los Angeles focuses on how various urban social formations—social networks, mutual aid groups, and associations based on ethnic, community, and voluntary ties—serve as arenas for making sense of atypical events and move into the vacuum to act as pathways through crisis, and will often form the basis of social movements on behalf of health and environmental quality of life. He also directs the UCLA Pre-College Science Education

Program, and conducts studies of project-based and inquiry-based learning in schools and action research in community-based organizations funded by the National Science Foundation, National Institutes of Health, US Environmental Protection Agency, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, Ford Foundation, Howard Hughes Medical Institute, and The California Endowment. He is a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Anthropological Association, and the Society for Applied Anthropology.

Sam Beck is Senior Lecturer and Director of the Urban Semester Program at Cornell University. His interests have focused primarily on intergroup relationships expressed as ethnicity, race, and class under a variety of conditions, processes, landscapes, and modes of production. He teaches a fifteen-credit academic program in which students learn ethnographic methods as tools for learning from experience. He guides students' experiences in their internships and community service/participation in critical reflection seminars. He is actively engaged in the North Brooklyn community, receiving from Churches United for Fair Housing (CUFFH) the Daisy Lopez Outstanding Leader of the Year Award. Cornell University recognized him with two Merrill Presidential Scholar Outstanding Educator Awards (2011, 2012) and the Kendall S. Carpenter Memorial Advising Award.

References

American Anthropological Association. 2009. "AAA Commission on the Engagement of Anthropology with the US Security and Intelligence Communities." Final Report on Army Human Terrain System Proof of Concept Program. http://www.aaanet.org/issues/policy-advocacy/CEAUSSIC-Releases-Final-Report-on-Army-HTS-Program.cfm.

Argyris, Chris, and Donald A. Schon. 1974. *Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Arrighi, Giovanni. 1994. *The Long Twentieth Century.* London: Verso.

Asad, Talal, ed. 1973. *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter.* New York: Humanities Press.

Balshem, Martha. 1993. *Cancer in the Community: Class and Medical Authority.* Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Barinaga, Ester, and Patricia S. Parker. 2013. "Community-Engaged Scholarship: Creating Participative Spaces for Transformative Politics." *Tamara: Journal for Critical Organization Inquiry* 11, no. 4: 5–11.

Beck, Sam, and Carl A. Maida. 2013. *Toward Engaged Anthropology.* New York: Berghahn Books.

Beeman, William O. 2000. "Introduction: Margaret Mead, Cultural Studies, and International Understanding." In *The Study of Culture at a Distance,* ed. Margaret Mead and Rhoda Métraux. New York: Berghahn Books.

Behar, Ruth. 1993. *Translated Woman: Crossing the Border with Esperanza's Story.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Bender, Thomas. 1993a. "The Cultures of Intellectual Life: The City and the Professions." In *Intellect and Public Life: Essays on the Social History of Academic Intellectuals in the United States.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

———. 1993b. "The Erosion of Public Culture: Cities, Discourses, and Professional Disciplines." In *Intellect and Public Life: Essays on the Social History of Academic Intellectuals in the United States.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Berger, Peter L., and Thomas Luckmann. 1967. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise on the Sociology of Knowledge.* New York: Anchor Books.

Biehl, João, and Adriana Petryna. 2013. "Critical Global Health." In *When People Come First: Critical Studies in Global Health,* ed. João Biehl and Adriana Petryna. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bird, S. Elizabeth, ed. 2009. *The Anthropology of News and Journalism: Global Perspectives.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

———. 2010. "Anthropological Engagement with News Media: Why Now?" *Anthropology News* 51, no. 4: 5, 9.

Bohannan, Laura (Elenore Smith Bowen, pseud.). 1954. *Return to Laughter.* New York: Harper and Row.

Borofsky, Robert. 2007. "Defining Public Anthropology: A Personal Perspective." http://www.publicanthropology.org/public-anthropology/.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 2004. *Science of Science and Reflexivity.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Bourgois, Philippe, and Jeffrey Schonberg. 2009. *Righteous Dopefiend.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Boyer, Dominic. 2010. "Digital Expertise in Online Journalism (and Anthropology)." *Anthropological Quarterly* 83, no. 1: 73–96.

Broad, Molly Corbett. 1998. "Foreword." In *What Business Wants from Higher Education,* ed. Diana G. Oblinger and Anne-Lee Verville. Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education / Oryx Press.

Burawoy, Michael. 1998. "Critical Sociology: A Dialogue between Two Sciences." *Contemporary Sociology* 27, no. 1: 12–20.

———. 2005. "For Public Sociology." 2004 Presidential Address. *American Sociological Review* 70, no. 1: 4–28.

———. 2009. *The Extended Case Method: Four Countries, Four Decades, Four Great Transformations and One Theoretical Tradition.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Carpenter, Edmund S. 1974. *Oh What a Blow That Phantom Gave Me.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Cartwright, Dorwin. 1951. "Introduction." In *Field Theory in Social Science Selected Theoretical Papers,* ed. Dorwin Cartwright. New York: Harper and Row.

Chagnon, Napoleon A. 1968. *Yanomamö: The Fierce People.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Chambers, Erve. 1989. *Applied Anthropology: A Practical Guide.* Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.

Checker, Melissa, David Vine, and Alaka Wali. 2010. "A Sea Change in Anthropology? Public Anthropology Reviews." *American Anthropologist* 112, no. 1: 5–6.

Clifford, James, and George E. Marcus, eds. 1986. *Writing Culture.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cole, John W., and Eric R. Wolf. 1974. *The Hidden Frontier: Ecology and Ethnicity in an Alpine Valley.* New York: Academic Press.

Comaroff, Jean, and John L. Comaroff. 2000. "Millennial Capitalism: First Thoughts on a Second Coming." *Public Culture* 12, no. 2: 291–343.

Deloria, Vine, Jr. 1969. *Custer Died For Your Sins.* New York: Macmillan.

Denzin, Norman K. 1996. "The Epistemological Crisis in the Human Disciplines: Letting the Old Do the Work of the New." In *Ethnography and Human Development: Context and Meaning in Social Inquiry,* ed. Richard Jessor, Anne Colby, and Richard A. Shweder. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Desjarlais, Robert, and C. Jason Throop. 2011. Phenomenological Approaches in Anthropology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 40: 87–102.

Diamond, Stanley. 1970. "Who Killed Biafra?" *The New York Review of Books* 14, no. 4: 17–26.

———. 1974. *In Search of the Primitive.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Drake, St. Clair, and Horace R. Cayton. 1945. *Black Metropolis: A Study of Negro Life in a Northern City.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Dyck, Noel, and James B. Waldram. 1993. *Anthropology, Public Policy and Native Peoples of Canada.* Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.

Eriksen, Thomas H. 2006. *Engaging Anthropology.* New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Evens, T.M.S., and Don Handelman. 2006. "Introduction: The Ethnographic Praxis of the Theory of Practice." In *The Manchester School: Practice and Ethnographic Praxis in Anthropology,* ed, T.M.S. Evens and Don Handelman. New York: Berghahn Books.

Farmer, Paul. 2003. *Pathologies of Power: Health, Human Rights and the New War on the Poor.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Field, Les, and Richard G. Fox, eds. 2007. *Anthropology Put To Work.* Oxford: Berg.

Fikry, Mona. 1980. "On Anthropology and Policy Studies." *Current Anthropology* 21, no. 5: 682–684.

Finnis, Elizabeth. 2004. "Anthropology and Participatory Research: Ethical Considerations in International Development." *NEXUS* 17, no. 1: 32–62.

Forte, Maximilian C. 2011. "The Human Terrain System and Anthropology: A Review of Ongoing Public Debates." *American Anthropologist* 113, no. 1: 149–153.

Fraser, Nancy. 1990. "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy." *Social Text* 25/26: 56–80.

Freire, Paulo. 1970. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* New York: Continuum.

Fuentes, Agustín. 2012. *Race, Monogamy, and Other Lies They Told You: Busting Myths About Human Nature.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Geertz, Clifford. 2000. "The State of the Art." In *Available Light: Anthropological Reflections on Philosophical Topics.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Geilhufe, Nancy L. 1979. "Anthropology and Policy Analysis." *Current Anthropology* 20, no. 3: 557–579.

Gibbons, Michael, Camille Limoges, Helga Nowotny, Simon Schwartzman, Peter Scott, and Martin Trow. 1994. *The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies.* London: Sage.

Giroux, Henry A. 2007. *The University in Chains: Confronting the Military-Industrial-Academic Complex.* Boulder: Paradigm.

Glaser, Barney, and Anselm Strauss. 1967. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research.* Chicago: Aldine.

Glenn, David. 2007. "Former Human Terrain System Participant Describes Program in Disarray." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* 5 December.

Gonzalez, Roberto J. 2004a. *Anthropologists in the Public Sphere: Speaking Out on War, Peace, and American Power.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

———. 2004b. "From Indigenismo to Zapatismo: Theory and Practice in Mexican Anthropology." *Human Organization* 63, no. 2: 142–150.

Goodall, Jane.1971. *In the Shadow of Man.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Goode, Judith. 1981. Teaching Urban Anthropology within a Problem-Solving Framework. *Urban Anthropology* 10, no. 4: 319–330.

Gough, Kathleen. 1968. "Anthropology and Imperialism." *Monthly Review* 19, no. 11: 12–27.

Graeber, David. 2011. *Debt: The Frist 5,000 Years.* Brooklyn, NY: Melville House.

Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks.* Ed. and trans. Quinton Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. New York: International.

Greenwood, Davydd J., and Morten Levin. 2006. *Introduction to Action Research: Social Research for Social Change.* 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gwaltney, John. 1980. *Drylongso: A Self-Portrait of Black America.* New York: Random House.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1991. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society.* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Hale, Charles R. 2007. "In Praise of 'Reckless Minds': Making a Case for Activist Anthropology." In *Anthropology Put to Work,* ed. Les W. Field and Richard G. Fox. Oxford: Berg.

Hall, Edward T. 1966. *The Hidden Dimension.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Hampshire, Kate R., Elaine Hills, and Nazalie Iqbal. 2005. "Power Relations in Participatory Research and Community Development: a Case Study from Northern England." *Human Organization* 64, no. 4: 340–349.

Hanks, Michele M. 2004. *The Women's Anthropological Society, 1885–1899: Contesting and Defining Women's Professionalism in U.S. Anthropology.* Mount Holyoke College Department of Anthropology.

Harries-Jones, Peter. 1985. "From Cultural Translator to Advocate: Changing Circles of Interpretation." In *Advocacy and Anthropology: First Encounters,* ed. Robert Paine. St John's Newfoundland: Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Harris, Marvin. 1977. *Cannibals and Kings: The Origins of Cultures.* New York: Random House.

Harrison, Faye V. 1991. "Anthropology as an Agent of Transformation: Introductory Comments and Queries." In *Decolonizing Anthropology: Moving Further Toward an Anthropology for Liberation,* ed. Faye V. Harrison. Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.

Harvey, David. 2011. "The Future of the Commons." *Radical History Review* 109: 101–107.

Hedges, Chris. 2009. *Empire of Illusion: The End of Literacy and the Triumph of Spectacle.* New York: Nation Books.

Hegeman, Susan. 1999. *Patterns for America: Modernism and the Concept of Culture.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Henry, Jules. 1963. *Culture Against Man.* New York: Random House.

Huizer, Gerrit, and Bruce Mannheim, eds. 1979. *The Politics of Anthropology: From Colonialism and Sexism Toward a View from Below.* Boston: Walter de Gruyter.

Hurston, Zora Neale. 1935. *Mules and Men.* Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott.

Hyland, Stanley E., and Linda A. Bennett. 2005. "Community Building in the Twenty-First Century." In *Community Building in the Twenty-First Century,* ed. Stanley E. Hyland. School of American Research Advanced Seminar series. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research.

Hymes, Dell, ed. 1969. *Reinventing Anthropology.* New York: Random House.

Isbell, Billie Jean. 2013. "Lessons from Vicos." In *Toward Engaged Anthropology,* ed. Sam Beck and Carl A. Maida. New York: Berghahn Books.

Israel, Barbara A., Amy J. Schulz, Edith A. Parker, and Adam B. Becker. 1998. "Review of Community-Based Research: Assessing Partnership Approaches to Improve Public Health." *Annual Review of Public Health* 19: 173–202.

Jablonski, Nina G. 2006. *Skin: A Natural History.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Jorgensen, Joseph, and Eric R. Wolf. 1970. "A Special Supplement: Anthropology on the War-path in Thailand." *The New York Review of Books* 15, no. 9: 26–35.

Judt, Tony. 2010. "Edge People." *The New York Review of Books* 57, no. 5: 11.

Keil, Charles. 1966. *Urban Blues.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Klein, Naomi. 2008. *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism.* New York: Picador.

Kleinman, Arthur, Veena Das, and Margaret Lock, eds. 1997. *Social Suffering.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kloppenberg, James T. 1994. "Democracy and Disenchantment: From Weber and Dewey to Habermas and Rorty." In *Modernist Impulses in the Human Sciences, 1870–1930,* ed. Dorothy Ross. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Konner, Melvin. 1982. *The Tangled Wing: The Biological Constraints on the Human Spirit.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Kuhn, Thomas S. 1962. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lamphere, Louise. 2004. "The Convergence of Applied, Practicing, and Public Anthropology in the 21st Century." *Human Organization* 63, no. 4: 431–443.

———. 2009. "David Maybury-Lewis and Cultural Survival: Providing a Model for Public Anthropology, Advocacy, and Collaboration." *Anthropological Quarterly* 82, no. 4: 1049–1054.

Lamphere, Louise, Helena Rangoné, and Patricia Zavella. 1997. "Introduction." In *Situated Lives: Gender and Culture in Everyday Life,* ed. Louise Lamphere, Helena Rangoné, and Patricia Zavella. New York: Routledge.

Lee, Dorothy. 1959. *Freedom and Culture.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1955. *Tristes Tropiques.* Paris: Librairie Plon. [1973. *Tristes Tropiques.* Trans. John and Doreen Weightman. London: Jonathan Cape.]

Lewin, Kurt. 1935. "The Conflict between Aristotelian and Galileian Modes of Thought in Contemporary Psychology." In *A Dynamic Theory of Personality.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

———. 1951. "Frontiers in Group Dynamics." In *Field Theory in Social Science: Selected Theoretical Papers,* ed. Dorwin Cartwright. New York: Harper and Row.

Lewis, Oscar. 1961. *The Children of Sanchez.* New York: Random House.

Lomax, Alan. 1993. *The Land Where the Blues Began.* New York: Pantheon.

Low, Setha, and Sally Engle Merry. 2010. "Engaged Anthropology: Diversity and Dilemmas." *Current Anthropology* 51, supplement 2: S203–S226.

Maida, Carl A. 2008. *Pathways Through Crisis: Urban Risk and Public Culture.* Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.

Manganaro, Marc. 2002. *Culture, 1922: The Emergence of a Concept.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Marchand, Trevor H.J. 2008. "Muscles, Morals and Mind: Craft Apprenticeship and the Formation of the Person." *British Journal of Educational Studies* 56, no. 3: 245–271.

Marcus, George. 2008. "Collaborative Options and Pedagogical Experiment in Anthropological, Research on Experts and Policy Processes." *Anthropology in Action* 15, no. 2: 47–57.

Marcus, George, and Michael Fisher. 1986. *Anthropology as Cultural Critique.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Maskovsky, Jeff, and Ida Susser. 2009. *Rethinking America: The Imperial Homeland in the 21st Century.* Boulder: Paradigm.

McKenna, Brian. 2009. "When Anthropology Disparages Journalism It Shortchanges Citizens, Damages Profession." *Society for Applied Anthropology Newsletter* 20, no. 1: 24–28.

———. 2010. "Exposing Environmental Health Deception as a Governmental Whistleblower: Turning Critical Ethnography into Public Pedagogy." *Policy Futures in Education* 8, no. 1: 22–36.

———. 2013. "Paulo Freire's Blunt Challenge to Anthropology: Create a *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* for Your Times." *Critique of Anthropology* 33, no. 4: 447–475.

Melton, James Van Horn. 2001. *The Rise of the Public in Enlightenment Europe.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Meltzoff, Andrew N., Patricia K. Kuhl, Javier Movellan, and Terrence J. Sejnowsky. 2009. "Foundations for a New Science of Learning." *Science* 325 (17 July): 284–288.

Menand, Louis. 2010. *The Marketplace of Ideas: Reform and Resistance in the American University.* New York: Norton.

Mills, C. Wright. 1956. *The Power Elite.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Minkler, Meredith, and Nina Wallerstein. 2011. *Community-Based Participatory Research for Health: From Process to Outcomes.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mintz, Sidney W. 1985. *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History.* New York: Viking.

Montagu, Ashley. 1951. *Statement on Race.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Mullings, Leith. 2013. "Communication, Engagement and Outreach." *Anthropology News* 54, no. 9/10: 3.

Nader, Laura. 1969. "Up the Anthropologist: Perspectives Gained from Studying Up." In *Reinventing Anthropology,* ed. Dell Hymes. New York: Random House.

———. 1996. "Coercive Harmony: The Political Economy of Legal Models." *Kroeber Anthropology Society Papers* 80: 1–13.

Nonini, Donald M. 2007. "Introduction: The Global Idea of 'the Commons.'" In *The Global Idea of 'the Commons,'* ed. Donald M. Nonini. New York: Berghahn Books.

Ong, Aihwa. 2010. "In Conversation with Professor Aihwa Ong." Interview by Vineeta Sinha. *Kroeber Anthropological Society* 100, no. 1: 95–103. http://kas.berkeley.edu/documents/Issue_99-100/8-InConversation.pdf.

Peck, Jamie, Nik Theodore, and Neil Brenner. 2012. "Neoliberalism Resurgent? Market Rule after the Great Recession." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 111, no. 2: 265–288.

Peterson, Mark Allen. 2010. "Journalism as Trope." *Anthropology News* 51, no. 4: 8–9.

Posner, Richard A. 2001. *Public Intellectuals: A Study of Decline.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pottier, Johan. 1997. "Towards an Ethnography of Participatory Appraisal and Research." In *Discourses of Development: Anthropological Perspectives,* ed. Ralph D. Grillo and R. L. Stirrat. Oxford: Berg.

Price, David H. 1998. "Cold War Anthropology: Collaborators and Victims of the National Security State." *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power.*4, no. 3/4: 389–430.

———. 2002a. "Lessons from Second World War Anthropology." *Anthropology Today* 18, no. 3: 14–20.

———. 2002b. "Past Wars, Future Dangers, Future Anthropologies." *Anthropology Today* 18, no. 1: 3–5.

———. 2004. *Threatening Anthropology: McCarthyism and the FBI's Surveillance of Activist Anthropologists.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

———. 2008. *Anthropological Intelligence: The Deployment and Neglect of American Anthropology in the Second World War.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Rabinow, Paul. 2011. *The Accompaniment: Assembling the Contemporary.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rohde, Joy. 2013. *Armed with Expertise: The Militarization of American Social Science Research During the Cold War.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Roseberry, William. 1989. *Anthropologies and Histories: Essays in Culture, History, and Political Economy.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Ross, Eric B. 2010. "Reflections on Vicos: Anthropology, the Cold War, and the Idea of Peasant Conservatism." In *Vicos Then and Now: A Half Century of Applying Anthropology in Peru,* ed. Ralph Bolton, Tom Greaves, and Florencia Zapata. Lanham, MD: AltaMira.

Roy, Arundhati. 2004. *Public Power in the Age of Empire.* New York: Seven Stories Press.

Rylko-Bauer, Barbara, and Merrill Singer. 2011. "Political Violence, War and Medical Anthropology." In *A Companion to Medical Anthropology,* ed. Merrill Singer and Pam Erickson. San Francisco: Wiley.

Rylko-Bauer, Barbara, Merrill Singer, and John van Willigen. 2006. "Reclaiming Applied Anthropology: Its Past, Present, and Future." *American Anthropologist* 108, no. 1: 178–190.

Sahlins, Marshall. 1974. *Stone Age Economics.* Chicago: Aldine.

Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism.* New York: Random House.

Sanday, Peggy Reeves. 1976. *Anthropology and the Public Interest: Fieldwork and Theory.* New York: Academic Press.

———. 1998. "Opening Statement: Defining Public Interest Anthropology." 97th Annual Meeting American Anthropological Association, Philadelphia, PA. http://www.sas.upenn.edu/~psanday/pia.99.html.

———. 2004. "Public Interest Anthropology: A Model for Engaged Research." http://www.sas.upenn.edu/~psanday/PIE.05.htm.

Sansom, Basil. 1985. "Canons of Anthropology?" In *Advocacy and Anthropology: First Encounters,* ed. Robert Paine. St John's Newfoundland: Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Schensul, Jean J. 2005. "Strengthening Communities through Research Partnerships for Social Change: Perspectives from the Institute for Community Research." In *Community Building in the Twenty-First Century,* ed. Stanley E. Hyland. School of American Research Advanced Seminar series. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research.

Schensul, Steven L. 1985. "Science, Theory, and Application in Anthropology." *American Behavioral Scientist* 29, no. 2: 164–185.

Schensul, Steven L., and Maria Borrero. 1982. "Introduction: The Hispanic Health Council." *Urban Anthropology* 11, no. 1: 1–8.

Schensul, Steven L., and Jean Schensul. 1978. "Advocacy and Applied Anthropology." In *Social Scientists as Advocates,* ed. George H. Weber and G.J. McCall. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schensul, Stephen L., Jean J. Schensul, Merrill Singer, Margaret Weeks, and Marie Brault. (in press). "Conceptual and Methodological Approaches to the Role of Anthropology in Community and Societal Change." In *Handbook of Methods in Cultural Anthropology,* ed. Lance Gravlee and Russell Bernard. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Scheper-Hughes, Nancy. 1992. *Death Without Weeping: The Violence of Everyday Life in Brazil.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 1995. "The Primacy of the Ethical: Propositions for a Militant Anthropology." *Current Anthropology* 36, no. 3: 409–440.

Schon, Donald A. 1984. *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think In Action.* New York: Basic Books.

Scott, James C., and Benedict J. Kerkvliet. 1977. "How Traditional Rural Patrons Lose Legitimacy: A Theory with Special Reference to Southeast Asia." In *Friends, Followers, and Factions: A Reader in Political Clientism,* ed. Steffen W. Schmidt, James C. Scott, Carl Landé, and Luara Guasti. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Shore, Chris, and Susan Wright. 1997. *Anthropology of Policy: Perspectives on Governance and Power.* London: Routledge.

Shostak, Marjorie. 1981. *Nisa: The Life and Words of a !Kung Woman.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sillitoe, Paul. 2002. "Participant Observation to Participatory Development: Making Anthropology Work." In *Participating in Development: Approaches to Indigenous Knowledge,* ed. Paul Sillitoe, Alan Bicker, and Johan Pottier. ASA Monographs 39. London: Routledge.

Singer, Merrill. 2000. "Why I am Not a Public Anthropologist." *Anthropology Newsletter* 41, no. 6: 6–7.

———. 2003. "The Hispanic Health Council: An Experiment in Applied Anthropology." *Practicing Anthropology* 25, no. 3: 2–7.

———. 2008. "Applied Anthropology." In *A New History of Anthropology,* ed. Henrika Kulick. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Singer, Merrill, Freddie Valentín, Hans Baer, and Zhongke Jia. 1992. "Why Does Juan García Have a Drinking Problem? The Perspective of Critical Medical Anthropology." *Medical Anthropology* 14, no. 1: 77–108.

Small, Meredith F. 1998. *Our Babies, Ourselves: How Biology and Culture Shape the Way We Parent.* New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples.* London: Zed Books.

Sterne, Jonathan. 2005. "C. Wright Mills, the Bureau for Applied Social Research, and the Meaning of Critical Scholarship." *Cultural Studies <=> Critical Methodologies* 5, no. 1: 65–94.

Strathern, Marilyn. 2001. "Blowing Hot and Cold." *Anthropology Today* 17, no. 1: 1–2.

Tax, Sol. 1988. "Pride and Puzzlement: Retro-introspective Record of 60 Years of Anthropology." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 17: 1–21.

Thompson, E.P. 1963. *The Making of the English Working Class.* New York: Random House.

———. 1971. "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century." *Past and Present* 50: 76–136.

Turnbull, Colin M. 1961. *The Forest People.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Turner, Victor W. 1986. "Dewey, Dilthey, and Drama: An Essay in the Anthropology of Experience." In *The Anthropology of Experience,* ed. Victor W. Turner and Edward M. Bruner. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Vermeulen, Hans F. 2008. "Anthropology in the Netherlands: Past, Present, and Future." In *Other People's Anthropologies: Ethnographic Practice on the Margins,* ed. Aleksandar Bošković. New York: Berghahn Books.

Vesperi, Maria. 2010. "Attend to the Differences First: Conflict and Collaboration in Anthropology and Journalism." *Anthropology News* 51, no. 4: 7–9.

Wakin, Erik. 1992. *Anthropology Goes to War: Professional Ethics and Counterinsurgency in Thailand.* Madison: University of Wisconsin, Center for Southeast Asian Studies.

Wali, Alaka, ed. 2006. *Collaborative Research: A Practical Introduction to Participatory Action Research (PAR) for Communities and Scholars.* Chicago: The Field Museum Center for Cultural Understanding and Change.

———. 2012. "The Arc of Justice: Indigenous Activism and Anthropological Intersections." *Tipití: Journal of the Society for the Anthropology of Lowland South America* 9, no. 2. Article 2. http://digitalcommons.trinity.edu/tipiti/vol9/iss2/2.

Wali, Alaka, Gillian Darlow, Carol Fialkowski, Madeleine Tudor, Hilary del Campo, and Douglas Stolz. 2003. "Methodologies for Interdisciplinary Research and Action in an Urban Ecosystem in Chicago." *Conservation Ecology* 7, no. 3: 2. http://www.consecol.org/vol7/iss3/art2/.

Wallerstein, Immanuel M. 1976. *The Modern World System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century.* New York: Academic Press.

Wasson, Christina, Mary Odell Butler, and Jacqueline Copeland-Carson, eds. 2012. *Applying Anthropology in the Global Village.* Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Wax, Dustin M., ed. 2008. *Anthropology at the Dawn of the Cold War: The Influence of Foundations, McCarthyism, and the CIA.* London: Pluto Press.

Wedel, Janine R., Chris Shore, Gregory Feldman, and Stacy Lathrop. 2005. "Toward an Anthropology of Public Policy." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 600: 30–51.

Westra, Richard. 2006. "Sociomaterial Communication, Community and Ecosustainability in the Global Era." In *Sustainability and Communities of Place*, ed. Carl A. Maida. New York: Berghahn Books.

Wolf, Eric R. 1969. *Peasant Wars of the Twentieth Century.* New York: Harper and Row.

———. 1974. "Foreword." In Stanley Diamond, *In Search of the Primitive.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

———. 1982. *Europe and the People Without History.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Woloch, Isser, and Gregory S. Brown. 2012. "Living the Enlightenment: The Public Sphere." In *Eighteenth-Century Europe: Tradition and Progress, 1715–1789*, ed. Isser Woloch and Gregory S. Brown. New York: Norton.

Worsley, Peter. 1984. *The Three Worlds: Culture and World Development.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.