

Introductory comment.

AAA Panel: Public and Public Interest Anthropology. New Orleans. 2002.

James Peacock, University of North Carolina.

How should we do public interest anthropology? Among those who do it and have done it, reflected in the papers of this panel, are two approaches. Model A, Discipline based, is anchored in the discipline, often in a department of anthropology, reaching out to address public issues. Model B, inter or extra disciplinary, is anchored less in the discipline or a department and more in an inter-disciplinary organization and/or in activist initiatives driven by issues in the society at large. Peggy Sanday and her students and colleagues appear to follow model A, as does Ulf Hannerz. They reach out from their departments at Penn or Stockholm. Rob Borofsky also is type A, naming his California press series Public Anthropology. Yolanda Moses and I appear to follow model B, as do Craig Calhoun and Linda Basch; Yolanda is President of the American Council on Education, I direct a university-wide center for international studies, Craig Calhoun is President of the Social Science Research Council, and Linda Basch is head of the National Council for Research on Women. That is, each of us heads an organization that does, among other things, public interest anthropology but is not identified as anthropological. All of us, however, identify as anthropologists (Craig, too, in addition to his identity as a sociologist, boasts strong background and practice in anthropology).

Model A is probably better illustrated in these papers than B, certainly is well stated in Peggy's, so I'll say a word more about B. B asserts, you can be a public anthropologist without remaining in anthropology as an institutional or even intellectual place. In fact, you may, to coin a phrase "get the most out of anthropology by getting out of anthropology" in the sense that you can take strengths of the discipline into wider spheres by locating yourself primarily in those wider, public spaces.

Both A and B have advantages and disadvantages. An advantage of B is that it draws a larger constituency; my center could not have attracted its funding for a large building and numerous projects, I suspect, had it been restricted to anthropology—internationalism is a seemingly larger flag to salute. An advantage of A, however, is its anchoring in a discipline which, as we celebrate at these meetings, boasts a century of hard won, brave, deep truths.

Of course, A and B are not mutually exclusive. Some anthropologists do both or alternate between them over a career, and other models, a C or D combine them as the papers creatively show.