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Public anthropology, simply put, refers to the view that practitioners of anthropology should undertake research not simply for readers in the discipline, but for publics. That is, knowledge should be produced explicitly for social change, moving ethnographic situations (including publics) to effect (positive) change. But this simple definition erases the many ways in which anthropologists are practicing public anthropology today, a diversity that is also blurred when described as ‘convergence’, or through the use of the term ‘engaged’ (are there any anthropologists who view themselves as ‘unengaged’?). Public anthropology reflects a wide range of different epistemological and ethical positions, different political orientations and different kinds of ‘field’ locations in which anthropologists work, both as employees and as researchers. Obvious examples of such locations are the employment of anthropologists outside academia (working in NGOs, international organizations, government – including the military – and the corporate world); the increasingly precarious and unequal conditions of employment within universities; and the location of the academy itself in the world (Field and Fox 2007; Lins Ribeiro and Escobar 2006; Sundar 2007). Not only do these locations complicate arguments regarding research ‘at home’ versus ‘elsewhere’, they indicate that what is called public anthropology is a product of quite different relationships to economic resources, political power, ethical obligations and political responsibilities and allegiances. What Rabinow et al. (2008) call the ‘ethos’ of anthropology can be hard to locate across such diverse contexts.

Practitioners undertake a range of different activities and define terms in quite different ways, all in the name of ‘public anthropology’. If public anthropology is to have a transformative edge, it will be important to delineate those features which buoy it as such. As feminist anthropologists, we have experienced how more radical and critical elements of alternative visions can be ‘tamed’ by the academy, quietly sidelined as inappropriate for the profession (Cole 1995, 2003).

In chapter 1 we reviewed the theoretical literature on publics illustrated by ethnographic examples that reveal how investigating publics necessarily requires investigating ‘privates’. A key conclusion we reach is that the different methodological and theoretical orientations of public anthropology demand an alternative pedagogical orientation – toward a position of learning with others, rather than an imperial ‘doing good’. This is a point made clearly in the narratives of the Latin American activists in Contesting Publics.
In this book we have taken a learning-with ‘standpoint’ (Harding 1986) that recognizes that all social worlds produce knowledge; knowledge production is not the exclusive prerogative of the academy. We have engaged dialogue across generations and within a diversity of activist settings, and we have conducted ethnographic analysis across multiple scales – from the household to the city to the nation-state to the transnational. We have tried to reflect this in the structure of the book by interweaving activist voices and different styles and tones of ethnographic writing.

To conclude Contesting Publics, we address three pedagogical questions that we consider to be central if we are to fulfill the possibilities of the transformative public anthropology we envision: What are the sites for change and with whom – and how? What are the roles and forms of collaboration in public anthropology? What are the epistemological implications, responsibilities and possibilities that are raised by, and in, public anthropology research?

SITES

Although there has been consistent attention in anthropology to the ‘communities’ or ‘people’ with whom we undertake research, the sites of public anthropology are not selected to ‘answer’ a pre-designed theoretical question – as is typically the case in academic research. Rather, sites are places that demand social change and ethical co-engagement. This may mean research is ‘multi-sited’ (Marcus 1998), but not necessarily. In Engaged Observer: Anthropology, Advocacy, and Activism Victoria Sanford and Asale Angel-Ajani (2008) offer illustrative examples of the kinds of sites in which self-defined advocacy and activist anthropologists conduct research. Angel-Ajani (2008) undertakes research with women in an Italian prison. She defines working ethically as refusing to present the women’s lives as ‘facts’ so that the discipline of anthropology – in its own juridical way – can judge them (do these women ‘deserve’ to be in jail or do they need to be saved?). Similarly, Marie-Eve Carrié-Moisan in chapter 3 (this volume) writes to challenge the representational practices at play in the campaigns against sex tourism, which tend to reduce Brazilian garotas de programa to sexually victimized women in need of rescue. She seeks to destabilize common assumptions about these women, and acknowledges the limits to accessing the standpoint of the women, given their own restricted access to public knowledge production and their lack of an articulated space for activism (see also Robertson and Culhane 2005).

Increasingly the internet and social media are recognized as significant public sites for diasporic communities and human rights research (Bernal 2006; Lozada 2003; MacClancy 2002). But sites for public anthropology can also include: the past, recovering stories from the archives and oral histories that challenge the public historical record (Cole 2003, 2009; M’Closkey 2002; Silva 2004); the classroom (Gordon 1993; Low 2011), the university (Barlett 2011), the communities in which we teach (Phillips 2011); and, the discipline of anthropology itself. For the latter, we have in mind efforts to ‘decolonize’ anthropology by activists like Faye Harrison (1991); see also Hymes 1972).

Finally, we note the intriguing efforts by some anthropologists to invent publics in research sites, enabling new knowledge for critique or change (Satterfield 2009; Smith-Nonini 2009). Erica Lagalisse, for example, in chapter 5 of this volume, uses her position as an activist-ethnographer to create a space to re-frame ‘gossip’. She initiates the compilation of what she calls an ‘anthology’ of gossip with which others can engage. Other examples of innovating publics include Jennifer Schirmer’s (2009) work that brings together long-time enemies in Colombia – the military and ex-armed guerrillas – through a process she calls conversatorios. Schirmer finds that creating an alternative space where disparate parties must listen respectfully to very different points of view challenges their entrenched ‘habits of mind’ and offers an alternative ‘model for deliberation’ (2009: 229).

These are sites in which anthropological knowledge can come into play to make the ‘private’ public and to effect social change. At the same time we must also be aware that some publics may take up private matters in repressive ways (public debates about the veil or abortion are a case in point). These are all sites of contestation where new notions of the public and feminism and other democratic practices may be in development – ‘emergent’ in Rabinow’s terms. If we heed the point that publics are in formation all around us, the research sites we could consider are endless.

COLLABORATION

Collaboration refers to how anthropologists engage with sites. Typically, in conventional anthropology, this involves techniques such as participant-observation, interviews and life histories. The
distinction of public anthropology is that research is undertaken not ‘on’ but in alliance with research participants, or ‘consultants’ or ‘co-intellectuals’ (Lassiter 2005; 23–24). That is, fieldwork involves the development of relationships as part of the co-investigation of research questions of mutual concern; collaboration is a consideration for all stages of research. Here public anthropology can draw from feminist methods which have long eschewed both the objectification of research participants as a ‘source’ of data and the promotion of knowledge production as a matter of technique (Abu-Lughod 1993; Haraway 1988; Jaggar 2007; Naples 2003; Oakley 1981). In chapter 2, Sally Cole collaborates with migrant women workers to record their narratives of liberdade in order to document their experiences navigating Brazil’s new political spaces and their creation of new public discourses on gender relations in their own neighbourhoods. When Lynne Phillips (chapter 4) arrived in Ecuador she did not expect to be focusing on the country’s constitutional changes; she accompanied feminist activists not because they provided her with ‘data’ on this theme but to learn ‘alongside’ them as they engaged with a feminist concern that matters to them.

Luke Lassiter has done much to generate debate and interest in collaboration, through The Chicago Guide to Collaborative Ethnography (2005) and creating the journal Collaborative Anthropologies as a way to ‘engage the growing and ever-widening discussion of collaborative research and practice in anthropology’. Lassiter highlights the important contributions of feminist anthropology to public anthropology (2005; see also Gutmann 2007). Collaborative research seeks to develop less hierarchical, more reflexive ways of working with others in research, developing concepts such as speaking nearby, co-narration, reflexive ethics and accompaniment (Bridgman et al. 1999; Chen 1992; Cole and Phillips 1995; Howard 2011; L. Phillips 1996, 2004; Robertson and Culhane 2005; Trinh 1992). Indigenous scholars are developing research methods that highlight the social relations of research (Smith 1999); some have described research as ‘ceremony’ (Wilson 2008). Collaborative research, from this perspective, points to the need for reflexive observation of one’s participation when undertaking ‘public ethnography’ (Tedlock 2007).

Ethical issues are central to public anthropology, not least because of the close temporal link between ‘public’ orientations and the question ‘For whom is knowledge being produced?’ Collaboration necessarily involves attending to this question. When Erica Lagalisse chooses to speak nearby her activist peers in the language of ‘direct action’, she does so in an effort to make her research constructive for and responsible to the anarchist movement itself, as opposed to academic voyeurism. Engaging a lay readership – or public – in this case a transnational anarchist one, implies more than writing ‘accessibly’ and translating drafts. It implies meeting collaborators on their own terms, including speaking a common language. One of the biggest challenges Erica faced in working with Contesting Publics was the fact that the language of publics is not only unused by her activist peers, but is also always suspect for its connotation of ‘civil society’ as well as of a passive ‘audience’, with which anarchists (including herself) emphatically do not identify. On the other hand, a gendered public-private analytical framework applied all too well (unfortunately) to her ethnographic situation. And so Erica decided that even if anarchists are not familiar with this feminist mode of analysis, they should be. She therefore sought a balance and synthesis of terms, a language at times familiar to feminists and theorists of publics (but not necessarily anarchists), and at times familiar to anarchists (but not necessarily feminists). She had two implicit goals: on the one hand, to suggest to feminists, and to others who theorize publics, ways in which ‘the political’ and ‘the public’ need to be reconceived to respond to a large terrain of contemporary social activism – the direct action of anarchists; and, on the other hand, to emphasize to anarchists the continued relevance of feminist analysis to the movement and in the world.

Indeed, it is interesting that collaborative public anthropology is emerging today precisely when two processes within universities – corporate control of knowledge production and medically based ethics procedures – dominate and monitor the research landscape. The former may welcome research teams, but seldom with the sense of collaboration assumed in a public anthropology, while the latter appear to manage the research process with legal complications (to the university) uppermost in mind. But ethics for public anthropologists can seldom be articulated before the research process begins – embodied as they are in the ‘particular’ (Abu-Lughod 1991) – and they can often emerge in ways that challenge research ethics councils. For example, following the rules of ethics in Canadian universities, the ‘subjects’ in Sally and Lynne’s research project on Latin American feminist activism signed consent forms ensuring them anonymity and thus we could not use the activists’ real names in this volume. In retrospect, we wonder if this process only reproduces a north/south dynamic where women activists remain
unrecognized as the public intellectuals that they are. Moreover, one finds that the ethics of caring and generosity – that Sally and Lynne certainly experienced in working with feminist activists – are erased from view altogether (see Tornquist and Resende Flescher 2012). Yet it is precisely the practice of these kinds of values (rather than, for example, hubris) that are central to collaborative research, to healthy publics and to the transformative possibilities of the public anthropology we envision.

Marie-Eve questions the ethics of collaborative research itself, in light of her first-hand encounter with the complex political interests that traversed her field site. Witnessing awkward alliances between feminist activists, business owners and state agents that led to further entrenching the stigmatization of and discrimination against poor Brazilian women, it became more important to shed light on the tensions, contradictions and implications of these alliances, rather than to seek collaboration. In other words, Marie-Eve thought that, in order to reveal the working of power in the campaigns against sex tourism, it was necessary to 'speak against' rather than 'nearby'. For, as she underscored in a conversation the four of us had about our experience working together on this book:

It is difficult to 'speak nearby' when one seeks to point to relations of power between different groups of people, or to recognize the many ways in which, within a group, different interests may be expressed. The Brazilian women I interviewed share multiple social locations and did not speak in a unified voice, but spoke in multiple voices. Yet, at the same time, I also see the value of challenging processes of knowledge production and I want to see the women, the garotas I am writing about as public intellectuals, creating meanings and critique alongside and with me.

The point here is that, while fieldwork is always a collaborative interaction, a public orientation requires a much more self-conscious examination of collaboration as a process. It requires vigilance about how more radical forms of collaboration – those which break down the divisions based on expertise and training – will be more difficult to do and more likely to be disciplined.

CO-THEORIZING AND EPISTEMOLOGY

Perhaps the most challenging dimension for public anthropology has been that of co-theorizing. If we accept that public anthropology demands collaborative research in alliance with others, this implies that collaboration also informs the knowledge production process, including its epistemological assumptions. Given the many years of training in individualist, competitive university environments, practitioners are seldom able to relinquish such control easily.

Joanne Rappaport (2005, 2007), based on her long-term research with indigenous activists and intellectuals in Colombia, argues for a collaborative anthropology that co-constructs research agendas driven by political, not theoretical, concerns. She recounts how her work involved engaging with alternative notions of time, space, knowledge and action – an alternative epistemological universe that challenged Rappaport's ideas of culture, collaboration and the construction of indigenous identity. She concludes that collaboration is less about the paternalist gesture of giving up the power to calculate than about subordinating oneself to a very different sense of the political – of not just 'knowing otherwise' (Berglund 2006: 198) but of acting otherwise. We see this levelling of the epistemological terrain as fundamental to co-theorizing.

The decision to make Contesting Publics an inter-generational dialogue, for example, helped Sally and Lynne, as 'viejas', to think differently about emergent epistemological possibilities – for example, alternative publics-in-formation – as well as about the book's potential audience(s). We had assumed a 'like-minded' audience, but it became clear that many new scholars saw public anthropology as a benchmark, a 'best practice', rather than a radical orientation to change.

Marie-Eve engaged the idea of publics at first reluctantly, as it did not resonate with the language used by the many participants in her research. Yet, as the inter-generational thought-process in the Contesting Publics project evolved, she came to see publics as an analytical concept that allowed her to engage the various political interests that were expressed in the context of sex tourism. Indeed, the notion, while seemingly detached from the local reality of the Brazilian women, made it possible to recognize the women as protagonists in the new political space that sex tourism has become. Thus, through the concept of publics, Marie-Eve is able to engage co-theoretically with Brazilian garotas de programa who elaborate a cogent critique of their social locations and of the campaigns that stigmatize them.

Charles Hale (2007, 2008) has launched an ambitious project to build an 'activist anthropology' that is in solidarity with his research participants in Central America and that, at the same
time, will be recognized and supported as academic ‘knowledge’ within university settings. The key to Hale’s argument is that activist knowledge is a distinct kind of knowledge – as we invite readers to discover in the activist testimonies presented in this volume – one that often brings to light contradictions in our understanding of the world. Hale decries the tendency of activist anthropologists to hide the contradictions that inevitably arise due to the action orientation of their research. He argues that these contradictions are pedagogical moments – it is precisely there that knowledge ‘bridging’ is possible (see also Edelman 2009; Speed 2006). For Hale, activist anthropology can, in this sense, meet the new demand for educational institutions to teach knowing ‘how’, not just knowing ‘what’ (see Greenwood and Levin 2001). However, neither private nor public academic institutions are well known for supporting action leading to radical change. Whether the institutionalization of activist knowledge, as Hale envisions it, will simply lead to it being defused remains to be seen. On this point, perhaps lessons can be learned from the institutionalization of feminism – the assimilation of its ‘respectable version’ – in the university curricula of Women Studies programmes (Brown 2005; McRobbie 2008).

While there are hints of engagement with different types of publics in the above examples (the community and the university), it is rare for public anthropologists to position their collaborative research explicitly in relation to changing publics as Contesting Publics seeks to do. Aimee Cox (2009) is a feminist public anthropologist whose research is driven by this goal. Working with and drawing from the experiences of young black women and the performance collective BlackLight in Detroit, Michigan, Cox and her research participants identify the public sphere as racialized, sexualized and ageist (black youth being viewed as a threat in Detroit). Cox specifically asks whether it can be part of public anthropology to negotiate the public in ways that support both the personal and collective transformation projects of young black women. Because the public is always subject to political manipulation, caution must be exercised in how engagement takes place. Thus, while the ‘public/private women’ of the Mujeres de Negro activists in Mexico (see discussion of Wright 2010 in the Preface to this volume), provide a rationale for ‘private’ women to participate in public, their activism paradoxically re-inscribes dominant gender norms and ideas of public/private relations. For the Detroit activists, Cox says, the goal is directly to challenge the meaning of the hypervisibility of young African American women in public. A major issue then becomes: how can intervention in the public take place without becoming a product to be consumed by ‘the public’ in mainstream ways? The young women of BlackLight do this by combining text and performance to communicate and exchange in public spaces their experiences and the ‘emotional impact of living in under-resourced communities’. Cox argues that BlackLight performances are ‘forums for deliberation, where community members begin to consciously represent themselves and contradict the identities constructed for them through the systems of the state’ (2002: 59).

Strategic public performance, then, is another way to challenge the ‘hierarchies of knowledge production’ (2002: 53), at the same time as it begins to shift the ways in which the public imagines young African American women.

**QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION**

To initiate discussion toward a critical pedagogy of public anthropology, we conclude Contesting Publics by offering to our readers – students, activists and citizen-scholars alike – the following questions. In concluding with these questions, our purpose is, first, to aid in problematizing the idea of the ‘public’ in public anthropology; second, to indicate some of the tensions, inequalities and contradictions involved in claiming public anthropology as a distinct way of doing anthropology; and, finally, to support the hope and potential of a critical, reflexive public anthropology to offer an alternative pedagogical and theory-driven practice for understanding – and transforming – worlds.

- **Situating publics**: Is there a discernible dominant public? Are there counterpublics? Parallel publics? Popular publics? What are their relationships to one another? How are the boundaries drawn, and what is the dynamic interplay among them?
- **Inclusion/exclusion**: Who is included in publics and how do they participate? Do some people dominate publics and with what consequences? Are there people in public spaces who remain invisible? Are they seen but not heard? By what criteria (citizenship? ‘habits and culture’?) are their modes of communication and argumentation judged, and by whom? Who is absent, and through what rationale? Is it a matter of cultural exclusion (‘matter out of place’)? Or is it a matter of economic ‘privatization’? Or is it self-imposed absence? What voices are lost?
• Women/gender: How are norms of ‘proper’ behaviour and communication in the public sphere gendered? How are masculinities/femininities/transgenders formed and performed in publics? What are the consequences for behaving otherwise? To what extent are the issues that are bracketed as ‘private’ gendered? How does this bracketing reproduce inequalities (class, race, sexual orientation, age, ability)? How does this bracketing shape agenda setting?

• State and market: How are the state and the market situated? What are the modes of governance? How are publics – and the media that aim to represent them – commodified? Are there invitations to become involved – to ‘participate’? If so, from whom? And, for what purposes? What are the risks/gains of participating?

• Space: How are publics spatialized? Across what kinds of borders? How does spatialization limit or expand participation? What potential scales can be identified? What implications does scale have for circulating knowledge? How does scale affect debate and decision-making? What are the dynamics of ‘mixed spaces’? What are the dynamics of women-only spaces? What are the dynamics of bureaucratic spaces?

• Time: Are there emergent publics? Are there publics (or private) being invented or ‘in-formation’? Are there generational disparities and possibilities – legacies? Convergences? Tensions? Why, and what discursive form do they take? ‘Old fashioned’? ‘Avant-garde’?

• Setting agendas for change: What issues are discussed in publics? How diverse or exclusionary are publics? What role do the media play in circulating or erasing diverse perspectives? How is decision-making achieved on ‘matters of concern’? What contradictions or ambiguities can be identified? How should emergent publics be represented – e.g. kinship diagrams, photographs? Which matters are not accepted for – and are therefore ‘bracketed’ from – public discussion and decision-making and why? How can we identify publics that are working for gender equality? What would a public that offers alternative feminist futures look like?

Notes

PREFACE: CONTESTING PUBLICS

1. See: www.youtube.com/watch?v=3yOCnZocrw; 17/05/11; see also Kapur (2012). Writing recently on SlutWalk and the Pink Chaddi (pants) campaign in India, Ratna Kapur argues that statements such as the police officer’s that focus on women’s dress ‘reflect anxieties around women occupying public zones as citizens, professionals and consumers’ (2012: np). She argues these anxieties – not women’s dress – are what we need to analyse. And this is what our theorizing of publics seeks to contribute to.

1 TOWARDS AN ETHNOGRAPHY OF PUBLICS

1. We recognize, however, that our project does have roots in some of the early work of feminist historians such as Landes (1988) and Ryan (1998).

2 AUTO-CONSTRUCTED FEMINIST PUBLICS

1. The research was conducted as a project of the Team for Advanced Research on Globalization, Education and Technology funded by the SSHRC-INE programme. I would like to thank the many women in Cascavel who so generously shared their lives and knowledge, and Marie-Eve Carrier-Moisan for her research assistance. We interviewed 95 women (numbered 1-1-95 in the text). Translations from Portuguese are ours. Names in text are pseudonyms.

2. The Bolsa Familia (family support) programme was introduced in 2003 as part of then-President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva’s Zero Hunger initiative. It builds on former president Fernando Henrique Cardoso’s Bolsa Escola (education grant) programme and replaces other smaller food and gas subsidy programmes. Households must apply to be categorized as baixa renda (low income). In 2005, the base amount was R$50.00 per month with a possible additional R$15.00 per month per child for up to three children for a maximum of R$95.00 per month.

3. Of the women interviewed, 26 per cent were aged 18–29 years; 19 per cent were aged 30–39 years; 54 per cent were over the age of 40. Twenty-six per cent were formally employed at the cashew factory (almost all were over 30 years of age); 49 per cent worked in garment factories (32 per cent formally employed; the rest informally); 18 per cent worked in other informal activities; 6 per cent worked in government or social services; and 3 per cent were unemployed. Of the women interviewed, 39 per cent of those under 40 years of age and 35 per cent of women over 40 were working without benefits or security (Cole and Carrier-Moisan 2005).

4. Our interview questions addressed: parents’ employment, interviewee’s employment, migration history, education, marriage and children, household membership, income, resources and expenses. Conjugal violence was not a
3. For excellent analyses of feminist work on the 1998 Constitutional reform, see Rosero et al. (2000) and León (2000).

4. The Catholic Church has a long and important history in Ecuador and its influence (along with the Right to Life movement in 2008) ensured that the topic of abortion would present problems for the women's movement. President Correa apparently stated that if the 2008 Assembly proposed abortion, he would be the first to vote against it. While it could be said that, at the women's pre-conference in 2008, there was also agreement to avoid the subject of abortion, this chapter makes clear that not everyone agreed that it should be left off the table.

5. Rosa Lopez (2004) notes that, thanks to the Ley de Cuotas (Quota Law), participation of women in local government in the southern coastal province of El Oro rose from 19 per cent in 2000 to 33 per cent in 2004. For more on the impact of the Ley de Cuotas on women's political participation in Ecuador, see Cánadas (2006).

6. Deeke and León's impressive cross-country study (2001) supports the argument that neoliberal governments, with pressure from women's movements, have had a positive impact on formal (legal) gender equality in Latin America, but that this equality has not translated into equality of property ownership (land, housing). Thus a seemingly contradictory situation has arisen where, as activist Mariza says for the case of Brazil: "Women are empowered in their knowledge and awareness but economically they are poorer every day."

7. See Desmarais (2007); Dufour et al. (2010); Fariñas (2003); León & León (nd); Gibson-Graham (2006); Sousa Santos (2006). Boaventura de Sousa Santos was invited to speak to the Constitutional Assembly as an expert on new economies.

8. For more on Correa's citizen revolution, see Aguilar and Haro (2008).

9. Some woman's groups sought mainstream media coverage but others tried to avoid it because of its tendency to manipulate issues. National newspapers, and particularly El Comercio, showed little interest in the Constitutional activities of the activists I interviewed. Outside the issue of abortion, my review of El Comercio between February and June 2008, for example, reveals minimal coverage of women's issues. This is in contrast to the coverage of indigenous issues (see, for example, El Comercio 26 May 2008: 7; La Hora 14 May 2008: B3). The mainstream press often caricatured feminist issues as silly and a waste of the nation's time.

10. Both of these concepts were eventually incorporated into the Constitution as part of a "regime of good living" (regimen de buen vivir). The concept of "good living" - in Quechua, numak kawsay - is attributed to an indigenous epistemology that values life, human and non-human. The 2008 Constitution is credited for being the first in the world to grant rights to nature.

11. Almost two-thirds of Ecuadorians (64 per cent) voted to support the Constitution in 2008, and Correa handily won re-election as President in April 2009. However, activists continue to be concerned, especially within the indigenous movement, that they are being "managed" by the government (CONAIE 2010).

5 GOSSIP AS DIRECT ACTION


2. See Behar and Gordon (1995) on the relationship of feminism to anthropology's 'flexible turn'.

3. For discussion surrounding the ethics of romantic and/or sexual involvement 'in the field' see Kulick and Wilson (1995).

4. Montreal is a bilingual city; however, the Francophone and Anglophone activist scenes are somewhat segregated.


6 A PEDAGOGICAL CONVERSATION: PUBLIC SCHOLARS AND PUBLIC SCHOLARSHIP

1. This is not to discount the many important contributions that have been made in the name of engaged anthropology. See Culhane (2011), Farmer (2003), Fortun (2001), Gill (2005), Goodale (2009), Schepers-Hughes and Bourgois (2004), Speed (2006) and Warren (2007).

2. Other examples of early contributions to politically engaged anthropology were the special issue on anthropology and imperialism in Current Anthropology in 1968 and Stanley Diamond's launching of the journal Dialectical Anthropology in 1975. In Canada applied anthropology has a long tradition, as seen in the pioneering work of Harry Hawthorn, Marc-Adéral Tremblay and Sally Weaver; see also the contributions of Jim Freedman (1977), Robert Paine (1985) and Penny Van Esterik (1989). Jim Waldram (2010) and Marie-France Labrecque (2000) offer useful reviews of this 'tradition' in Canadian and Quebec contexts.

3. For more on the journal Collaborative Anthropologies, see: www.marshall. edu/coll-auth/
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