R Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

# Introduction: Public Anthropology

CAROLE MCGRANAHAN

Anthropology may not be what you think it is. The term "anthropology" often causes people to pause: what *is it* exactly that anthropologists do? Romantic views of anthropologists as studying "lost" civilizations, esoteric rituals, and tribal peoples inadequately describe the discipline and what it has to offer. Contemporary anthropology is about the whole of human life, society, and culture—about stories and communities, problems and practices, the cultural logics and state structures that frame people's everyday lives, and the myriad and cultural means by which people make their way in the world. It is as much conducted in urban locales as in rural ones, as familiar with analyzing advertising agencies as village communities, and insistent on analyzing the esoteric alongside the everyday. Anthropology explains culture, meaning, and practice in the past and the present, including a reckoning with the discipline's own history.[1] Our past connections to colonial projects and to state institutions implicate anthropology in creating and reifying the very cultural categories we now so humbly yet urgently work to understand and to implode.[2]

This special double issue of *India Review* is very much about that implosion—about how to use and think anthropology as a project for addressing inequity. Social inequities, economic inequities, educational, political, and categorical ones, and hierarchies of gender, nation, caste, and class all fall within the anthropological domain.[3] What might anthropology bring to the communities within which and with whom we work? If anthropology is not to be a solely extractive enterprise, but an ethnographic one in the spirit of exchange, then we suggest it must be an engaged endeavor.[4] It must to some degree be a public project. Yet what happens when we preface anthropology with "public?" Why might public anthropology be worth pursuing now? And why worth pursuing in India? In this special issue, we try to capture the energy of current anthropological work in India. This is thus

not a survey of all public anthropology in India (or applied or activist work more generally),[5] but a glimpse into how some archaeologists and cultural anthropologists are practicing and envisioning public anthropology.

Public anthropology is a new practice within the discipline. A mostly unorganized, informal trend, one not associated within any specific theoretical school or subfield, public anthropology is most simply understood as an anthropology engaged with public, real-life problems and issues. Some might argue that anthropology has always been engaged with such issues, or that specific subfields such as applied anthropology have already been there and done that.[6] We contend that we see something new at present. Public anthropology is not just old wine in new bottles. As the contributors to this issue show, public anthropology is a project of this current political and historical moment, of postcolonialism, of contemporary shifts in the global order, of our own rethinking of the production and circulation of knowledge, and of a new appreciation of the value and application of anthropology in today's world.[7] So, with all of this in mind, what is public anthropology?

Public anthropology: Socially relevant, theoretically informed, and politically engaged ethnographic scholarship. At a minimum, this might be a sufficient definition. A fully fleshed out definition might require the inclusion of academic standards, collaborative aspects, critical theory, problem-solving or policy prescriptions, and/or a genuine involvement and location in a public domain.[8] A public anthropology is not one that disavows the academy, but that works to transform it by refiguring anthropological practice. This is thus an academic project as much as an applied one. Public anthropology is an ethnographic research endeavor that is both anthropologically significant and interesting *and* works to relieve human suffering.[9]

Engaged scholarship is not new in anthropology. The discipline has a long history of interventionist work, including Franz Boas' efforts to change discriminatory ideas on race, Margaret Mead's efforts to influence social and educational policy, Sol Tax's action anthropology in the 1940s and 1950s, to the more recent subfields of applied and practicing anthropology; a less salutary genealogy would include the complicity of anthropology with colonial and other

(including recent) state endeavors to classify and control populations. As with some of these earlier predecessors, public anthropology strives to effect change based on ethnographic findings. It responds to specific conditions, collaborates with relevant communities, and includes a healthy dose of anxiety surrounding issues of authority, privilege, and representation. In setting out the difficulties as well as the contributions of a public anthropology, the goal of this volume is to result in a more productive anthropology.

There exist a small number of academic projects devoted to public anthropology such as the University of Pennsylvania's Public Interest Anthropology program.[10] The most prominent is Robert Borofsky's Public Anthropology project. Borofsky's project is unique in that it is not linked to any one university, but is instead a vast and ambitious undertaking, centered on a website that creates and collates information on public anthropology, including a guide to academic departments, an annotated listing of anthropologists who have "spoken out," and a book series with the University of California Press.[11] Borofsky defines public anthropology as follows:

> Public anthropology demonstrates the ability of anthropology and anthropologists to effectively address problems beyond the discipline—illuminating the larger social issues of our times as well as encouraging broad, public conversations about them with the explicit goal of fostering social change. It affirms our responsibility, as scholars and citizens, to meaningfully contribute to communities beyond the academy—both local and global—that make the study of anthropology possible.[12]

Most, if not all, of the contributors to this special issue of *India Review* agree with this definition. But not all of them are content to rest at that. Starting with Sita Venkateswar's opening essay and its call to push past Borofsky's definition and concluding with Piya Chatterjee's haunting reflection on the roles and locations of the ethnographer, a number of our authors take public anthropology further.

An unexpected source provides new dimensions to the idea of a public anthropology: Aristotle. Sita Venkateswar draws on Aristotle's notion of phronesis as "an emotional, embodied, ethico-political existence explicitly tied to the goal of human flourishing" to envision an anthropology that is always public, one in which academic endeavors

always include commitments to social justice in and beyond the communities in which we work.[13] As an embodied practice, public anthropology would not just be an occasional or side practice, or something that one serendipitously stumbles into during fieldwork. Instead, Venkateswar argues that it should rightly be a core of the discipline as well as a commitment of individual anthropologists. A public anthropology built on "ethical forms of action and intervention" would require shifts in the disciplinary modus operandi.[14]

Embodiment and accountability are two key components of such ethical forms of action and intervention. What, for example, is the anthropologist's relationship to the knowledge claims she or he make for and about communities? How might we better link the philosophical and the pragmatic in making such claims? Piya Chatterjee poses these questions in outlining how embodiment and accountability may anchor a public anthropology. An amplification of location is one means, specifically considering "the partial, the particular, and positioned" aspects of our research and relations such that our accountability is to multiple communities involving different, but equally rigorous sorts of peer review. Ethnographic community, disciplinary colleagues, public sphere, academic department, oneself as scholar and human—a coeval accountability to each requires work such that any given community is not privileged in one sphere, but subordinate in another. How might we do this? Chatterjee suggests an *epistemology of hunger*—"the collective and collaborative spirit of many bodies in human and social action: of knowledges that are situated, partial, and truly objective"—as providing the conceptual and physical space for moving public anthropology forward.[15]

Yet not all anthropologists like the term "public" anthropology. Contributor Mark Nichter prefers to preface his description as an anthropologist with "engaged," rather than with applied, practicing, or public. As an engaged anthropologist, Nichter poses five questions to each of his research projects:

1. Whom do I hope to engage through this research and writing?
2. What kind of engagement am I attempting to foster?
3. What stage in a multistage process of problem solving does this research inform?
4. What needs to be considered next; what stakeholders are being addressed by the research and who is being neglected?

5. Can this research inadvertently be used to further an agenda that might harm a group of people and how can I minimize this possibility?[16]

These questions are crucial for conducting research that is as empirically rich as it is ethnographically sound and applicable in a real-world context. Such standards ground public as well as engaged anthropology. In any given research project, however, anthropologists are not the only ones asking such questions.

Archaeologists often rely on local communities to help them locate archaeological remains. Contributor V. Selvakumar once queried a local farmer as to whether or not there were such remains nearby; the farmer replied with three queries of his own:

1. What will you get out of it?
2. What will the country get out of it?
3. What will I get out of it?[17]

His questions cut to the heart of public anthropology. It has multiple beneficiaries, albeit ones that do not necessarily overlap and for which the benefits for one might be deficits for the other. It is political, in that it involves state and other communities beyond just researcher and local community. And, it is conducted in particular and historic contexts, ones in which a farmer's concerns are presumed to follow those of the state which follow those of the researcher. A public anthropology must thus work both with and against the way local, national, and global worlds are ordered and reordered.

## Doing Public Anthropology

There are many ways to do public anthropology. This volume alone showcases several of them—detailed case studies that might be used to inform policy, actual collaborative projects undertaken by anthropologists,[18] and radical rethinkings of the anthropological project. Nita Kumar, for example, pushes well beyond the application of research findings to propose different sorts of interventions. She tackles a difficult, deeply personal dilemma, one with which many anthropologists might be uncomfortable: the education (or lack of it) of the women she hires as servants while in the field. How, she asks, can we *serve* our informants, the people who share their stories with us? The goal of a refigured anthropology in this instance is a highly personal

one residing in the "interdependent needs of scholar and informant."[19] It is an anthropology where the scholar is not just educated by an eth-nographic community, but in turn might educate them in a broad sense.[20] The "service" one extends as anthropologist will look differ-ent from anthropologist to anthropologist and community to commu-nity. Thinking in terms of service and education is a step toward addressing the inequities present within research relationships them-selves, to acknowledge and act on such realizations as Kumar's that "I do not make myself and my presence in the field all that it could be."[21]

Similar desires to do more than research while in the field inspired several of our contributors. Dennis McGilvray found himself moving from studies of kinship and ritual to that of post-tsunami recovery strategies, from a solo practitioner model to principal investigator on a five-person interdisciplinary National Science Foundation-funded research grant. In the aftermath of such trauma, anthropology offers things NGOs often cannot—cultural and linguistic fluencies, decades-long commitments to communities, and ethnographic famil-iarity with a range of local histories, issues, and personalities. As com-munities rebuild, it turns out that such seemingly "trivial" ethnographic details as "Tamil caste hierarchies and Muslim matrilineal clan organization" matter in important and often overlooked ways.[22]

Media is another important component of public anthropology. Radio programming is one way contributor Kelly Alley extends her work, collaborating with media, NGOs, and public activists to further the exchange and circulation of knowledge. Seeking, creating, and uti-lizing new means for disseminating information is, for Alley, more than turning anthropologists into "change agents." It means instead to "con-duct scholarly life as the embodiment of socio-political participation."[23] V. Selvakumar also finds media critical in helping archaeology "reach the streets."[24] Articles, letters to the editor, internet discussions all play a role in public archaeology in India. As the political and economic uses of archaeology grow, the media is valuable for reaching the public in ways that academic programs often cannot. For each person able to visit an active archaeological site such as Selvakumar's Kadakkarappally boat, or for those able to read about it in a newspaper or online, there are still others unable to do either. Beyond questions of location and other problems of access, there is also the question of language. As Sel-vakumar points out, archaeological knowledge in India is produced in English rather than in any other Indian language.

As we embody, engage, and extend anthropology in new and public ways—to use some of our contributors' terms—with whom exactly are we doing this? For cultural anthropologists, the communities are often multiple, not simply "the people with whom we work," i.e. members of the ethnographic community in which we do research. For archaeologists, these communities might be even more varied given all the parties who stake claims to archaeological sites and histories. In her essay here, Uzma Rizvi explores the differences between "publics" and "communities," deciding that community-based archaeology rather than public interest anthropology makes the most sense in her particular research context. In the midst of her recent research, Rizvi joined a local archaeology initiative designed to foster local knowledge about archaeology while also promoting economic development. The project was ultimately unsuccessful; in analyzing why, Rizvi differentiates between public interest archaeology as existing in the realm of civil society (following the work of Peggy Sanday on public interest anthropology)[25] and community-based archaeology as involving "hand over of partial control of the project to the local community" not just to any member of civil society as representative of the public. The case she makes is particular both to her specific field location and to India. This attention to local, national, and global context is a hallmark feature of anthropology in general.

## Ethnography and Fieldwork

The power of anthropology lies in its methodology: ethnographic fieldwork. Anthropologists typically go to live in the community among which they conduct their research, for example, in a village, a town, or a class, caste, or ethnically defined neighborhood in a city. Ethnographic research methods center on participant-observation, participating in a community while also observing everyday life, ritual events, political structures, conducting formal and informal interviews and a wide range of other methodological activities. Anthropologists also tend to work in the same communities for long periods of time, often over the course of several distinct research projects. As Dennis McGilvray shows in his essay, his 30 year relationship with the people of Akkaraipattu makes a difference in the type of research he does and the reception he receives. Anthropologists are often people who return. People who know families across generations, and increasingly, across countries. Or, if not people in kin, ethnic, or geographic

communities, people in interest-based or professional ones. Mark Nichter's career as a medical anthropologist has involved building the same sort of longitudinal connections among medical professionals—be they doctors, grassroots health practitioners, or those in public health education. Ethnography involves not only work in and across communities, but also the building *of* community.

Networks are a key part of public anthropology. In the twenty-first century, these are as often virtual as they are face-to-face. If traditional fieldwork presumed a singular, face-to-face community, contemporary anthropological research does not. In the case of Sita Venkateswar's experience, the communities of her research are multiple, including those whose stories she tells (e.g., the Andaman communities) and those with whom she fights the powers that be (e.g., her internet activist network). Such networks compose the frame and body of Kim Fortun's research, reflecting the real-life configuration of individuals and groups impacted by the Bhopal disaster. Given the multilayered, inextricably bound, yet also disjointed nature of these communities, Fortun suggests that ethnography has a particular relevance for addressing how different systems "hang together." Be they textual, social, or technological, she argues that ethnographic projects are especially adept at addressing open systems, those "that are continually being reconstituted through the interaction of many scales, variables, and forces."[26]

In their own way, each contributor to this issue highlights the strength of ethnographic fieldwork. Ethnography brings us to the ground, to how people experience the abstract categories into which they are slotted, to aspects of life not easily accessed by quantitative or other qualitative methods. Working in the development field, Sondra Hausner found that ethnography offered needed insights and methods for planning, carrying out, and evaluating effective development projects. Specifically, she states that "ethnography can tell programmers stories they did not know existed [and] demonstrate links and connections that no questionnaire could have dreamed up."[27] These contributions, however, are not so widely known outside of the discipline. When Hausner first began her job, she was asked what anthropology was, indeed what qualitative research was—"is it focus groups?" her colleagues wanted to know. One goal of this special issue is to work harder to explain anthropology to a non-anthropological audience. We do so by discussing what anthropologists do, by

providing ethnographic analyses of specific issues and communities, by rethinking how we can extend ourselves as scholars and global citizens, and by musing out loud about why anthropology matters in the present.

Anthropology excels at excavating and understanding marginal narratives. Ironically, what is often "public" are majority positions and beliefs that leave little space for alternatives. If anthropology is good at accessing subaltern perspectives and unconventional or suppressed histories, then public anthropology can put this strength to use. Kim Gutschow takes such an approach in re-narrating public, conventional stories of communalism. Buddhist–Muslim relations in Zangskar, a corner of Jammu and Kashmir state, do not follow hegemonic narratives of troubled religious interaction in India. In detailing a history of past and present communal relations in Zangskar, she explores "the conflicting discourses and practices by which persons and communities participate in the public realm."[28] Such fine-grained studies as Gutschow's and that of Robyn Andrews could provide important ideas for state policies that affect people's everyday lives. In Andrews' work with Anglo-Indian communities in Kolkata, she was surprised to discover an illiterate population among them. Andrews seeks to mobilize a debate about the uncertain place of Anglo-Indians within the broader Indian community. Her prescriptions for education policy represent what she calls a "modest challenge to the status quo," but one that "if implemented, [would] have very significant impacts on the lives of individuals."[29]

Yet, access to policy makers is not always easy to obtain. Nor, as Sondra Hausner shows so clearly, is it immediately evident to policy makers why they might want to be in dialogue with anthropologists. Convincing others that anthropology is a positive resource for those involved in planning, implementing, and assessing public policy is a collective and cumulative project.[30] Participating in policy endeavors also creates new subject positions for anthropologists, as many contributors discovered. The anthropologist is now no longer solely researcher, but also mediator, translator, voice, authority, and agent of change. Wearing all of these hats at the same or even consecutive times is not easy. As Rizvi realized in the midst of doing so, "collaborating successfully with a great range of civil society actors is extremely difficult to do and to do well."[31] It is not, however, impossible. Mark Nichter's wide-ranging work in medical anthropology is one career example of this. As he argues, anthropologists need

to be "clear, strategic, and tactful" in "waking up the public, evoking emotional–moral response, and challenging complacency."[32]

## Public Anthropology Now

Why is public anthropology so relevant now? It has much to do with a postcolonial (although still imperial) world. Nita Kumar suggests that public anthropology is as much a theoretical move as it is a methodological one. Theorizing the structural inequities in scholar/informant relations, between scholars as subjects and others as subjects of our study is one response to this. Piya Chatterjee's epistemology of hunger is a related response, one designed to shift from texts to bodies, and to acknowledge and then purge anthropology of the colonial ideas that persist within it. Histories of individual scholars, of countries, and of disciplines must all be reckoned with so as to "fully get at the predicaments and possibilities" of public anthropology.[33] As contributors to this issue demonstrate, there are many ways that anthropology can work to effect change at multiple levels. From individual lives to community projects to state policy to disciplinary change, the hopes for public anthropology resonate in this post-reflexive turn, late capitalist, and postcolonial moment. At its best, public anthropology responds to changes in both the discipline and in the world.

Public anthropology also makes sense in India. Many of our contributors address timely issues—Kim Gutschow's interventions into dominant narratives of communalism, Robyn Andrews' work on changing views about Anglo-Indians in national discussions of ethnicity and education, Kelly Alley's analyses of environmental debate as commentary on nation, science, and public participation in both, and Kim Fortun's work in the fields of science and technology. In discussing three ethnographic studies, Fortun shows how ethnography as open systems analysis is particularly relevant because the "scope, pace, and complexity of change underway [in contemporary India] so clearly outruns the vocabularies and planning mechanisms" in place.[34] Her own work in and on Bhopal strongly reveals the value of ethnographic fieldwork, specifically as a post-structural "engagement with what is not expressible in dominant idioms."[35] The goal here is ethnographic in several senses, including one that responds directly to Selvakumar's farmer's second question: What will the country get out of it? Fortun suggests that a public anthropology might help also with the ways India is imagined at home and abroad. The India whose

image might be publicly supported by ethnography is, in her vision, "a living culture with the capacity to work through paradox, recognizing in complexity opportunities to build new cultural forms."[36]

Much of this work is already taking place. Not all of it is labeled "public" anthropology, nor need it be. As Dennis McGilvray observes, the urgency for public anthropology is not the same in all places. If anthropology—public or not—is rarely visible or vocal in the USA, the same does not necessarily hold for other places. In Sri Lanka, for example, McGilvray contends that public anthropology already exists as a result of "social change, ethnic conflict, and natural catastrophe [which] have unavoidably altered the local context of ethnographic fieldwork"; it is neither a new nor premeditated aspect of anthropology.[37] Anthropology looks different around the world. Access to funding, employment opportunities and obligations, amounts of privilege and prestige, and participation in national and public (not just disciplinary) debates all vary, sometimes widely. For anthropologists of India, the turn to a public anthropology signals a desire to address these inequities as well as those rooted in Indian societies and histories. As we work to make anthropology more productive, more humane, we draw on its strengths to help us better serve those who are the discipline's single most important constituency— the people whose stories we tell, whose everyday lives we learn from, who give so generously and so often receive nothing in return. If public anthropology is to serve anyone, it is them.

NOTES

1.  On the anthropology of India, see Kelly Alley, "The American Anthropology of India," *India Review* Vol. 5, No. 1 (January 2006), pp. 122–43; Veena Das, "The Anthropological Discourse on India," in Robert Borofsky, ed., *Assessing Cultural Anthropology* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1994); Nicholas Dirks, "The Policing of Tradition: Colonialism and Anthropology in Southern India," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* Vol. 39, No. 1 (January 1997), pp. 182–212, and "The Crimes of Colonialism: Anthropology and the Textualization of India," in Peter Pels and Oscar Salemink, eds., *Colonial Subjects: Essays in the Practical History of Anthropology* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999); Saloni Mathur, "History and Anthropology in South

Asia: Rethinking the Archive," *Annual Review of Anthropology* Vol. 29 (2000), pp. 89–106; Susan Wadley, "From Village to City to World: Changing the Paradigm of Anthropological Research in India," in Joseph Elder, ed., *After Fifty Years: American Studies of India* (New Delhi: Manohar Books, 1998), pp. 111–38.

2. As Nicholas Dirks has argued in the case of South Asia but also beyond, the anthropological concept of culture would not exist without colonialism. See his "Introduction: Colonialism and Culture," in *Colonialism and Culture* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992), pp. 1–26.

3. Veena Das' work consistently addresses such issues. See, for example, her *Critical Events: An Anthropological Perspective on Contemporary India* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1995).

4. For a discussion of the future of anthropology as a socially-active endeavor, see James L. Peacock, "The Future of Anthropology," *American Anthropologist* Vol. 99, No. 1 (1997), pp. 9–29.

5. Applied, if not public, anthropology does have a long history in India. For a detailed review of this history, see L. K. Mahapatra, "Anthropology in Policy and Practice in India," *NAPA Bulletin* Vol. 25 (2006[1997]), pp. 52–69. See also A. K. Kalla and K. S. Singh, *Anthropology, Development, and Nation Building* (New Delhi: Concept Publishing, 1997); P. R. G. Mathur, *Applied Anthropology and the Challenges of Development in India* (Calcutta: Punthi-Pustak, 1994); L. P. Vidyarthi and B. N. Sahay, *Applied Anthropology and Development in India* (New Delhi: National, 1980).

6. For an excellent comparative review of these subfields, see Louise Lamphere, "The Convergence of Applied, Practicing, and Public Anthropology in the 21ˢᵗ Century," *Human Organization* Vol. 63, No. 4 (Winter 2004), pp. 431–43. An excellent overview of applied anthropology is John van Willigen, *Applied Anthropology: An Introduction,* 3rd edition (Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey, 2002). For action research, see Davydd J. Greenwood and Morten Levin, *Introduction to Action Research: Social Research for Social Change* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2006[1998]).

7. For an advocacy of anthropology as a field of knowledge *and* a field of action, see Nancy Scheper-Hughes, "The Primacy of the Ethical: Propositions for a Militant Anthropology," with responses, *Current Anthropology* Vol. 36, No. 3 (June 1995), pp. 409–40. Other examples of anthropology's engagements with contemporary events are: Catherine Besteman and Hugh Gusterson, eds., *Why America's Top Pundits Are Wrong: Anthropologists Talk Back* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005); Gautam Ghosh, ed., *Civilization, Vulnerability, and Translation: Reflection in the Aftermath of September 11ᵗʰ,* special issue of *Anthropological Quarterly* Vol. 75, No. 1 (Winter 2002); Roberto J. Gonzalez, ed., *Anthropologists in the Public Sphere: Speaking Out on War, Peace, and American Power* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004)

8. Although we focus on the research aspects of public anthropology in this issue, it also has relevance in teaching. For many anthropologists, teaching involves some of their most public, critical, and engaged work.

9. Dennis McGilvray, this issue.

10. In the USA, departments of anthropology that have programs in public anthropology include American University, the University of California at Berkeley, the University of Oregon, the University of Pennsylvania, and Tufts University. These programs vary from actual degree program certificates to active research and teaching themes—some in archaeology, some in cultural anthropology, and some across the subdisciplines.

11. The website address is www.publicanthropology.org.

12. See also Trevor W. Purcell, "Public Anthropology: An Idea Searching for a Reality," Quote from Borofsky's Public Anthropology website. *Transforming Anthropology* Vol. 9, No. 2 (2000), pp. 30–33.

13. Nandini Sundar makes a related argument: "anthropologists' primary task today must be to widen public understanding of what it means to be human." See her "Toward an Anthropology of Culpability," *American Ethnologist* Vol. 31, No. 2 (2004), pp. 145–63.

14. Sita Venkateswar, this issue.

15. Piya Chatterjee, this issue.

16. Mark Nichter, this issue.
17. V. Selvakumar, this issue.
18. An excellent example of collaborative writing and research is Ann Grodzins Gold and Bhoju Ram Gujar, *In the Times of Trees and Sorrow: Nature, Power, and Memory in Rajasthan* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2002). On collaborative ethnography as public anthropology, see Luke Eric Lassiter "Collaborative Ethnography and Public Anthropology," with responses, *Current Anthropology* Vol. 46, No. 1 (February 2005), pp. 83–106, and *The Chicago Guide to Collaborative Ethnography* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005).
19. Nita Kumar, this issue.
20. She states, "By this awkward term [education], which suggests activities forced and unpleasant, I mean in fact a very wide discourse and a huge range of activities."
21. Kumar, this issue.
22. McGilvray, this issue.
23. Kelly Alley, this issue.
24. Selvakumar, this issue.
25. On Public Interest Anthropology, see statements by Sanday and others at www.sas.upenn.edu/anthro/CPIA/.
26. Kim Fortun, this issue.
27. Sondra Hausner, this issue.
28. Kim Gutschow, this issue.
29. Robyn Andrews, this issue.
30. On anthropology and policy, see Cris Shore and Susan Wright, eds., *Anthropology of Policy* (London: Routledge, 1997); John van Willigen, Barbara Rylko-Bauer, and Ann McElroy, eds., *Making our Research Useful: Case Studies in the Utilization of Anthropological Knowledge* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1989)
31. Rizvi, this issue.
32. Nichter, this issue.
33. Chatterjee, this issue.
34. Fortun, this issue.
35. Fortun, this issue.
36. Fortun, this issue.
37. McGilvray, this issue.